NCURA Holds Leadership Convention

by Jerry Fife

On Saturday, July 30 and Sunday, July 31, NCURA held its first Leadership Convention since 1988. NCURA brought together its Board of Directors, three delegates from each region and members of the NCURA staff to design succession paths for NCURA’s future leaders; discuss recruitment and retention of members, and; look at ways of enhancing the national and regional partnership. The group met outside of Philadelphia at the Villanova Conference Center and, speaking for myself, I found the Convention both exciting and exhausting. The weekend was filled with honest, open discussion and many new and creative ideas emerged.

After two days of intense work, the group came up with five major recommendations. Each of these recommendations is discussed below along with some of the recommended steps for achieving these goals.

1. Improve Recognition of the Value of NCURA to the Profession

Convention attendees believed that, in many institutions, research administration was neither understood nor valued. As a result senior officers at these institutions may not recognize the value of NCURA membership. A few of the recommendations to remedy this were:

- Conduct and provide research administration survey results to senior officers
- Announce NCURA awards/election to office to supervisors
- Develop talking point document listing the benefits of NCURA membership
- Consider discounts for Vice Presidents/Deans to attend NCURA meetings to encourage attendance
- Create a marketing taskforce to further develop a NCURA marketing plan
- Consider development of public service announcements about research

2. Encourage and Welcome New(er) Members at All Levels

As NCURA has grown to a membership of approximately 5000 with an annual growth of 500

continued on page 10

NCURA’s 47th Annual Meeting

by Laura Wade, Pat Hawk and Kerry Peluso

It's hard to believe that our annual meeting is just around the corner. We know you’re all extremely busy, but we wanted to give you a few brief reminders before you travel to Washington, DC. Our last Newsletter talked about our workshops, so now we want to remind you about some other things.

First, please check the meeting website again. There have been some additions and changes to the program, so make sure your “pro picks” for sessions are still what you want.

Don’t forget we’ll have a networking opportunity Saturday night.

As you get ready to pack, here’s some other things to remember. Feel free to get “gussied up” for our Sunday reception and banquet. If you’re doing workshops, feel free to dress “comfortable business casual,” and for the rest of the meeting, business casual is okay by us!

Monday will be Halloween. Feel free to come to the coffee house all decked out in your favorite costume. Also be sure to check out the Monday night sessions as you plan your night. Two very interesting sessions will be held. For your Monday night dinner plans, we will have the traditional opportunity to join a dinner group. Tuesday’s party will be a Vegas Night and there could be some interesting sightings the night. Dress is casual for Tuesday night.

Finally, be prepared to learn a lot and have a wonderful time connecting with both old and new friends. We look forward to seeing you!

Laura Wade is the NCURA Vice President/President-elect and serves as the Associate Director of Administration, Texas Center for Superconductivity, University of Houston; Pat Haek and Kerry Peluso are the Co-chairs of the 47th Annual Meeting. Pat serves as the Assistant Director, Sponsored Programs & Research Compliance for Oregon State University and Kerry serves as the Director, Post Award Financial Administration for the University of Pennsylvania.

New Manuscript Submission System Supports NIH Public Access Policy
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NCURA Election Results Announced

Whitlock Wins NCURA Vice Presidential Election

Clark Wins Secretary Election

Peluso Wins Treasurer-elect Election

Forstmeier and Liders also Elected

Pamela Whitlock, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of North Carolina at Wilmington has been elected Vice President/President-elect of the National Council of University Research Administrators. Whitlock has been a member since 1986 and served NCURA in a number of ways over the past 19 years. Whitlock served as the Chair of Financial Research Administration VI in 2005, and is currently the Board Member from Region III. Upon learning of the election outcome, Whitlock stated, “I am humbled and honored to have been elected Vice President of NCURA. I am committed to NCURA’s continued leadership as the preeminent professional development organization in the nation. I look forward to working with NCURA’s leadership at both the regional and national levels to meet member needs for professional and leadership development and promote a feeling of community. NCURA’s regions are a vital link between our members and the national level. We shall continue the dialog begun at the recent Regional Leadership Convention to make NCURA a strong and vibrant organization.”

Denise Clark, Director, Research Administration & Finance, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute has been elected Secretary of NCURA. An active member on the regional and national level since 1989, Clark has contributed to numerous sessions as a panelist, moderator, Workshop Coordinator, and has co-chaired the Annual Meeting, and eRA Summer Conference and Regional Meeting. Clark states, “I welcome the opportunity to serve in this capacity to ensure NCURA continues to call upon and learn from the experienced members while fostering the development and inclusion of newer members.”

Kerry Peluso, Director, Post Award Financial Administration, University of Pennsylvania has been elected Treasurer-elect. Peluso brings over 20 years of experience in the accounting field which includes experience in public accounting, auditing, investments, and financial research administration to her new position. An active member since 1998, Kerry has served on the national and regional levels, chaired the Financial Research Administration V Conference and is currently a Co-Chair of the 47th Annual Meeting. In addition to a strong financial background, Peluso brings a commitment to communication. “While a strong financial background is essential for this position, I feel strong communication skills are just as essential to ensuring that all of the relevant facts are available and that people understand the financial opportunities and limitations faced.”

Ken Forstmeier, Director, Office of Research Information Systems, Pennsylvania State University and Gunta Liders, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, University of Rochester have been elected to the Board of Directors. Forstmeier has been active in NCURA since 1997 and has served our community in a variety of ways including regional steering committees, program committees, and presenting on numerous national and regional panels and workshops. Forstmeier looks forward to contributing by working with the board to ensure a sustainable NCURA, continuing to facilitate the comprehensive implementation of eRA, and promoting research administration.

