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

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

**Vice President/President-elect**
Pamela Whitlock, 
*University of North Carolina at Wilmington*  
Marianne Rinaldo Woods,  
*The University of Alabama*

**Secretary**
Denise Clark,  
*Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute*  
Penrhyn “Penny” Cook,  
*Yale University*

**Treasurer-elect**
Vivian Holmes,  
*Harvard Medical School*  
Kerry Peluso,  
*University of Pennsylvania*

**At-large Board of Directors Member (2)**
Kenneth Forstmeier,  
*Pennsylvania State University*  
Gregory Foxworth,  
*Texas A & M University*  
Gunta Liders,  
*University of Rochester*  
Jan Madole,  
*Oklahoma State University*

---

**YOUR VOTE COUNTS!**
Thank you in advance for your participation in these important elections!

The 2005 Nominating and Leadership Development Committee

Peggy Lowry, Chair  
Thomas Coggins, Vice Chair  
Norman Hebert, Region I  
Betty Farbman, Region II  
Bonnie Bruno, Region III  
Deborah Yetter, Region IV  
Jan Fox, Region V  
Pamela Webb, Region VI  
Timothy Edwards, Region VII  
Patrick Fitzgerald, Ex Officio
FRA VII Chairs Announced

John Case, Executive Director of Finance, Academic Affairs for The Cleveland Clinic Foundation and Marilyn Surbey, Associate Vice President for Finance and Research, Emory University are NCURA’s Co-Chairs for Financial Research Administration VII: Enhancing the Partnerships, April 2-4, 2006 in La Quinta, CA.

John and Marilyn are already working hard, putting together a wonderful program committee. In addition to the well received Primers and Management sessions for our new to mid-level professionals in the FRA arena, we are adding a Senior Level track to ensure a wide variety of programming spanning all areas, and all levels of financial research administration.

Below our chairs share their thoughts with you:

“I am excited to be working with Marilyn, the FRA VII committee members, and the NCURA staff on this program. The functional tracks we finalized will give all research administrators an opportunity to learn more about the important research related issues facing their institution today. Most importantly it’s a great opportunity to network with your colleagues from across the country. Mark the date on your calendar and we’ll see you at La Quinta.”

John Case

“Developing, nurturing, and maintaining partnerships is such a critical component of today’s research administration experience. I am pleased to be a part of FRA VII’s focus on this important topic. I am pleased that John, our dedicated and creative committee members, and the outstanding NCURA staff will be my “partners” in developing this exciting program. I hope everyone is able to join us in California for a great time and outstanding learning experience.”

Marilyn Surbey

So mark your calendars for an outstanding conference in beautiful La Quinta, CA April 2-4, 2006 and you can check out the La Quinta Resort and Spa at http://www.laquintaresort.com/

Congressional Developments of Interest

It appears on the surface that Congress is poised to accomplish something it has not done in many years – complete the budget process prior to the start of the federal fiscal year. Appearances can be deceiving though, as we review what is happening on the Hill with the federal budget for research, and look at what other research-related legislation is being considered.

Budget, Appropriations, and Assorted Mischief

Both the House and Senate are showing early progress in moving the individual FY 2006 appropriations bills. The House has now approved all 11 of its FY 2006 funding bills; the Senate has approved three out of its 12 funding bills, with four more reported from full committee and the rest scheduled for subcommittee action in July. Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist (R-TN) has said that much of the Senate’s floor time in July is likely to be devoted to the spending bills. However, that schedule could change if the Senate moves quickly to consideration of a new Supreme Court justice to replace Sandra Day O’Connor, who announced her retirement.

One potential pitfall, however, is that the House and Senate this year reorganized their respective appropriations committees. The House now has 10 subcommittees and 11 appropriations bills, while the Senate has 12 subcommittees and 12 bills. One of the major difficulties facing appropriators this year is the mismatch of jurisdictions between House and Senate funding bills, which will complicate conference committee negotiations.

National Institutes of Health

For NIH, the House recommends a total of $28.5 billion, an increase of $142.3 million above the FY05 level and slightly below the Administration’s requested FY06 increase of $196 million. This constitutes an increase of about 0.5 percent.

One troubling development is an amendment that would eliminate NIH funds for two studies financed by the National Institute of Mental Health. This is the third consecutive year that the House has considered amendments to remove funds from NIH-approved grants, although none has yet passed the full Congress because of opposition in the Senate. According to the amendment’s sponsor, the research failed to promote the development of new treatments for serious mental illness, which he said should be a priority. In one project, scientists are studying how pigeons react to visual stimuli. The work may help improve understanding of disorders in humans like schizophrenia and autism that involve abnormal perception. In the second project, researchers are studying how couples perceive and maintain the quality of their marriages.

The NIH Director called the amendment "damaging and inappropriate political interference" in peer review, "the historical strength of American science." Nevertheless, rather than risk the possibility that the amendment could be approved on a recorded vote, Appropriations Committee leaders agreed to place the amendment in an en bloc group of amendments that was approved by voice vote. The hope is that the amendment will be eliminated during the House-Senate conference.

The House Appropriations Committee rejected an amendment proposed by embryonic stem cell research opponents to bar NIH funding to states (so-called “therapeutic cloning”) is performed. During the debate, appropriators were urged to vote against the amendment because, in the words of one Committee member, “if the amendment passes, this research will go on, but not in places like our universities where you would want it to be done.”

In another move related to research, the House amended the bill to bar the Administration from considering political affiliation in making appointments to scientific advisory committees at the Department of Health and Human Services.

La Quinta Resort & Spa, an easy trip from the Palm Springs Airport in Palm Springs, CA, will be the home to NCURA’s FRA VII conference in 2006.
Senate Committee Approves Funding Bill for NSF and NASA

The Senate Appropriations Committee has approved its FY 2006 Commerce/Justice/Science appropriations bill, with funding totals below both the House-approved levels and the Administration’s FY 2006 requests.

NSF

The committee-passed bill would provide $5.53 billion for NSF. That is $113 million below the House-approved level and $74 million below the Administration’s FY 2006 request. The total is $58.1 million above FY05 funding. Committee report language opposes the Administration’s plan to phase out NSF’s Math and Science Partnership program and notes the addition of $4 million to the program’s budget above the Administration’s request:

“…the Committee rejects the administration’s continued request to have the Math and Science Partnership [MSP] program only exist at the Department of Education. Current activities initiated by MSP are only beginning to provide measurable results and have yet to be ready for implementation on a nationwide basis. The MSP program is an important asset in providing improved math and science education by partnering local school districts with faculty of colleges and universities. For this purpose an increase of $4,000,000 above the budget request is provided to the MSP program to be used to fund activities that are not being addressed by the companion program at the Department of Education.”

NASA

The committee-passed measure would provide $16.4 billion for NASA overall. That is $75 million below the House-approved level and $60 million below the Administration’s FY 2006 request. The total is $200 million above the FY05 level.

In the section of the Committee report dealing with the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), the committee expresses concern about the impact that declining public funding of research will have on the ability of U.S. industries to innovate. The panel also expresses continued concern about the adequacy of the nation’s S&T workforce and reiterates the committee’s interest in improving coordination and cooperation among various R&D agencies under the auspices of OSTP.

The committee also calls specifically for OSTP to review federal agricultural research. The report says:

“Recognizing the critical and important opportunities in agricultural research in this new century, the Committee encourages OSTP to assess the merit-based, peer-reviewed basic science to support food and agricultural research across all Federal agencies. The Committee further encourages OSTP to assess future opportunities and avenues for improving merit-based, peer-reviewed basic science to support food and agricultural research and to report their findings to the Committee.”

Patent Reform Legislation Takes Center Stage

A recently proposed House bill would make a number of changes in U.S. patent policy, including moving from a “first-to-invent” to “first-inventor-to-file” system; instituting a new post-grant opposition procedure to challenge patent validity; eliminating many subjective grounds that currently are available for invalidating patent claims; tightening criteria for obtaining injunctions to stop patent infringement; requiring publication of all patent applications after 18 months; expansion of “prior user rights;” and other changes having to do with imposing a duty of candor and good faith in filing and prosecuting patent applications. Notably missing is any exemption from infringement for use of patented inventions for research or non-commercial purposes.

In response the Association of American Universities, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Council on Education, and the Council on Governmental Relations submitted comments to the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property. The associations believe that, although the U.S. patent system is working well in many respects, important reforms are needed, and that, while the bill raises a number of specific concerns, it provides a strong start down the path of effective reform. The associations’ comments draw substantially on the report of the National Research Council, A Patent System for the 21st Century.

The joint association statement is available on the AAU Web site at: http://www.aau.edu/intellect/Assn_Pat_Com062405.pdf.

This is just a sampling of the items being debated in Washington that will impact universities. Controversy and concerns regarding stem cell research, export controls and dual-use life sciences research, and management and accountability of non-profit organizations are all on the table for Congressional or Executive branch action. It may be a long hot summer in DC, in more ways than one.

Tony De Crappeo serves as the Associate Director for the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
Much like traffic flow on the Washington, D.C. Beltway, Electronic Research Administration (eRA) initiatives between the grant community and federal agencies seem to move by ‘fits and starts’. Recall the flurry of activity in 1994 when the National Science Foundation (NSF) re-invented its own business processes with FastLane. For the grant community, methods of proposal preparation, submission and peer review moved from paper to electronic and changed the role of research administrators forever. Information Technology (IT) became the watchword of sponsored research offices, and NCURA responded with a series of six annual conferences (eRA or Electronic Research Administration I-VI) focused on this revolution. But progress toward development of a common eRA interface between universities and the federal government slowed significantly after “eRA VI” in 2001, frustrated in part by federal agencies following divergent paths and creating functionally independent eRA interfaces. The focus of the sometimes “frank” communication between the agencies and the research community relating to eRA interfaces largely shifted to the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), and NCURA’s innovative series of eRA conferences was suspended.

With new eRA activity centered on Grants.gov, many in the grant community see a parallel development cycle previously experienced during maturation of FastLane. Grants.gov use of the ‘PureEdge’ viewer along with recent capacity issues, seem strangely familiar to FastLane requirements for a specific version of ‘Adobe Acrobat’ and slow response times from web servers during deadlines. ‘It’s like déjà vu all over again’ quips a follower of Yogi Berra ‘isms’. Several members of the grant community expressed deep frustration over a variety of recent “glitches” that prevented or delayed proposal submission via Grants.gov. The vast majority of these problems appear to be “scaling issues,” directly resulting from the large increase in volume of transmissions associated with a tripling of applications to Grants.gov between March and June, 2005. While not shutting down Grants.gov servers, the spike in volume did generate significant problems both with hardware and the ability of Grants.gov personnel to respond to the associated spike in requests for help desk support from frustrated users.

**FastLane**

Such frustration, coupled with misconceptions over the true value of eRA, have led some to argue that FastLane be adopted by all agencies and consequently become the “common federal eRA system”. But such a view is short-sighted. First, FastLane was never developed with the primary objective of satisfying the eRA needs of the grant community. It was created by NSF to support the internal administrative data processing needs of the NSF! There was never an intent (or obligation) on the part of the NSF to provide access to the internal administrative data processing needs of the NSF! There was never an intent (or obligation) on the part of the NSF to provide access to information already gathered via a useful database for the research community.

Second, if a university wishes to report data submitted to the NSF either separately or within the context of other institutional sponsored programs data, the institution has no choice but to record that data via separate processes, usually involving re-keying of data into one or more institutional databases. Even if universities accepted this additional burden and unnecessary inefficiency, the use of FastLane as the common method of transmitting grant-related data to the federal government fails on an even more practical reality. If all federal agencies were to use FastLane as a front end system, they would have to re-engineer or eliminate their own back-end systems in favor of FastLane which, for the NSF, serves as both front- and back-end. Cost considerations of establishing a “foreign” back-end system aside, it is difficult to even begin to imagine federal agencies cooperating to this degree.

**Grants.gov**

The newly deployed Grants.gov system-to-system (S2S) interface constitutes the best hope to date of establishing a common federal eRA portal that would not only accept and validate grant applications from the research community for transmittal to the appropriate federal agency “back office” electronic systems, but also would provide a single communication portal for ALL data interaction with federal grant-making agencies. The S2S interface transmits “raw” XML data, which can flow from a variety of institutionally or vendor developed forms through Grants.gov to whatever back-end systems a federal agency wishes to employ. Such a portal potentially eliminates the need to re-key data at any point on either side of the integrated databases. One other important aspect of Grants.gov S2S design is that it is platform neutral and thus overcomes one criticism - the use of ‘PureEdge’ forms that are difficult for those not using the ‘Windows’ operating system.
Moreover, such an interface opens the possibility of being able to accept and validate data relating to any aspect of the grant life cycle, whether pre- or post-award.

Some of this potential already has been demonstrated. In June, live grant proposals were transmitted via the Grants.gov S2S interface to the Department of Energy and the NSF by MIT and InfoEd International, respectively. These transmissions constituted the first significant “proof of concept” of S2S capabilities that have been eagerly awaited by the research community.

But there are sure to be more “bumps” along the path to a truly effective common federal eRA interface. The law (PL 106/107), which requires the development of common electronic grant application and reporting systems, sunsets in 2007. Will potential Grants.gov development efforts beyond ‘Find and Apply’ be abandoned without the law’s prodging? A recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report dated April 2005 titled ‘Grants Management – Additional Actions Needed to Streamline and Simplify Processes,’ recognizes progress made thus far, yet is critical of the lack of feedback from the grantee community. The report cites progress in facilitating coordination activities, but notes that initiatives lack continuing input from grantees. To help augment the progress toward streamlining grant administration before PL 106/107 looses its teeth in 2007, GAO recommends that the Office of Management and Budgets ensure:

1. initiatives have clear goals for completion
2. agency annual progress reports are prepared
3. efforts toward common reporting continue
4. OMB’s streamlining strategy integrate individual initiatives now underway
5. grantee input is solicited on an ongoing basis

It is difficult to conceive that many goals of PL 106/107, especially those relating to post-award functions, will be achieved to any significant degree by “sunset.” To be sure, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) which, through the Department of Health and Human Services, oversees development of Grants.gov, has initiated a Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB) that is expected to guide development of electronic, government-wide systems providing “end-to-end” grants management activities. However, it remains unclear how the GMLoB will accomplish this charge. Under the plan announcing creation of the GMLoB, Grants.gov is envisioned as a “storefront” for grantees, but its role in providing a common portal for post-award functions also remains unclear. Consequently, it is not inconceivable that the grant community may be forced to establish multiple interfaces with federal agencies to perform these functions, a “solution” that falls far short of the potential that could be realized with a common interface.

Electronic Grants Business Forum

Recognizing the value of a single, common portal or storefront between the grantee and federal agencies, the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) eRA Standing Committee organized a meeting between agency and FDP institutional representatives on March 25, 2005 hosted by Grants.gov. The agenda emphasized the need for a vision of functionality beyond ‘Find and Apply’ and the positive outcomes that were achieved through earlier cooperative interactions between federal agencies and the grant community. Among the most significant were the many obstacles between agencies that were overcome when consensus was reached on using information contained in the standard form SF-424 (and later extended the addition of ‘Research and Related’ data) for applications. Establishing a single data standard for proposal submissions triggered considerable “consternation” when agencies were requested to justify including information beyond that contained in the ‘SF-424 Research and Related’ definition. Yet this effort reduced or eliminated a significant number of items contained on agency-specific paper applications. Understanding the daunting background negotiations that had to occur in order to agree on this single standard helped promote an optimistic expectation for the agenda among many attendees.