Liders has been active in service to NCURA since 1987 as a teacher, Chair of Financial Research Administration IV, co-editor of the Newsletter, member of the Professional Development Committee, and Regional Treasurer/Secretary for Region II. Liders states, “At this point, I believe I could be instrumental and beneficial to the Board by playing a governance and leadership role and assisting NCURA in achieving its stated goals for the coming years.”

Whitlock, Clark, Peluso, Forstmeier and Liders take office on January 1, 2006.
In the Fall of 2003, Dr. Elias Zerhouni, Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), unveiled an ambitious plan to identify opportunities and gaps in biomedical research in an effort to improve human health. It has been approximately two years since Dr. Zerhouni’s Roadmap for Medical Research was unveiled with three major themes:

- New Pathways to Discovery
- Research Teams of the Future
- Re-engineering the Clinical Research Enterprise

The NIH initiated the planning and implementation of the Roadmap at the 2002 NIH Leadership Forum and nine Implementation groups were formed in the spring of 2003. The funding initiatives for each major theme for the roadmap are outlined below illustrating the progress that has been made since the public announcement of the NIH Roadmap.

NEW PATHWAYS TO DISCOVERY
The focus of this theme is to provide researchers better tools to understand the complexity of the Human biological systems and new strategies for the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of human disease. The following initiatives have been funded or announced for implementation groups for this theme:

Building Blocks, Biological Pathways, and Networks
- 2 Centers for Networks and Pathways funded in FY2004
- Re-announced for FY2005

Molecular Libraries & Molecular Imaging
- 6 Extramural Screening Centers established
- Chemical Genomics Center on NIH Campus
- 9 P20 center grants funded in August, 2004
- RFA on R21 grants with $3.3M available in FY2005

Structural Biology
- 2 Centers for Innovation in Membrane Protein Production were funded in FY2004
- RFA issued in FY2005 for individual research grants and P01s

Bioinformatics and Computational Biology
- 4 NATIONAL Centers for Biomedical Computing were funded in FY2004
- Re-announced in FY2005 (applications due 1/24/05)

Nanomedicine
- 20 Center Development grants funded in FY2004
- 3-4 Centers to be funded in FY2005
- 2-4 Centers to be funded in FY2006

RESEARCH TEAMS OF THE FUTURE
This theme focuses on forming novel research partnerships to accelerate new discoveries from the bench to the bedside and explore new avenues of research that can lead to revolutionary discoveries. The following initiatives have been funded or announced for implementation groups for this theme:

High-Risk Research
- 9 Pioneer Awards were funded in FY 2004
- 5 to 10 Pioneer Awards will be funded in FY2005

Interdisciplinary Research
- RFAs for Exploratory Centers for Interdisciplinary Research & Training for a New Interdisciplinary Workforce

Public-Private Partnerships
Along the lines of building research teams and fostering interdisciplinary research, the NIH issued a Request for Information on July 29, 2005 to gather responses to a proposal for Multiple Principal Investigators for NIH grants. If this change to the NIH grants process is implemented, this new policy could stimulate an increase in research collaborations.

RE-ENGINEERING THE CLINICAL RESEARCH ENTERPRISE
This theme seeks to establish new research partnerships between patient communities, community-based health care providers, and academic researchers encouraging the development of new technologies to improve clinical outcomes and enhanced training opportunities for clinical researchers. The following initiatives have been funded or announced for implementation groups for this theme:

Clinical Research Networks
- Created Clinical Research Policy Analysis and Coordination Program in the NIH Office of Science Policy

Clinical Research Workforce Training
- RFA for Pre-doctoral Clinical Research Training Program
- 7 Multidisciplinary Clinical Research Career Development Programs in FY2004
- RFA for Multidisciplinary Clinical Research Career Development Programs in FY2005

Dynamic Assessment of Patient-Reported Chronic Disease Outcomes
- Funded a data coordinating center and 6 collaborating sites for a Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement System

Translational Research
- RFA for Translational Cores Resources Pilot Project

The proposal to re-engineer the clinical research enterprise has not progressed as well as the other two major themes. An RFA for planning grants for regional translational research centers was cancelled may not be reissued until next fiscal year and Center grants will not be funded until FY 2007 or 2008. This lack of progress is disappointing to the clinical research community since, over the years, the budget allocation process at the NIH has favored basic research over clinical research. The majority of funding for clinical research has traditionally come from collaborations between industry and academia with some assistance from the NIH. Translational research has evolved in academic medical centers over the past two decades at the same time that academic medical centers have become the focal point for technology transfer. The translational cycle from bench to bedside and back has provided a pathway for new discoveries to become standard of care despite the lack of strong leadership in this area from the NIH.

ROADBLOCK
The NIH appropriation is an impediment to the continued development of the Roadmap plan. While the Consumer Price Index (CPI) is increasing at an annual rate in excess of three percent, the NIH appropriation only increased by 1.9% in FY 2005 and is slated for a .5% increase in the President’s Budget for FY2006. With increases in the NIH budget falling short of the CPI increase the NIH budget is effectively decreasing. With the commitments that the NIH has for non-competing awards and active grants that go the renewal process each year, it will be very difficult to fund new programs. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that the NIH will have the available funds to support the new initiatives planned through the Roadmap.

Tom Wilson serves as the Director, OFC of Sponsored Projects Beckman Research Institute, City of Hope National Medical Center.
Okay, I have now publicly admitted that I am an export controls junkie. It started out innocently; just a little experimentation purely out of curiosity. But it is now a habit that is completely out of control. I have tried to quit but no one else will touch this issue. I go to meetings and temptation is everywhere. My family can even follow my acronym-laden recounts of my day. I even have the EAR, ITAR and OFAC homepages and denied lists bookmarked as “Favorites”…..how sick is that?! 