The quarterly meetings of the new forum are open, with the agenda and direction guided by a core group of individuals that include representatives from federal agencies, Grants.gov, and FDP institutions. Meeting twice without a formal name, the group recently picked the moniker of ‘Electronic Grants Business Forum’ (EGBF) to describe its mission as a subcommittee of the FDP eRA standing committee. The ambitious agenda for the first two meetings included topics such as: a ‘laundry list’ of small items and quick wins to enhance current Grants.gov functionality; establishing a common national user profile database for those needing access to government resources; DUNS/CCR registration issues for institutions; and Grants.gov user interface and cross-platform compatibility.

Mutually beneficial changes in policies and practices on both sides of the federal/grantee interface are cornerstone goals of the discussions taking place at meetings of FDP’s EGBF. Problems often can be mitigated when interacting parties understand the circumstances under which each party is functioning. For example, it has been argued by some outside the university environment that a solution to the occasional spike in transmission volume is to have users submit proposals to Grants.gov well before deadline. Research administrators, who have long made such requests to proposal developers for similar reasons, fully understand the futility of such requests. Human nature will always intervene, leading both to rational and irrational demands for the removal of any system that cannot accommodate the inevitable spikes in data transmission that will accompany agency mandated deadlines. It remains unclear whether the current design of Grants.gov S2S system handling capacity, which is significantly different than that developed by NIH, will be able to cope with these inevitable surges in data transmission from the research community. However, this issue is at the forefront of subcommittee discussions, which hopefully will help foster a long-term solution.

DUN’S Numbers

The understanding that can result from these discussions may lead to other mutually beneficial changes in eRA policy and practice, both within research institutions and federal agencies. For example, many are becoming increasingly concerned about the proliferation and misuse of Dun & Bradstreet numbers (DUN’s) and Central Contractor Registration (CCR) filings that are accumulating within individual universities. Acquisition and use of DUN’s numbers, which are required for transmission of proposals to Grants.gov, are not being managed judicially in many institutions, leading to increased confusion over whether, when, where, and under what circumstances a particular DUN’s number should be used. While the control over the acquisition and use of DUN’s numbers by a university is a university and not a federal government problem, federal agencies, including Grants.gov, are in many instances unwittingly contributing to the problem. When first contacting Grants.gov, prospective users are informed that they need to acquire a DUN’s number and are then advised on how to register with CCR. This is sage advice for the majority of individuals submitting applications to Grants.gov, but it is not good counsel for most within the research community where a university may already have established one or more DUN’s numbers and CCR registrations to conduct a variety of transactions with the federal government. As pointed out by others in the research community, Grants.gov should include an explicit statement in its directions that separate registrations are not necessarily required for individuals submitting grant proposals through a research institution, and that such individuals should first contact the appropriate institutional official for guidance.

Continued on next page
Although provision of such statements would be helpful, the source of this problem is not Grants.gov. The lack of control over use of DUN’s numbers and proliferation of CCR registrations in universities stems in part from a lack of communication and understanding both within universities and between universities, federal agencies, Dun and Bradstreet, and the CCR. This issue has been raised at FDP, and is already leading to some promising discussions and actions within the EGBF subcommittee. Representatives of the university community and Grants.gov are approaching both Dun and Bradstreet and the CCR to apprise them of the problem. FDP may well invite representatives of these organizations to its September meeting to air the issue. For its part, NCURA may also be able to help by including a session at an upcoming meeting that might promote better management of these numbers and registrations within the research community.

These are but a few examples of the positive outcomes that can result from collaborative interactions among all parties involved in achieving the promise of eRA, namely, increasing the productivity of those directly involved in the conduct of research. If the new FDP Electronic Grants Business Forum can foster enhanced efficiency of the interface between federal and institutional eRA systems through better communication and mutually productive demonstration projects, we likely will be one step closer to realizing that promise.

R.N. Keogh, Consulting Services, InfoEd International and Ron Splitterber, Director, Research Services, Colorado State University.

---

Beyond the A-133 Audit: Expanding the Focus (Part 1 of a Series)

by Kathleen Hall and Marilyn Surbey

Many universities undergo audits beyond the usual A-133 audit. When the sponsor conducts an audit of specific projects, the experience can be very different from what we are accustomed to in the usual A-133 audit. In addition to a thorough examination of effort reporting, non-salary costs are being reviewed in a new way. University research administrators tend to focus on the propriety of the expense. Is the expense allowable and allocable? Does it belong to the grant to which it was charged? If the answer to both of these questions is yes, we assure the principal investigator and university administration that everything will turn out fine. However, that reassurance may be premature.

Auditors are increasingly reviewing the detail behind the institutional forms or signature requirements and requesting proof of award-specific approvals and procedures that show knowledge of and compliance with the grant terms and condition. Auditors are going beyond the normal, general financial system requirements and are wanting to validate in-depth understanding and compliance with award terms, on a transaction-by-transaction basis.

The auditor will review the internal control structure that provides the authority to spend, the documentation for the expense, and the adequacy of the post-review. How will your institution answer the following questions?

**Supplies**

Who made the request and who approved the purchase? Are they different people? Are they familiar with the grant program terms and needs? Who gave them the authority? How is this documented? Prove it.

How do you document “receipt” when there is no receiving report? Are packing slips or other such documentation reviewed, noted and retained? If not, how can you prove the goods were received?

When costs are split, how is the allocation methodology explained and documented? (“The PI said so” is not an acceptable answer.)

Are there written, internal departmental procedures (i.e., in addition to university procedures - detailed procedures for the local unit) for purchasing supplies on sponsored projects?

**Travel**

Who authorized the trip? Can you prove the trip was authorized prior to the trip being taken? Is the approver familiar with the program needs and the financial terms and conditions? Do they have the authority? How is this authority documented?

Does backup documentation to the travel expense justify how the trip was related to the grant rather than just justify the expenditures? Is there an agenda, meeting notice or other information that substantiates the purpose of the trip?

Are all prepaid expenses included on the voucher? If there is only prepaid airfare, how is the trip authorized, justified, etc.? Do you maintain the boarding passes or other evidence that the traveler actually took the trip?

If all of the above has been done properly by an authorized individual, familiar with the purpose of the trip, why would a cost transfer be necessary after the cost has been posted to the ledger?

---

Kathleen Hall is Associate Director, Office of Grants and Contracts Accounting, Emory University and Marilyn Surbey is Associate Vice President for Finance and Research, Emory University.
Jerry Fife and Pat Hawk presented an Online Education Program entitled “Surviving an Audit” and the Compliance Corner wanted to highlight a couple of points for NCURA members. Below is a “conversation” between Jerry and Pat.

**PAT:** It’s amazing how quickly our 90 minutes passed, so I wanted to follow-up on our conversation on audits. In particular, I want to follow-up on one of the types of audits we identified— investigations stemming from whistleblower suits. While whistleblower suits are not audits per se, you talked about the importance of these whistleblower suits, and now we see why they’re important. Whistleblower suits carry civil and criminal penalties, but they can also lead to inquiries and investigations from an Inspector General.

The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Inspector General has announced that they intend to perform pilot audits in FY05. DHHS indicated their work in resolving whistleblower suits, as well as findings from audits they performed for other agencies, has led to these pilot audits. The audits will examine these five areas: direct charging of clerical and administrative, cost transfers, cost sharing/matching, subrecipient monitoring and budgeted effort vs. effort charged.

DHHS has also announced they intend to perform audits on service centers again (their last audit on services centers took place about 10 years ago) in FY05. DHHS indicated their work in resolving whistleblower suits, as well as findings from audits they performed for other agencies, has led to these pilot audits. The audits will examine these five areas: direct charging of clerical and administrative, cost transfers, cost sharing/matching, subrecipient monitoring and budgeted effort vs. effort charged.