Serving on the faculty for the NCURA seminars on Export Controls and Embargoes this summer gave me the opportunity to completely immerse myself in the regulations and to refine my thinking. In the arena, knowledge does not bring me comfort; the more I know the more concerned I am. When you browse the Bureau of Industry and Security homepage, you can predict the future and, in my opinion, it is not going to get any easier.

In his speech to the 8th National Forum on Export Controls on April 28, Acting Under Secretary Peter Lichtenbaum states, “We are seeking to promote both U.S. security and economic interests – not to “balance” them. “Balancing” implies a tradeoff where one interest is sacrificed at the expense of another.” If that is not enough to give you pause, in that same speech he expresses concerns about exports that may have dual use capabilities enabling China to strengthen its military. He asserts:

“As much as we favor expanding trade with China, we will not knowingly approve any export that will help China modernize its military capabilities. We continue to support the arms embargo and have urged our European allies to do likewise. We will also require a license for all exports that an exporter knows could materially assist the Chinese military. We will review any application that supports the advancement of Chinese military capabilities under a general policy of denial. We will encourage our allies to adopt similar positions.”

His testimony before the U.S. – China Economic and Security Review Commission Hearing on June 23 did little to soften that stance as he augured that in the near future, “...the Department of Commerce will propose a new “catch-all” regulation that will require a license for otherwise uncontrolled exports that could materially assist the Chinese military, and we will review any application that supports the advancement of Chinese military capabilities under a general policy of denial.”

Coupled with changes to the Export Administration Regulations and to the DFARS, many fear the result to be an erosion of the protections afforded to fundamental research. This brings me to my point. This is no time for complacency and every institution that supports open inquiry on their campus must pay attention to these issues and get involved in the national dialogue. The Department of Commerce received over 309 responses to their Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) related to deemed exports, two-thirds from universities. That level of response is causing the Department of Commerce to reexamine their proposed revisions. At the urging of organizations representing higher education, the Department of Defense extended the deadline for receipt of comments in response to their proposed rulemaking relative to DFARS Subpart 204.73 Export Controlled Information and Technology.

Bob Hardy, Director of Contracts and Intellectual Property Management for the Council on Governmental Relations (CGR) offers, “It is important for universities to make their voices heard with regard to the ever-increasing federal compliance demands, particularly with regard to newer areas of science and security. Federal regulators may not understand the full implications for universities of proposed new rules, and it’s very important that universities participate in the rule-making process to explain the impacts and ramifications.”

Coordinated efforts at institutions are encouraged and institutions who are represented by organizations such as the American Association of Universities (AAU) and (CGR) can submit individual responses in support of the organizational response. Less is not more when making your voice heard is imperative. To facilitate a timely response to such requests for comments, institutions should designate someone to monitor the Federal Register announcements and to draft briefing documents and response letters. Letters should be signed by the president or the appropriate executive officer. For example, past responses are posted on the AAU and COGR homepages and the Bureau of Industry and Security has posted the responses to ANPR on their website.

Susan Wyatt Sedwick is Associate Vice President for Research and Executive Director for Research Services, University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus.
Our approach to research misconduct during the late 1980's to mid-1990's was marked by considerable emphasis on government regulation. But, we soon realized that placing total faith in external regulation was not the long-term solution. This is so because regulations proscribe rather than prescribe behavior. That is, they tell us what we cannot do, not what we ought to do. Furthermore, while we can try to design a system to stop bad things from happening, such systems would not likely be compatible with what science needs to thrive.

Ideally, the research community should elicit from its members a higher standard of behavior than that which can be commanded by regulation. A focus on efforts by research institutions to foster an environment that promotes research integrity is warranted by at least three considerations. First, while individuals must bear ultimate responsibility for their actions, the social and behavioral science literature demonstrates conclusively that institutional environments serve as a prism through which individuals interpret, evaluate, and assign value to all that is going on around them, and as a consequence help shape individual attitudes and behavior when evaluating ethically complex situations. Second, the public expects institutions to oversee the manner in which public monies on research are spent, and holds them accountable for preserving the integrity of the public purse. And third, public policy in this country expects to keep in mind is that the vision must make sense in light of the reality that institutions that consider themselves to be primary knowledge producers have produced very little data about the effects of some of their own initiatives. There is a need for serious research and evaluation in order to rationally and efficiently allocate institutional resources.

To accomplish the research and evaluation I have prescribed will require an institutional commitment and capacity to do it well. For institutions, this means having a leadership that sends a strong message of the priority of research integrity on their watch; that makes clear the importance of learning from successes and mistakes; that establishes clear lines of accountability for designing, implementing, and evaluating various initiatives; that encourages some of the institution's leading research faculty and top graduate students and trainees to be active participants in those efforts; and that provides resources adequate to the task.

Institutions committed to the production of knowledge as part of their core mission should apply the same degree of scientific rigor that is used on their campuses in a wide range of empirical investigations to the study and assessment of research integrity in all of its manifestations. We should expect no less from those who embrace knowledge and reason as a more useful guide for action than random anecdote, embarrassing scandals in the lab, or political expediency.

Mark S. Frankel is with the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

What internal and external factors affect an institution's research environment? How can valid and reliable measures of their influence be developed? How do (or don't) institutions take those factors into account in creating and monitoring their research environment? Admittedly, these are tough questions to get our hands around. Yet, if we do not collect the kind of data that they are intended to yield, we will never really know the association between ends and means. Norms, policies and practices will be based on anecdotes and hunches, which is surely inconsistent with the intellectual mission of our universities, not to mention that it will make it difficult for institutions to convince policy makers and the general public that they are serious about promoting ethical research practices.

The next set of questions includes the following:

How effective are efforts by institutions to foster research integrity? Are there certain approaches that are more or less effective in different environments, for different target audiences at different stages in their careers, and what explains whatever differences are found? What confidence should we have in our abilities to answer those questions?

These are, of course, the “what works” and “why” questions, and they are directly linked to the process of evaluation. It is troubling that institutions that consider themselves to be primary knowledge producers have produced very little data about the effects of some of their own initiatives. There is a need for serious research and evaluation in order to rationally and efficiently allocate institutional resources.

Toward that end, I want to pose some research-worthy questions related to the institution’s role in promoting research integrity.

How can institutions create an environment that fosters research integrity? The first task is for an institution to develop a clear vision of what constitutes research integrity. It is this vision that will anchor and drive decisions about what conduct and character should be expected from members of that institution. This vision is unlikely to be uniform across research institutions. One size will not fit all, although I would anticipate considerable overlap. A critical aspect to keep in mind is that the vision must make sense in light of the experiences of the members of that institution if they are to believe in it and live by it. Efforts taken that bear little or no resemblance to life in the lab or field will breed cynicism and avoidance.

With a vision in place, the focus can turn to giving it legs. But before that can happen, there is a need to develop a solid knowledge base that can inform and guide efforts to promote research integrity.

Defining and Assessing a Responsible Research Environment*

by Mark S. Frankel

*This essay is based on a luncheon address at a conference on “Promoting a Productive and Responsible Research Environment,” convened by the University of California, Davis, and the U.S. Office of Research Integrity, Sacramento, CA, June 13, 2003.
Beyond the A-133 Audit: Expanding the Focus (Part 2 of 3)
by Kathleen Hall and Marilyn Surbey

This article is the second in a series of three addressing some of the questions auditors are currently asking that expand the audit scope for non-salary costs. Please refer to the July/August issue for the article on supplies and salaries. Additional cost categories are outlined below.

P-Card
P-cards have long been a hot topic in the research administration arena. Our institutional policies and procedures need to satisfactorily address the following questions.

• Who made the request for departmental P-Cards and authorized their use on sponsored programs? Are they familiar with the terms and needs of the grant program as well as the program’s financial terms and conditions? If not, did someone with that knowledge approve the cost before posting it to the sponsored account?

• Do the individuals that purchase or approve individual P-Cards have knowledge of the program terms, needs, and financial terms and conditions? If not, does documentation exist proving that individuals with that knowledge or authority approved the cost before posting it to the account?

• How are grant-related authorities documented? Where are the receipts? Where is the documentation for group meals, catering, food, etc., that outlines the grant-related purpose and lists the attendees? How is the allocation methodology documented and explained if the costs are split? (Dollars available is not the right answer!)

• How is the post-review procedure documented? Why would P-Card transactions be transferred after posting and be allocated to a different project if transactions are being handled appropriately and costs do not post to the account without a review and approval process?

• Are there written internal procedures?

Equipment
How is the allocation methodology documented and explained if costs are split? Who decided the split and how did they make the determination? Are there written internal procedures that outline the purchase request, approval, receipt of equipment, and post-review process?

Consultants and Speakers
Where is the written agreement or offer letter? Where is the documentation or explanation of how rates were determined?

Where is the documentation of the event for speakers, lecturers, etc.? Does the event documentation include an explanation of the purpose of the event and outline how it relates to the grant program? Does the event documentation include a list of attendees? Does the event and attendee documentation provide proof that 100% of the speaker fee should be allocated to the grant? In case of a split, how was the allocation determined?

Cost Share
Can you prove the same level and type of documentation of knowledgeable and appropriate prior approval, review, cost appropriateness, and allocation procedures for cost shared costs?

How can you prove that an individual item is appropriately allocated to cost share for the specific program?

The final article will discuss filing and record retention and make some general observations.

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.

Noteworthy!

Milestones

Harold M. Gollos has moved to Washington, DC and is now the Managing Director, Research Services, The George Washington University.

Sonja W. Robinson from Jackson State University in Jackson, Mississippi was promoted from Sponsored Programs Administrator to Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs.

Brandi Boniface joined the University of Florida’s Division of Sponsored Research as Assistant Director of Research. She came from the University of South Carolina where she was the Senior Industry Contracts Manager in the Intellectual Property Office.

Jerry Pogatshnik is now the Dean of the Graduate School and Associate VP for Research at the Eastern Kentucky University (Region III). He came from Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville where he was Associate Dean of the Graduate School (Region IV). Jerry also is the Chair of the PUI Neighborhood Committee.

Jane Youngers has been promoted to Assistant Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio. Congratulations Jane!

Best of luck to all of you!
A is for Appropriations

By Judy Fredenberg

IN some universities, the word “appropriations” rolls off the administrative tongue as though it contains only four letters. In others, it is spoken as though it is manna from heaven. And in most, it is acknowledged with acceptance and certainty much as the rising and setting of the sun.

For those institutions that seek, and receive, federally appropriated funds, there is no argument that such dollars offer additional funding streams. However, when compared with competitive grants, appropriations sometimes come with a unique set of challenges.

Grants are typically competitive grass-roots efforts. The perfect scenario is something like this: A principle investigator identifies a funding opportunity and writes a grant for scholarly activity in an area of interest and expertise. The proposal is given to the OSP far in advance of the agency deadline. This provides adequate time for necessary changes to be made prior to OSP processing and approving it.

The grant is submitted. It is funded. The PI works with the OSP to follow all federal and state regulations from cradle to grave.

Ultimately, the PI successfully completes the grant and meets all final reporting requirements. And, throughout the duration of this grant cycle it only rains at night.

With appropriations, the perfect scenario is, at best, something of a sticky wicket. At the start, institutions vary in how potential projects are selected each fall to be presented to their respective federal delegations. Some have an ad hoc advisory board that vets projects from an internal solicitation. Others rely on top administrators to select appropriate projects. Some institutions may seek forty projects, some only two.

One commonality, however, regardless of an institution’s selection process, is that potential appropriation projects are typically selected because they cannot be funded via the traditional competitive grant process. These projects often pull together numerous participants. As a result, an institution has a keenly vested interest in seeing it succeed as such projects are often part of a much larger strategy.