DHHS has also announced they intend to perform audits on service centers again (their last audit on services centers took place about 10 years ago) in FY05. DHHS indicated their work in resolving whistleblower suits, as well as findings from audits they performed for other agencies, has led to these pilot audits. The audits will examine these five areas: direct charging of clerical and administrative, cost transfers, cost sharing/matching, subrecipient monitoring and budgeted effort vs. effort charged.

**JERRY:** You’ve done a comprehensive job of covering most of the pertinent topics. I would add that policies should be reviewed periodically to make sure that they are current and are aligned with institutional practices. I would also encourage those charged with developing policies to make sure that once a policy is written that it receives wide distribution and that training sessions are conducted to review the policy and answer any questions that arise.

**PAT:** Along the same vein, I’m a HUGE fan of documentation in the files. Files are your friends—be good to them and don’t neglect them. They should be managed “in the moment” because it will be very difficult—if not impossible—to recreate events and appropriate documentation after the fact. Documentation doesn’t have to be exquisite or horribly complicated—it can be as simple as a note to the file. I have used these on many occasions, and I’ve also used e-mail messages from principal investigators. A perfect example of this occurred when I wanted to verify a principal investigator’s grant-related activities while he was on sabbatical. I knew he was going “off the payroll,” but I didn’t know if he’d be away from campus for more than 3 months (a prior approval issue on his National Institutes of Health grants). Getting the verification from him that he would not be away from campus for more than 3 continuous months—via e-mail—was all I needed for proper documentation. Jerry, any other comments you’d like to make on this or anything else?

**JERRY:** I have a slightly different topic regarding files. Make sure your record retention policy is current and provides clear guidance on how long files are to be maintained in order to meet sponsor requirements. Once defined do not maintain files longer than required because your institution will be required to produce records that are maintained beyond the requirement if requested.

**PAT:** Yes, Jerry has a very good story about keeping files too long. This happened to him at one institution. If you want to hear Jerry’s story, or if you’re interested in hearing more of our conversation on audits, visit NCURA’s Online Education Program website at http://www.ncura.edu/meetings/oep/.

Surviving an Audit Faculty: Jerry Fife, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Finance, Vanderbilt University; Pat Hawk, Assistant Director, Sponsored Programs & Research Compliance, Oregon State University.
Greetings. I hope everyone is having a great summer.

Many thanks to all who played a part in putting together a wonderful program and very successful Spring meeting. I am happy to report that, because of your hard work, we had record-breaking attendance for the meeting. Approximately 270 people were in attendance. The meeting evaluations were very positive. A number of people commented on the timely sessions and great speakers. The Tuesday evening dinner at the Mystic Aquarium was also a big hit. Special thanks go out to the NCURABLES for a fabulous Tuesday night party. Stay tuned for details of the 2006 Spring meeting.

Now that the Spring meeting is behind us, we can set our sights toward the NCURA 47th Annual Meeting. The Annual Meeting will take place October 30 through November 2, 2005. The preliminary program and registration information can be found on the NCURA website http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/47/. So mark your calendars. We hope to see you all there.

There are a few things happening at the Regional level as well. By the time you receive this newsletter, the process for electing a new Regional Chair, Treasurer, and Board Member from Region I will be well under way. We hope to have a slate of nominees by the end of July, go through the balloting process during the month of August and have newly elected officers by the first week of September. The new officers will take office effective January 1, 2006.

Lastly, the dates for the 2005-2006 RADG season have been set. The dates are October 20 and December 14, 2005 and February 9, April 4, and June 14, 2006. Our featured speaker for the October 20th meeting will be Geoff Grant, Deputy Director for Management, Operations and Policy, National Science Foundation.

Information regarding the RADG meetings can be found on the Regional website http://web.mit.edu/osp/www/ncura/

We will see you soon. Enjoy the rest of your summer.

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

Greetings Region II Colleagues:

The Region II Communications Committee is in the process of revising and revamping our website, and we will be including an expanded section on member news. If you have something you would like to post to the Region II website News section, please email to Maureen McMahon, our region’s Secretary, at mmcmahon@umbc.edu. The Region II Communications Committee is also looking for volunteers interested in helping to develop the website and contribute to a regional newsletter that we are planning to initiate in the near future. If you’re interested in volunteering, please contact Maureen.

I am pleased to report that Region II was well represented at NCURA’s Leadership Convention held at Villanova University, July 29-31, 2005. The three representatives are: Wayne Brown, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Cheryl Williams of Rochester University, and David Bond of the Rochester Institute of Technology. The three representatives were selected by the Region II Steering Committee from those nominated among the membership. We thank them for their service and dedication to our region.

Later this summer we will be holding elections for officers for the region. This will include elections for Chair Elect and Secretary. Anyone interested in these positions, and in serving the region, may look at the descriptions in the region’s bylaws on the Region II webpage on the NCURA website.

Speaking of bylaws, there have been several suggestions made for changes in the bylaws. One of particular interest is to create the position of a Treasurer Elect, who would assist the Treasurer, and have a year to learn in that position, before assuming the position of Treasurer. Pending the recommendation of the Steering Committee, these bylaw changes will come up for approval by the membership.

I hope that everyone has a wonderful summer. We are always looking for volunteers—if you are interested in becoming more active in Region II, please contact me at demartro@shu.edu. As always, I welcome your suggestions and comments.

Robert De Martino is Chair of Region II and serves as Director of Grants and Research Services at Seton Hall University.

As predicted, the Regional Conference held at the New Orleans Fairmont was a big success, due in large part to the unselfishness of so many regional members. I would like to thank the members of the program committee once again for their hard work in putting the conference together. The committee members were Aynoka Bender, Furman University; Dawn Boattman, North Florida University; Tricia Callahan, Western Kentucky University; MJ Carver, University of North Carolina Wilmington; John Childress, Vanderbilt University; Mark Dorminy, Vanderbilt University; Brian Farmer, East Carolina University; Randy Legeai, Tulane University; Martha Taylor, Auburn University; Jill Frazier Titcher, University of Miami; Pam Whitlock, University of North Carolina Wilmington; and Marianne Woods, University of Alabama. In addition, the conference could not have occurred without the oversight and assistance of Pat Green, Vanderbilt University and Mo Valentine, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences. The attendance exceeded everyone’s expectations with registrations nearing 275 people. The “Big Easy” did not disappoint in terms of providing the regional membership with informative sessions and opportunities to unwind. The region looks forward to next year’s conference to be held at the Miami Wyndham on May 7-10th.

David W. Richardson is Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
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David W. Richardson is Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
NCURA Region IV members, along with SRA Midwest Section members, took the plunge in Chicago with record attendance at our Spring Meeting. Over 470 attendees were present for the festivities, which gave our members an unprecedented chance to network and learn. During the meeting, we honored Jim Maus from the Genome Sequencing Center at the Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis, and Deborah Galloway from the University of Cincinnati, with Distinguished Service Awards for their continuing and long-term contributions to Research Administration. Jim and Debi have both been involved with Region IV for many years and have served in various capacities in our region, including Chair. Both have contributed greatly to furthering the Region, acting as mentors and friends. In addition, the AIMS Enhancement Project Team from Purdue University received the Meritorious Contribution Award. The group of winners included the following: Christy Sprinkles, Mary Bell, Edie Doland, Julie Jang, Rob Lehman, Trent Terry and Susan Whaley. The AIMS Enhancement Project’s goal was to prioritize the needs expressed by faculty and their research staff to improve AIMS (Accounting Information Management System), which had been implemented in 1997. Their improvements were met with positive feedback from faculty and staff, who are now able to more effectively manage their sponsored program funds. Congratulations to our winners for their contributions to the Region. And, thanks to SRA Midwest Section President Frances DeVos and NCURA Region IV Chair Heather Offhaus for leading the planning team through a successful meeting!

Region IV was also proud to be home to the most recent NIH Regional Seminar, held at Purdue University in West Lafayette, Indiana on June 23 and 24th. Over 700 attendees from around the country and as far away as South Africa participated in the two-day seminar. Look for a first-hand account in the next Region IV newsletter.