Rather than being an individual’s research project, they can be multi-faceted, inter-institutional and inter-departmental efforts that provide one of many building blocks upon which future competitive funding may be secured.

The projects selected for consideration as appropriation requests are typically condensed to one- or two-page white papers and presented to the respective federal delegations at the beginning of the federal budget process early in a calendar year. Their status is followed throughout the congressional cycle and numerous follow-up conversations and meetings are held between the institutions’ federal relations representatives and congressional members and staff. While there may be an occasional visit to Washington where the PI will join the institution’s federal relations liaison, there is usually little PI involvement.

Institutions learn the results when appropriation bills are conferenced, usually in the fall. If successful, the institution is notified and advised to wait until the funding agency contacts them, often not until the first part of the next calendar year.

When the agency contacts the institution, a full proposal is usually requested. The process now proceeds much like that of a competitive grant, except the agency may have considerable input in tailoring the proposal. As opposed to a PI responding to a competitive RFP within his or her research area, the scope-of-work for an appropriated project often must be negotiated so that it fits within the agency’s strategic vision as opposed to being more of what the institution might initially have intended.

Compiling a proposal for a successful appropriation can be a challenge, particularly when the project involves other institutions, several departments, or a multitude of participants in a variety of capacities.

Much like the large federal grants that focus on capacity building, appropriation proposals can require a considerable amount of collaboration and orchestration prior to completion. Yet, the process now becomes much more routine for the folks in OSP: The proposal is written, internal approvals and signatures are secured, and it is approved by the OSP and submitted per the agency’s specifications. One unique characteristic is that when the proposal is submitted, the PI and other participants are confident that it will be funded.

Are appropriation projects good? Bad? Ugly? While the latter is often cited, the fact is that funds secured by smaller institutions through appropriations often result in building long-term infrastructure. The process provides many institutions with another funding stream for sponsored activity. Perhaps the strongest argument as to its goodness is when the overriding criteria is that such requests must be for projects that fall outside of any competitive funding effort and provide a building block for future projects.

Other institutions take the proverbial high road and, for a variety of reasons, simply neither solicit nor allow federal appropriated funding.

These institutions often focus their federal relations efforts on a broader policy-related approach rather than individual congressional line-items.

The appropriations “game” has been played for a very long time. Getting on board, with the proper criterion, makes sense for many institutions. For others, it is simply not an option.

Judy Fredenberg is the Executive Assistant to VP of Research and Director of Federal Relations, University of Montana.
Goodbye summer and hello fall. This transition always brings with it a touch of sadness as well as a feeling of excitement for NCURA members. We’re sad to see summer go, but at the same time this kicks off a number of exciting NCURA-related events. A number of exciting developments are under way at both the national and regional level. There is plenty of buzz going around about NCURA’s 47th Annual Meeting. The final program is out and it looks like the program committee has a fantastic meeting planned for us. All Region I newcomers are encouraged to attend the Orientation for the Newer Member scheduled for Saturday evening, this session will be repeated Sunday afternoon as well. This is an excellent opportunity to find out more about NCURA and meet your fellow research administrators from around the country. All are welcome to join us at the regional hospitality suite, where friends and colleagues meet to relax and enjoy each other’s company after a long day of sessions. Every Region I member is invited to join us for the Regional Business Meeting on Tuesday afternoon. The regional leadership will share news of upcoming events and initiatives happening at the regional level – it’s not to be missed. Another event not to be missed is NCURA’s Tuesday evening “Vegas Night.” Stacy Riseman is hard at work coordinating our regional entry, which will be a booth representing Caesars Palace. If anyone would like to volunteer to participate in this event, please contact Stacy at Stacy.Riseman@olin.edu. As this goes to press, electronic balloting is under way for Regional Chair, Treasurer, and Board Member from Region I. Thanks go out to Norm Hebert and the Regional Nominating Committee for submitting a well-qualified slate of candidates for these positions. The successful candidates will be announced at the Regional Business Meeting during the Annual Meeting in November.


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

Greetings Region II Colleagues:

I hope that everyone in Region II had a great summer, and is ready for the fall semester!

Don’t forget to vote in the Region II elections. This year the Region is holding elections for Chair Elect and Secretary. Nominations for both of these positions were due no later than September 26 to our current Chair Elect, Cheryl Williams, at cwilliam@orpa.rochester.edu. Information and instructions on how to vote will be sent by email in October to each member of Region II.

The Region II Communications Committee has had a number of conference call meetings over the last several months. The Committee has been diligently working on an exciting new look, that will include dynamic menus and an updated design for our website, now hosted by Seton Hall University. This new look should be launched on the Region II website later this fall. For more information please contact Maureen McMahon, Committee Chair, at: mmcmahon@umbc.edu.

I encourage all of my colleagues to attend NCURA’s 47th Annual Meeting to be held October 30-November 2. The theme this year is “In the Public Interest: Supporting and Promoting Research.” You should also plan on joining your Region II colleagues at the Regional Business Meeting on Tuesday and find out how you can get involved in regional activities! Also, don’t forget Vegas night on Tuesday night—Region II has the Treasure Island Hotel theme.

Mark your calendar for the Spring Region II Meeting from April 23-25, 2006. Workshops will be held on Sunday, with the Spring Meeting beginning that night with a reception. Our keynote and concurrent sessions will be all day on Monday and then again on Tuesday until noon. Our meeting is at the beautiful and historic seaside resort, Marriott’s Seaview in Galloway, just outside of Atlantic City, New Jersey. So when at the national Annual Meeting, plan to stop by the Region II Hospitality Suite to learn more about the Spring Meeting, as well as to network with your Region II colleagues.