Region IV is pleased to have our own Bill Sharp as the new editor of NCURA’s scholarly journal—Research Management Review (RMR). Bill is always on the lookout for articles that will contribute to our understanding of research administration. If you’d like to consider writing, please contact Bill at: wsharp@ku.edu.

Erin Nash serves as Communications Chair, Region IV and is a Grants & Contracts Manager, Office of Research & Sponsored Programs for Ohio University.

Greetings!

The Program Committee and Regional officers are making great progress in putting together an initial draft of the program for the 2006 spring meeting. As you all know the Region V Spring 2006 meeting is scheduled to be held in Austin, TX. The dates of the meeting and the Hotel information will be made available as soon as the contract is finalized and the dates are confirmed.

Information about the National meeting has just been announced. Please review the meeting program and dates and make your travel plans early to take advantage of early bird registration, airfare and room rates. For new and newer members planning to attend, the hotel rooms sell out very soon after the program is announced so make your reservations early. As always, feel free to contact me or any of the regional officers with any questions regarding our region or the national meeting.

At this time, on behalf of the awards committee and Region V members, I would like to recognize Joanne Palmer from Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi and Leah Anne Brooks from Southeastern Oklahoma State University, who were recipients of the 2005 Quinten S. Mathews Travel Scholarship Award.

Region V also recognizes Bobby Mcquiston of University of Texas Austin and Joan Howeth of The University of Oklahoma (Retired and past chair) who were recipients of the 2005 Distinguished Service Award for Region V.

Please join me in congratulating each of the recipients. To those vacationing or traveling this summer, Safe Travels!

Govind Narasimhan is the Chair of Region V and is with the Office of Finance – Contracts & Grants at The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston.

Hello everyone. Just a few updates… I wanted to remind you that many of the PowerPoint presentations from our April meeting in Chandler Arizona are available on the Regional website – go to http://www.ogrds.wsu.edu/r6ncura/meetings.asp and under “Presentations” click on the session you would like to review. Thanks to the presenters and Monte Sutton and Dan Nordquist at Washington State University for making this information available to us all.

Things are rolling along for the National Meeting and we are hoping for a big turn out from the Region at National.

Remember, this makes for a great opportunity to schedule some visits with those very supportive grants personnel in the federal agencies.

The Region VI Nominating Committee, chaired by Christina Hansen, University of California – Irvine with Dick Seligman, California Institute of Technology and Dan Nordquist, Washington State University, has developed a fine slate of candidates for the positions of Chair-elect, Secretary/Treasurer-elect, and one Regional Advisory Committee member; more on that later.

Ann Pollack, our Chair-elect from the University of California – Los Angeles, along with some “on-site” support by Georgette Sakumoto from the University of Hawaii, has squared away the hotel arrangements for our next regional meeting. I am pleased to announce we will be at the Radisson Kauai Beach Resort on the island of Kauai, with meeting dates of April 23 through April 26, 2006. As usual, we have made arrangements for the conference rates to be available for up to 4 days before and after the conference, provided space is available. We will have more information for the membership through our Regional listserv at a later date.

That’s it for now. I hope you all have a cooler (except for our colleagues in Alaska) and great rest of the summer.

Gary Chaffins is Chair of Region VI and serves as the Director of the Office of Research Services and Administration at the University of Oregon.

Hello Region VII Members,

Hope everyone is enjoying their summer and is taking time out for some rest and relaxation! I hope you will reserve a portion of that energy to participate in the various programs and events NCURA has planned for the rest of this year and next.

The 2006 Joint Region VII/VII Spring meeting will be Kauai, HI on April 23-26, 2006. Hotel negotiations are in their final stages. Information will be made available as soon as the contract is finalized.

Information regarding the upcoming national NCURA meeting was recently released and is available at, www.ncura.edu.

Please take a moment to view the meeting program and the variety of sessions to be
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Welcome to the NCURA Annual Meeting 2005
“In the Public Interest: Promoting and Supporting Research”

As we planned our 47th Annual Meeting, your Program Committee has chosen to align the 47th Annual Meeting theme with NCURA’s new strategic goal of promoting and advocating the research enterprise. As an organization of more than 5,000 individuals, how can we accomplish this? We can promote, advocate and support the research enterprise in our daily tasks by communicating the importance of research and development activities as well as supporting them. It is with great pleasure that we present this Annual Meeting Program to you, the member.

The conference tracks are designed to assist you in promoting and supporting research by providing you with many informational and educational opportunities. The tracks are organized to include something for everyone involved in research administration and include Departmental Administration, Predominately Undergraduate Schools, Pre-Award, Post-Award, Compliance, Federal and Washington Updates, Contracts, and Intellectual Property tracks. The list of offerings also includes Primers and Discussion Groups. The Program Committee has worked long and hard to develop a balanced program that will provide you outstanding information and educational opportunities, regardless of whether you are a beginner or a seasoned veteran in both the pre-meeting workshops and the sessions during the meeting. It is our hope that all sessions will encourage you, as a participant, to pose questions and engage in discussion—this is how we support each other! This year’s program also features two blocks of short take sessions. These one hour sessions were very popular at last year’s meeting; the topics are such that information can be disseminated and shared in a one hour time period.

For those of you arriving early, we will be offering a night of networking on Saturday evening. Our Sunday night banquet will feature actor and comedian Robert Klein. Robert Klein is a veteran of stage, screen and television for more than 30 years, and has most recently authored “The Amorous Busboy of Decatur Avenue: A Child of the Fifties Looks Back.” This will be an event you won’t want to miss!

We are very fortunate to have Dr. Francis Halzen from the University of Wisconsin – Madison to join us for our keynote address on Monday this year. He has entertained and illuminated many with his interesting presentation on his renowned ice research in the South Pole. Dr. Halzen is the lead investigator on Project Ice Cube, which is a high-energy neutrino observatory being constructed at—actually, in—the South Pole. Project Ice Cube is a collaboration of more than 20 institutions and foreign scientific organizations, and is primarily funded by the National Science Foundation.

On Monday evening, we will welcome back our talented “Ncurables” for an evening of great music at NCURA’s 3rd Annual Coffee House. This year it will fall on Halloween. For those of you truly in the Halloween spirit, we would love to have you join us in costume. We will be holding a 60’s costume contest at the Coffee House. So whether you are dressing in the days of your youth or your parent’s youth, this is an opportunity to have some fun and perhaps win a prize. Others who enjoy Halloween more as a spectator sport should truly enjoy being in DC for this holiday. It is a city who really knows how to celebrate this holiday.

On Tuesday evening, the opportunities to network and have fun with your colleagues continue with an opportunity to try your luck. Our Vegas Night is sure to provide everyone with an opportunity to be a “winner”. Following that will be our truly traditional Tuesday night party where there will be lots of great food and amazing entertainment by our own “Soul Source and the No Cost Extensions”.

All are sure to leave this conference in a better position to “Promote and Support Research”. There will be many opportunities to expand your knowledge and network with others who face many of the same daily challenges in research administration that you face. We sincerely believe you will find this to be a very enjoyable and rewarding experience. We look forward to seeing you there.

Laura Wade, NCURA Vice President/President-elect
Patricia Hawk, Conference Co-Chair
Kerry Peluso, Conference Co-Chair
NCURA to Add Seventh Neighborhood
by Jerry Fife

I am pleased to announce that in the coming months NCURA will add an International Neighborhood to provide members with additional resources in this area. The International Neighborhood constitutes the seventh neighborhood. The six existing neighborhoods are: Compliance, Departmental Administration, Electronic Research, Financial Research, Pre-Award and Predominately Undergraduate. The neighborhoods are formed along areas of interest and are open to all NCURA members. I encourage you to browse these neighborhoods. They are filled with useful information.