The Program Committee is looking for volunteers for the Spring Meeting. Anyone interested in joining should contact Jeanne Galvin-Clarke at jclarke@umaryland.edu.

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 the Chair of Region II and serves as the Director of Grants and Research Services for Seton Hall University.

We hope that you had a restful and productive summer. Regional membership continues to expand and we hope to see many of our new members at the national meeting in D.C. If you are a first-time attendee, we encourage you to join us at the Regional Business Meeting and to visit the Regional Hospitality Suite.

We also encourage you to volunteer. Volunteering is the best way to introduce yourself to NCURA, to learn about the organization, to broaden your professional network, and to stay current on sponsored research developments. Volunteer opportunities are still available for Vegas Night (Region III is representing the Flamingo Hotel) and the NCURA Registration and Information Booths. Do not miss an opportunity to share the Region III spirit with the rest of NCURA! If you are interested in helping in one of these areas, please e-mail Tony Ventimiglia at ventiaf@auburn.edu. Tony is our newly appointed Volunteer Coordinator for Region III. Thanks, Tony!
Our members are looking forward to the in the region. Volunteers and newcomers to get involved with a user-friendly portal for projects, including a new-and-improved Region IV plans to take on some new volunteer opportunities. In addition, describing & cataloging the possible graduates in regional activities and participants at the National Leadership Board Meeting in Milwaukee and we're Region IV just conducted our Summer Undergraduate Institution Neighborhood. Committee member of the Predominately New College of Florida and is a of Research Programs and Services at Jeanne V. Ware serves as Director, Office Manager in the Intellectual Property Office. where she was the Senior Industry Contracts Manager in the Intellectual Property Office. Jerry Pogatshnik is now the Dean of the Graduate School and Associate VP for Research at the Eastern Kentucky University (Region III). He came from Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville where he was Associate Dean of the Graduate School (Region IV). Jerry also is the Chair of the PUI Neighborhood Committee.

I am writing this on behalf of Govind Narashimhan, Region V Chairman, who along with millions of other Texans, evacuated in the wake of Hurricane Rita. It is not too late to register for the NCURA 47th Annual Meeting! The meeting will be held at the Hilton Washington in Washington, D.C., October 30 – November 2, 2005. All Region V members are encouraged to attend the Region V Business Meeting, on Tuesday, November 1, from 1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m. (check the program for the location). Don’t forget to visit the Region V “hotel” for “Vegas Night” in the Exhibit Hall, Tuesday November 1, 7-9 p.m. Each region will represent a different Las Vegas hotel, and games of chance will be set up – should be lots of fun! We need volunteers to help decorate and man the Region V booth. If you would like to help, contact Govind Narashimhan, at (409) 266-9456 or via email gonorasi@utmb.edu, or any of the Region V officers. As usual, Region V will host a Hospitality Suite on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday nights. Stop by and mingle with the other Region V folks – there will be plenty of beverages, snacks and conversation! Mark your calendars now for the Region V Spring Meeting at the Doubletree in Austin, Texas, May 7 – 10, 2006. If you would like to present a topic, moderate a session, or participate in any way, please contact our Vice-Chair, Vicki Cox, at (713) 798-3101 or via email at vcox@bcm.tmc.edu. Volunteers are needed! Last but not least, we are pleased to announce the Region V website has been completely re-designed! Kudos to Cindy Schaefer, Oklahoma State University, for designing our beautiful new website, and to Scott Davis, Oklahoma University Health Sciences Center, Region V Publications Chair, for his help in putting this together. If you haven’t checked it out, the new website address is: http://www.ncuraregionv.com.

Hello everyone, the nominating committee has completed its work, and after the membership had 30 days to submit further nominations the slate of candidates is finalized. Voting will begin in early October and will close 30 days after it commences. The positions we will be voting on include Chair-Elect, Secretary/Treasurer-Elect, and a Regional Advisory Committee member. I want to thank the nominating committee, consisting of Chris Hansen, Dick Seligman, and Dan Nordquist for their extraordinary effort to put such a fine slate of candidates together for the Regional membership to vote on. Now our job as Region VI members will be to cast our votes when the balloting opens.

As you know our National Meeting in Washington, D.C. is fast approaching and I wanted to remind you that again Region VI and VII have a joint hospitality suite which always provides great opportunities for meeting the people in our two Regions. I would also like to mention that our Regional Business Meeting at National will be Tuesday, November 1 from 1:30-2:30 p.m. I hope all those at National will attend. More information about the National Meeting and Regional Planning meeting will be sent out on the Regional list serve shortly.

Also as a reminder, air fares are going up so you may want book your air reservations for the Regional Meeting. In case you have forgotten, it will be at the Radisson Kauai Beach Resort on the island of Kauai in Hawaii from April 23 through April 26, 2006.

And thank you Sue Camber and Ann Pollack for their input and assistance.

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.

continued on page 21
new members per year, attendees were concerned that NCURA needed to be sensitive to welcoming and making early contact with new(er) members. Some of the strategies recommended to accomplish this goal were greater regional involvement, increasing new member activities at both the regional and national level, the creation of working groups to address this issue and to target institutions with no NCURA members.

3 Increase the Level of Personal Communications with Members
Convention attendees were unanimous in acknowledging the need for better and more frequent connection/communication with former, inactive and uninvolved members through any and all means at both the regional and national level.

4 Foster Membership, Voluntarism and Leadership Development at All Levels
The need to develop a comprehensive plan to define volunteer opportunities at both the regional and national level was recommended as a method to assist members getting involved in NCURA activities. A part of this plan might include the appointment of volunteer coordinators at both the regional and national level. Other recommendations included surveying the membership to determine why they are reluctant to volunteer and to hold random focus groups at the regional and national meetings to gain additional feedback in this area.

Did I mention that there was a murder solved at the Summit? Dave Richardson thought Pat Green did it. Next time you see Latasha Johnson ask her about it.

NCURA 2005 Leadership Convention Delegates

Diane Barrett, Region IV Delegate University of Wisconsin – Madison
Matt Berry, Region V Delegate University of Oklahoma – Norman
Tara Bishop, Staff Delegate NCURA
David Bond, Region II Delegate Rochester Institute of Technology
Don A. Boydston, Board Delegate Rush University Medical Center
Wayne Brown, Region II Delegate Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
John Carfora, Board Delegate Boston College
Susan Cassidy, Region I Delegate Brigham and Women’s Hospital
Thomas Cooley, Board Delegate NSF
Carrie Cotman, Staff Delegate NCURA
Marti Dunne, Board Delegate New York University
Kay Ellis, Region V Delegate Oklahoma State University
Jerry Fife, Board Delegate Vanderbilt University
Patrick Fitzgerald, Board Delegate MIT
Judy Fredenberg, Board Delegate University of Montana
Pat Green, Region III Delegate Vanderbilt University
Christina Hansen, Board Delegate University of California – Irvine
Edward Herran, Board Delegate Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center
Crystal Hiner, Staff Delegate, NCURA
Vivian Holmes, Board Delegate Harvard Medical School
Dianne Horrocks, Board Delegate Idaho State University
Josie Jimenez, Region VII Delegate New Mexico State University
Latasha Johnson, Staff Delegate, NCURA
Lisa Laatsch, Region VII Delegate University of Arizona
Kathleen Larmett, Board Delegate NCURA
Peggy Lowry, N&LDC Chair Oregon State University
Glenda Luecke, Region IV Delegate Washington University in St. Louis
David Mayo, Board Delegate California Institute of Technology
Bruce Morgan, Region VI Delegate University of California – Riverside
Debbie Newton, Region V Delegate University of Tulsa
Dan Nordquist, Region VI Delegate Washington State University
RaeAnne Nye, Staff Delegate, NCURA
Heather Offhaus, Region IV Delegate University of Michigan – Ann Arbor
Dennis Pafthre, Region VII Delegate Utah State University
Ben Prince, Region I Delegate University of Massachusetts Medical School at Worcester
David Richardson, Region III Delegate Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Georgette Sakamoto, Region VI Delegate University of Hawaii
Marc Schiffman, Staff Delegate, NCURA
Myrta Stager, Region V Delegate UTMB Galveston
Sally Tremaine, Region I Delegate Yale University
Michele Vazin, Region III Delegate Vanderbilt University
Laura Wade, Board Delegate University of Houston
Denise Wallen, Board Delegate University of New Mexico
Cynthia White, Board Delegate Washington University in St. Louis
Pamela Whitlock, Board Delegate UNC at Wilmington
Cheryl Williams, Region II Delegate University of Rochester
Stephen Williams, Board Delegate Wake Forest University

NCURA Holds Leadership Convention

5 Mutually Develop Closers Connections Between NCURA and its Regions
Attendees believed that in order for NCURA to continue its success, the National organization and officers needed to maintain closer contacts with the regions. Some of the recommendations made in this area included: an annual caucus of regional chairs; creating internships on regional governing groups; formal connections between regions and the national organization; quarterly conference calls between the regional and national officers; creation of volunteer coordinators at both the regional and national levels, and; hiring of a full-time regional support person at the national office.

6 Encourage Regions to Share Best Practices About Governance, Operations, etc.
Many regional attendees acknowledged that both regional leadership and NCURA members would benefit by ensuring better communications by vesting responsibility for communicating Board activities in regional leadership, the development of shared guidelines among and between regions and the publishing of volunteer opportunities at the regional level.

Since the Convention, the Officers have already begun to implement some of the recommendations. A new member breakfast will be held at this year’s annual meeting. One of the regions has appointed a volunteer coordinator and another has conducted a survey of members and initiated contact with new(er) members in a number of different ways. The board has begun discussions on prioritizing the recommendations from the Convention.

Jerry Fife is the NCURA President and serves as the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Finance, Vanderbilt University.
The National Institutes of Health (NIH) has developed a password-protected, web-based, NIH Manuscript Submission (NIHMS) system to implement the new NIH Public Access Policy (http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-05-022.html). The Policy, which took effect on May 2, 2005, requests and strongly encourages all NIH-funded investigators to make their peer-reviewed author final manuscripts available to other researchers and the public through the NIH National Library of Medicine’s (NLM) PubMed Central (http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov) immediately after the final date of journal publication. (The author’s final manuscript is defined as the final version accepted for journal publication, and includes all modifications from the publishing peer review process). Authors are given the option to delay the release of their final manuscripts through PubMed Central up to 12 months after the publisher’s official date of final publication.

The NIH anticipates that investigators, or their designees, will submit an electronic version of the author’s final manuscript upon acceptance for publication, resulting from research supported in whole or in part with direct costs from the NIH. Providing the NIH with early access to the full text of publicly-funded NIH research findings will enable the NIH to manage more efficiently and to understand better their investments in NIH-supported research and the public through the NIH National Library of Medicine’s (NLM) PubMed Central (http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov) immediately after the final date of journal publication. (The author’s final manuscript is defined as the final version accepted for journal publication, and includes all modifications from the publishing peer review process). Authors are given the option to delay the release of their final manuscripts through PubMed Central up to 12 months after the publisher’s official date of final publication.

As an incentive to investigators and grantee institutions, final manuscripts submitted to PubMed Central through the NIHMS system also will fulfill the Non-Competing Grant Progress Report (PHS 2590) requirement to “provide one copy of each publication” to the NIH. Beginning in the fall of 2005, a listing of submitted final manuscripts will also appear in the publications section of the NIH’s eRA Commons (https://commons.era.nih.gov/commons/) under electronic streamlined non-competing progress reports (eSNAPS) for easy association with the progress report.