The International Neighborhood grew out of the Presidential Commission on International Research Administration which began in 2003. First the Presidential Commission and now the International Neighborhood have been led by John Carfora, Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs, Boston College. John has an extensive background in dealing with international programs. Please join me in thanking John for his willingness to provide members with this valuable contribution.

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

International Neighborhood
by John Carfora

I am pleased to announce that NCURA’s Board of Directors has approved the formal establishment of an INTERNATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD to serve the growing interest of members for more information and resources on international research administration.

The International Neighborhood is the culmination of years of thoughtful planning and successful initiatives, including the 2003 conference on University-Industry: Enhancing the Partnership in a Global Economy; establishment of a Presidential Commission on International Research Administration in 2003-2004; the convening of an International Forum at NCURA’s 46th Annual Meeting in 2004; development of an International Resources website on the NCURA homepage; a workshop on International Sponsored Programs Administration; and, most recently, NCURA’s participation at the 2005 Annual Meeting of the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA) in Genoa, Italy. NCURA representatives at the EARMA meeting were Denise Wallen (University of New Mexico), and myself. Denise and I held substantive meetings with members of EARMA’s Executive Committee, who supported our recommendation that EARMA offer a presentation (or pre-conference workshop) on “Fundamentals of European Research Administration” at a future NCURA Annual Meeting. Likewise, we supported an EARMA recommendation that NCURA offer a presentation (or pre-conference workshop) on “Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration: An American Perspective” at EARMA’s next annual meeting in Paris (2006). In brief, the EARMA conference was an NCURA “success,” and NCURA subsequently received an invitation to participate in the INORMS (International Network of Research Management Societies) conference scheduled to meet in Brisbane, Australia (2006).

Guiding each of the above mentioned initiatives are several questions outlined by NCURA’s Board of Directors.

1. Where is NCURA internationally and what are members’ needs within the international arena?
2. What do NCURA members need to be more competent and confident working within the international domain?
3. What should NCURA be doing to establish a stronger international presence that meets the professional needs of the increasing number of international research administrators?
4. What should NCURA be doing to internationally support its core values?
5. How should NCURA proceed to increase its worldwide outreach as the leader in research administration?
6. What should NCURA be doing to enhance international understanding of research and sponsored project administration?

What weaves all these questions together is a belief that NCURA’s collaboration with international organizations and globally-based research administrators will enhance cross-cultural understanding and cooperation, as well as lead to the development and delivery of meaningful services, courses, and workshops that benefit the professional needs of NCURA members.

Looking forward, over the next few months, the “construction” of an international neighborhood will begin and the process of
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developing an on-line site for international resources of professional value to NCURA members will commence. Longer-term goals involve the development of courses and workshops on international research administration. What professional resources would you like to see? I invite any member with an interest in NCURA’s new International Neighborhood to contact me directly at john.carfora@bc.edu.

John Carfora is Director, Office for Sponsored Programs at Boston College; Chair of NCURA’s Commission on International Research Administration; a Member of NCURA’s Board of Directors; and Chair of the new International Neighborhood.

PRE-AWARD Neighborhood

The Pre-Award Neighborhood (PAN) reminds you that the NIH is now requiring the use of its new forms. Links to the forms and instructions are available at http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/forms.htm.

The NIH also has a wide variety of information on proposal preparation (including grant-writing tips) available at http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/resources.htm.

Also, if your data base is not working and you need to run a quick check on funding, you may want to check out the NIH Commons https://commons.era.nih.gov/commons/index.jsp or CRISP http://crisp.cit.nih.gov/; an alternate version of CRISP– including amount of funding– is available at http://www.cbwtransparency.org/crisper/crisper_advanced_search.php.

The NIH Commons is an excellent tool that can be used for a variety of purposes, including submission of progress reports, Just In Time (JIT) information, and final reports, as well as checking on the status of proposals and participating as reviewers. And, of course, your post-award office can submit no-cost extensions via Commons.

The NSF grant award information is available at http://www.nsf.gov/funding/

The updated version of the GPM is available at http://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=gpm. At this time, the GPM only is available in PDF format. And, of course, the NSF Fastlane is the premier tool for proposal submission, revised budgets, and post-award matters.

If your pre-award office is responsible for reporting inventions to the various federal agencies, you can use i-Edison for electronic submission. You will want to work with your tech transfer office, since they may need to assign you an access ID and password.

Check out the new PAN home page and let us have your comments and suggestions!

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

eRA (electronic Research Administration)

There continues to be much action on the eRA front in the nation’s capital. At the May 23 and 24 meeting of the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), representatives from government agencies and member research institutions addressed both the progress and the problems inherent in the development of new models of grant application submission and reporting.

NIH, in reporting on milestones in its eRA initiatives, set out a target of May 2005, by which date the SF 424 R&R, the backbone of the Grants.gov e-application initiative, will be mandated by NIH as the official vehicle for applying for research funding grants.

There was some discussion as to the reasonableness of this target, but most present seemed to agree that the goal was reasonable and offered a benchmark so that all may have a sense of whether or not they are on schedule in preparing for this significant change in how we do business.

Among the problems to be addressed are several around the issue of authentication of those who are doing the filing of electronic applications. Especially challenging are the cases of those universities that may have centralized administrative infrastructures for grant application submission, but whose campuses may have several legitimate identities in the federal marketplace. One’s authorization to do business with the federal government is regulated in part by the issuance of DUNS numbers, which are essentially registration ID’s with Dun & Bradstreet, a private firm that maintains a database of business entities worldwide. It is not uncommon for large organizations, particularly those with multiple sites, to have multiple DUNS numbers. There are minimal criteria surrounding the issuance of these numbers, and it is conceivable that individual researchers could obtain their own numbers, register with the federal Central Contractor Registry (CCR), and apply for grants on their own authority, circumventing centralized institutional administrative mechanisms. Funding agencies are working to standardize how they verify the identity of applicants, but it appears that at times the pace of innovation in eRA mechanisms may be outstripping the readiness of agencies to cope with the demands of these systems. While we all try to keep up, it becomes incumbent on grant administrators to educate their local researchers establish the procedures needed so that some measure of control is maintained over the grant application process.

This confusion over identification of applicants is only one of many before the eRA community. Other issues having to do with the whole area of identifying and tracking individual players in the grant application and administration process have to do with the establishment of a user profile database (to avoid researchers having to maintain such information at each of several funding agency sites) and unique user identifiers to serve as the means of authenticating users coming in to sites such as Grants.gov.

To foster a dialogue between federal agencies and research institutions as we search for resolutions to these challenges, the FDP has established a subcommittee to the FDP’s standing eRA Committee with the express charge to bring together those stakeholders who will eventually craft both the technology and the regulations that will shape how eRA grant management will evolve in the next few years. The first meeting of this group took place in March, with a second immediately following the FDP meeting in May. Another was scheduled for late July, with FDP leadership...
seeking to ensure that the attendees represent a broad spectrum of both the grantee and grantor communities, including large and small institutions, administrators, technicians, and faculty, as well as representatives of the major federal funding agencies. In the past, FDP has been instrumental in shaping established practice in the administration of federal grants. It is hoped that this developing FDP/Federal eRA forum will have similarly beneficial results.

Tom Drinane serves as Information Systems Analyst, Office of Sponsored Projects, Dartmouth College and is Chair of the eRA Neighborhood.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION Neighborhood

The Departmental Administration Neighborhood Committee will soon launch an online survey to assess how NCURA might better meet the needs of departmental administrators. Look for an announcement soon. NCURA members who have an interest in Department Administration to join the neighborhood list serve as the best method for keeping current with events, issues and initiatives associated with this community.

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

FRA (Financial Research Administration) Neighborhood

Officially, the Financial Research Administration (FRA) survey is now over. The committee would like to thank everyone who responded and congratulate our final winner of the coveted NCURA travel mug – James Reisert from Georgetown University. Even though the survey is officially over, we still need your feedback. Please feel free to contact any of the committee members with suggestions or comments to help make the neighborhood a more valuable resource to you.

The committee held its first conference call on June 21st. Although there were many topics to consider from the vast array of survey suggestions, the committee has decided to focus on the following efforts in the next few months.

First, it was suggested that clicking on a link should open a new window. This has been successfully completed! No longer will clicking a link take you out of the NCURA website and into another. It will now open a new browser window. It is our hope that this will make researching information in the library easier.

Second, we are looking into archiving our listserv discussions. This will tie in nicely with our new series of Listserv Topics that were started in July. Hope you all saw the current discussion regarding “Export Controls, Financial Nightmare?” If not, keep a look out for any subject title with “Listserv Topic” in it. Feel free to contribute to the discussion and also to start your own topics! We are excited to have this going on and hope that the discussions will prove to be very beneficial to our members.

Third, the committee agreed to collect and post links to Policy and Procedure manuals from different institutions. If anyone is willing to allow us to post a link to your manual please email the link to drrouleau@wpi.edu. We will make sure it is posted.

Fourth, the committee will be taking a closer look at the organization and design of our library. Specifically, we will be looking to reorganize the information to be user-friendly and also change the icons to make them larger with possible drop down boxes for ease in locating topics directly. It is the hopes of the committee to have this completed by the end of the summer.

FRA VII has been finalized. We are happy to announce that FRA VII will be held April 2-4, 2006 in lovely La Quinta, California (in close proximity to Palm Springs) at the La Quinta Resort & Club (http://www.laquintaresort.com/). Be sure to look for future information as it becomes available.

If you haven’t been to the neighborhood lately, stop in and check out our new article entitled DISCLOSURE STATEMENT (DS 2) AUDIT, written by our own Lori Selby from Washington State University. If you missed the May edition of On Campus with Kerry Peluso of U Penn, you can still check it out through the link on the front page.

Arsenio Roldan serves as the Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Research, Stanford University and is a committee member of the FRA Neighborhood.

COMPLIANCE Neighborhood

The Compliance Neighborhood has been working very hard in revising and re-building a better Neighborhood for NCURA members. We think you will be very pleased with the new look and the updated and useful information.

First, we want to thank all of you who have participated in our Compliance survey. The information we have obtained will help the committee design the website and future programming that will best meet the needs of the NCURA membership. We received 89 responses to our survey. The following are highlights that will be of interest to you:

1. Of the respondents, 47% work in Sponsored Programs offices, 12% work in Compliance Offices, 12% in Dean’s/Vice Provost/VP for Research offices. The remainder is divided across a broad spectrum of offices.

2. Of the compliance-related office functions, the largest percentages were developing educational programs, compliance information clearinghouse, and compliance reporting. A substantial number also reported performing compliance assessments and managing/monitoring conflict of interest.

3. Individual respondents were asked about their own compliance responsibilities. The highest number of respondents reported those related to developing educational programs, compliance reporting, and performing non-financial compliance assessments.

4. When asked about what the respondents would like NCURA to provide to assist them in their compliance responsibilities, the largest responses were (in order): a compendium of organizational sites that have developed training programs, references to policies and procedures regarding the establishment of compliance training programs, and establishing a compliance listserv.

5. The most favored training opportunities were reported as on-line tutorials, NCURA regional and annual meetings, and national/regional compliance summits/workshops.

The Compliance Neighborhood Committee has prepared a great layout of the results for your review. This can be found at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/compliance.asp.

We also invite you to visit the updated Resources Section in the Compliance Neighborhood. We have revised the format and expanded the coverage of compliance issues. In addition to the areas covered previously, we are working to include resources to include: Compliance Requirements for Select Agents, HIPAA/FERPA, Export Controls, Effort Reporting, Cost Sharing, and SEVIS.

Continued on next page
Upcoming conferences sponsored by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI):
http://www.ori.dhhs.gov/conferences/upcoming_conf.shtml

October 1, 2005
Plagiarism across the Science Disciplines: An Exploration of the Parameters of Plagiarism in Scholarly and Scientific Publications, New York, NY

October 7, 2005
Promoting RCR in Research in the Social, Behavioral and Educational Sciences, San Antonio, Texas

October 20-21, 2005
Responsible Conduct of Research: Essentials for Research Success and Integrity, Pocatello, ID

Upcoming conferences sponsored by the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP):
http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/education/conference.html#upcoming

August 15-16, 2005
Protecting Human Subjects in a Changing Research Environment, Youngstown, OH

Upcoming conferences sponsored by Public Responsibility in Medicine and Research (PRIMR):
http://www.primr.org/education/conf_future.html

August 15-16, 2005
IRB Administrator 101 and Essentials of IACUC Administration, Chicago, Ill.

August 18-19, 2005
Southwest Regional Conference on Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) Best Practices: Today and Tomorrow, San Antonio, TX

Kathleen Taggart serves as Research Compliance Officer and Director of Grants Administration for Creighton University and is a member of the Compliance Neighborhood.

PUI (Predominantly Undergraduate Institution)

The Neighborhoods are getting ready to re-launch the well-received Interactive Learning Series (ILS). Please visit the ILS archives, located on the Neighborhoods home page, to better understand the useful learning experience the sessions provide. The PUI Neighborhood was pleased to sponsor the Interactive Learning Series, “The Ins & Outs of Faculty Incentives.” The ILS, held on June 17, 2003, was presented by Bob Lowman, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Director of Research Services at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and Pam Whitlock, Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at University of North Carolina – Wilmington. The moderators offered a number of helpful suggestions for providing incentives to faculty, including seed grants, release time and summer support, as well as ways to garner support from chairs and administrators in promoting research at PUIs. An abbreviated transcript of the discussion is posted on the PUI Neighborhood Website at under the Town Hall link. I would encourage all PUI members to visit the website and take advantage of the insights provided by Pam & Bob through this ILS. Also, stay tuned for more insightful ILS sessions to come!

PUI members should also note that NCURA's Professional Development Committee has set up a task force comprised of members of all the Neighborhoods, as well as representatives from the National office, to improve the effectiveness of the Neighborhoods. Jerry Pogatsnik, Chair of the PUI Neighborhood, will serve as chair of this joint committee. Any comments or suggestions on improving the Neighborhoods’ electronic resources, including the Neighborhood websites, the Online Education Programs, and the Interactive Learning Series can be forwarded to the committee through the PUI Neighborhood Committee at nc.pui@lists.ncura.edu

The PUI Neighborhood also would like to welcome two new members to the Neighborhood Committee. Joining the PUI Neighborhood Committee is Joseph McNicholas, Director of Foundations & Government Relations at the University of Redlands, and Kim Pachetti, Director of Sponsored Programs at Canisius College. The PUI Neighborhood Committee looks forward to their contributions during the coming year.

Jerry Pogatsnik serves as Associate Dean of the Graduate School at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville and is Chair of the Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions Neighborhood.

NCURA Leadership Convention 2005

From July 29-31, 2005 at the Villanova Conference Center, NCURA brought together 3 Delegates from each region, the Board of Directors and NCURA Staff to address these important objectives:

✔ Develop a clear, knowledge-based understanding of the realities and challenges facing NCURA's volunteer leadership development and succession planning;
✔ Identify what is working well today;
✔ Identify the trends that are affecting our future;
✔ Explore the issues that need to be addressed as we move towards our desired future; and
✔ Develop solutions that can be implemented to increase membership involvement and participation that will encourage leadership development at all levels for NCURA's future

Look for the full story and listing of delegates from this exciting convention in the September/October Issue of the NCURA Newsletter!
Best Practices in Research Compliance: Update on Policies and Regulations and Implementation at Institutions

This session includes an overview of the current state of various non-fiscal compliance areas such as human subjects, animal use, rDNA, safety, biohazards, select agents, and conflicts-of-interest. The faculty for this workshop will address centralized vs. decentralized responsibility and include examples of lines of responsibility. Suggestions on monitoring to ensure compliance and a look at available tools will be highlighted. The workshop will conclude by sharing information on how institutions are covering the increasing cost of compliance.

Moderator/Team Leader: Marianne Woods, Associate Vice President for Research, University of Alabama
Faculty: Daniel Vasebird, Director, Office of Research Integrity and Compliance, University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Benjamin Fontes, Biosafety Officer and Manager, Safety Advisor Program, Office of Environmental Health & Safety, Yale University; Todd Guttmann, Associate Vice President for Research Compliance, The Ohio State University; Linda Triemer, Director, Office of Research Ethics and Standards, Michigan State University; Michael Carome, Associate Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office for Human Research Protections, US Department of Health & Human Services

Principles of R&D Contracting
June 14, 2005

June cast getting ready for second half of the show – one minute to go!
(l to r) Kathleen Irwin, University of Wisconsin – Madison; David Mayo, California Institute of Technology; Bo Bogdanski, Colorado State University; Randy Draper, University of Colorado at Boulder and Kathleen Larmett, NCURA.
The cost of the full series (all four workshops) is $2,800.00 per campus. To purchase a “ticket” to an individual session the cost is $950.00 per campus. All Video Workshops will be aired from 11:30 am – 3:30 pm, Eastern Time. NCURA will transmit a test signal one hour (10:30 – 11:30 am, Eastern Time) prior to air time!

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

**Unable to receive satellite programming?** We will be simultaneously “webcasting” our 2005 NCURA Video Workshop Series, offering Broadband and Dial-up bandwidth video-streaming technology over the internet. Participate in the live broadcast, right from your desk. Webcasting is not recommended for large-audience viewing (no more than 3 or 4). You should have a soundcard and headsets/speakers to hear the audio portion of the webcast. If you are not sure which version to subscribe to, please contact NCURA.

**VHS/DVD:** Those who select the tape option will receive handout information when they receive their copy of the tape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACT NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VHS $950.00</td>
<td>VHS $950.00</td>
<td>VHS $950.00</td>
<td>VHS $950.00</td>
<td>Live: $950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD $950.00</td>
<td>DVD: $950.00</td>
<td>DVD: $950.00</td>
<td>DVD: $950.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/05: $2,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Amount Due: $__________________  Please circle one: Visa  MasterCard  American Express

Card #: ____________________________ Exp. ____________________________

Card Holder’s Signature ____________________________

**CANCELLATIONS:** Notification of cancellation must be received in writing no later than 14 business days prior to each telecast and are subject to a $75 cancellation fee. Cancellations received after the deadline will not be refunded. You must receive confirmation from NCURA to receive a refund.

NCURA
One Dupont Circle, NW
Suite 220
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 466-3894
Fax: (202) 223-5573
Email: info@ncura.edu
Website: www.ncura.edu
Focus.

Huron’s professionals provide consulting services addressing pressing issues of colleges, research universities and academic medical centers relative to finance, research, operations, strategy and technology.

We are recognized national leaders in dealing with complex operational and regulatory requirements of federally funded research programs. Our team focuses on providing high-quality consulting services in the areas of:

- Accounting operations assistance
- Financial management and internal cost assessment
- Information systems planning, design and implementation
- Interim staffing
- Operational assessments
- Research administration and compliance assistance
- Strategic planning
- Strategic sourcing

Huron’s Higher Education team of over 100 professionals has worked with more than 70 of the 100 largest research universities and academic medical centers.

www.huronconsultinggroup.com
1-866-229-8700

Higher Education
Managing Directors

Peter Eschenbach, 312-583-8755
peschenbach@huronconsultinggroup.com

Shandy Husmann, 312-583-8757
shusmann@huronconsultinggroup.com

Bill Jenkins, 312-880-3038
wjenkins@huronconsultinggroup.com

Lisa Murtha, 646-277-8810
lmurtha@huronconsultinggroup.com

Jim Roth, 312-583-8760
jroth@huronconsultinggroup.com

Mike Smith, 312-880-3282
mmsmith@huronconsultinggroup.com

Laura Yaeger, 312-583-8762
lyaeger@huronconsultinggroup.com

2005 NCURA Gold Partner
Your institution is awarded millions of dollars of federal research grants every year, are your financial compliance issues in order? Is your administrative infrastructure in place? If not, getting future grant awards might be difficult.

RACS is here to help. We perform analytical and compliance reviews to help you put the correct organizational structure in place today, as well as the policies and procedures to keep you compliant for tomorrow. In addition, we identify your staffing requirements, training needs and all the tools and reports you need to maintain the highest level of accountability.

The RACS assessment will provide a detailed report showing you how to minimize communication breakdowns among your staff, eliminate research faculty complaints, increase your service to the research community, and maintain audit compliance. Or if you prefer, RACS can implement our findings to ensure proper execution and ongoing compliance.

For more information or to initiate a pre- or post-award functional assessment, contact Charlie Tardivo today.

RACS
Research Administration Consulting Services

(216) 403-8176  FAX (216) 221-8066  GRANTSRESEARCH@YAHOO.COM
Regional Corner continued

offered. Make your travel plans early to take advantage of early bird registration, airfare and room rates.

I would also like to take this opportunity to wish Larry Irvin from Boise State University a fantastic retirement. Over the past 21 years, Larry has been very active in serving Region VII in various capacities at both the regional and national level. Region VII will greatly miss Larry’s great sense of humor and dedication to the organization. Larry, best wishes with all of your future endeavors!

Josie Jimenez is Chair of Region VII and is an Assistant Director in the Office of Grants and Contracts at New Mexico State University.

Mark your calendars now for your Regions’ 2006 Spring meeting!

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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Noteworthy!

Milestones

Glenn S. Davis has moved to the Stevens Institute of Technology and now serves as the Director for the Office of Sponsored Research.

Joan Howeth, who recently retired from The University of Oklahoma, was honored at the Region V Spring Meeting with the Region V Distinguished Service Award. She was a co-recipient along with Bobby McQuiston for this honor. Both were long standing members of NCURA and their wit, dedication and knowledge will be greatly missed.

Larry Irvin from Boise State is retiring. Over the past 21 years, Larry has been very active in serving NCURA in various capacities at both the regional and national level. Best wishes with all of your future endeavors!

Sally S. Tremaine has announced that she will be leaving Yale University in September to take the position of Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations at Quinnipiac University in Hamden, Connecticut. You can write to Sally after September 6, at sally.tremaine@quinnipiac.edu.

Export Control & Embargo Issues Seminar a Success

NCURA in collaboration with PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP Export Control Practice held in July a series of three intensive day and a half seminars on Export Control and Embargo Issues. Every seminar was filled to capacity as over 200 members from across the country participated in the “hands-on” program that provided an overview of the regulatory requirements (ITAR, EAR and OFAC) and addressed the myriad of challenges faced by universities as they administer export control & embargo regulations.

Here’s what attendees had to say....
“it was just terrific overall. I wish I could go to another one!”
“The presenters were really, really good. They know their stuff, and presented it appropriately, professionally, and with a touch of humor. “
“Well worth attending. Have shared info with our legal counsel “

Export Control and Embargo Issues was held in Chicago, Boston and San Francisco. The Boston Faculty are pictured: (l to r) Don Fischer, PricewaterhouseCoopers; Susan Sedwick, University of Oklahoma Norman Campus; Marianne Rinaldo Woods, University of Alabama; and Erica Kropp, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science.

Chicago Team: John Childress, Vanderbilt University; Don Fischer, PricewaterhouseCoopers; Julie Norris, Huron Consulting Group; Susan Sedwick, University of Oklahoma Norman Campus

San Francisco Team: Jilda Garton, Georgia Institute of Technology; Jamie Lewis Keith, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mary Ellen Sheridan, University Research Administration, University of Chicago; Don Fischer, PricewaterhouseCoopers
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