For more information about the NIH Public Access Policy, please go to the NIH Public Access Web site: http://www.nih.gov/about/publicaccess/.

For more information about the final manuscript submission procedures, please visit the NIHMS System Web site: http://nihms.nih.gov/.

Common questions about the NIH Public Access Policy:

1. Can authors and journals continue to assert copyright in scientific publications resulting from NIH funding?

Yes. The Public Access Policy does not affect the ability to assert copyright. Funding recipients may continue to assert copyright in works arising from NIH-funded research, and they may assign these copyrights to journals as is the current practice. Copyright holders may enforce these copyrights as before. Authors and/or their institutions should ensure that their final manuscript submissions to PubMed Central are consistent with any other agreements, including copyright assignments that they may have made with publishers or other third parties. While individual copyright arrangements can take many forms, NIH encourages investigators to sign agreements that specifically allow the manuscript to be deposited with NIH for public posting on PubMed Central as soon as possible after journal publication. As an example, the kind of language that an author or institution might add to a copyright agreement includes the following:

“Journal acknowledges that Author retains the right to provide a copy of the final manuscript to NIH upon acceptance for Journal publication or thereafter, for public archiving in PubMed Central as soon as possible after publication by Journal.”

2. Will this Policy be an added burden to NIH-supported investigators and research institutions?

No. Public Access Policy submissions will provide NIH-supported investigators with an alternate means by which they can fulfill the existing requirement to provide publications as part of progress reports and other application and close-out procedures. It is anticipated that, in the future, investigators applying for new and competing renewal support from the NIH will also utilize this resource by providing links in their applications to their PubMed Central-archived information. NIH anticipates that this may reduce, rather than increase, burden for investigators who choose to use this method as part of their application/progress report/close-out submissions.

3. If I submit my manuscript to a journal that is already participating in PubMed Central, do I still need to separately submit the manuscript to the NIHMS system?

No. A separate submission to the NIHMS system is not necessary if a manuscript has been accepted by a PubMed Central journal that permits free access in 12 months or less. The list of journals participating in PubMed Central can be found at: http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/front-page/fp.fcgi?cmd=full_view. The entry for each journal indicates when articles become freely available within PubMed Central.

For NIH grantees, beginning later in 2005, the NIHMS system will extract the necessary identifying information (e.g., NIH award number) from the journal article and transfer it to the NIH’s grants management system to fulfill grantees’ responsibility for providing publications as part of progress reports. (Also note, PubMed Central, a full text repository, is not the same as PubMed, a citation index).

Timothy Hays is Project Director, Knowledge Management for Disease Coding, Project Manager, Public Access Policy, Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, National Institutes of Health/DHHS.
Do you know where your bread is buttered? In other words, do you know where the funding comes from that pays your salary? If you are a Research Administrator working in a Department or Central Administration, more than likely, your bread is buttered, so to speak, by the F&A dollars generated by the proposals you prepare and/or you review.

Think about it! Whether or not your position is funded directly or indirectly by F&A dollars, you need to understand your Institutional Rate Agreement. You need to know your Institutional F&A rate. Is your F&A rate Predetermined or Provisional? What is the effective period of your current F&A rate agreement? What constitutes an Off-campus rate vs. an On-campus rate? What costs are excluded from the modified total direct cost (MTDC) base? More importantly, what costs can be included in the MTDC base? All of these factors equate to dough, dollars, bread; all of which can make a difference between you trick-or-treating in Washington, D.C., at the NCURA National Meeting or trick-or-treating in your neighborhood.

Funding is tight and will continue to be tight for the foreseeable future. NIH concluded its initiative of doubling its budget. For FY06, NIH is looking at a mere 1% overall increase over FY05. The same holds true for NSF.

The intention is not to spread gloom and doom, but as a Research Administrator, you need to be aware of these issues. It is your responsibility to ensure that each proposal budget you prepare or review is earning the maximum F&A costs allowable per your Institutional Rate Agreement. Don’t leave any dough on the table! If you are not utilizing your maximum F&A rate, you need to know why. Don’t be afraid to ask!

One of the most common errors involves consortiums (i.e. subawards/subcontracts). As a Prime Awardee of a federal award, the Prime is entitled to F&A on the first $25K of each subaward and/or subcontracts. Whether it is one institution with multiple projects or multiple institutions with one project each, it is the number of subawards and/or subcontracts (i.e. research projects) that determine the MTDC base. All too often the computation surrounding the MTDC base is calculated incorrectly when another institution or institutions are involved with multiple subawards and/or subcontracts.

The following scenario illustrates dollars and “sense”. The impact of leaving dough, so to speak, on the table.

University You (UY) receives a $500k P50 award from the NIH. The federally negotiated F&A rate for UY is 50%. In our scenario, University Other-than-You (UOTY) has four projects, totaling $400k in total costs (TC). If the overall research project dictates four separate Scopes of Work (SOWs) and four separate Co-Investigators, UY should receive F&A on $100k (first $25k x four projects), which equates to $50k ($100k x 50% F&A rate). However, if UY treats this scenario as one project, because there is simply one other institution (i.e. University Other-than-You) participating, UY will receive $12.5k (F&A on the first $25k x 50% F&A rate). That’s a difference of $37.5k. That’s more than a national meeting! That’s (1) FTE!

As a Department Administrator, it is imperative that the overall research dictate how this issue is addressed and if the overall research dictates four separate projects with four separate SOWs and four separate PIs, you should propose these projects as separate projects, account for the allowable F&A and convey this information to Central Administration. After all, as Prime, you will be monitoring, tracking and accounting for these four projects separately.

It does not take many of these “missed opportunities,” before we are talking some serious dough. Enough dough that could result in a flat operating budget from year to year. Worse yet, every Research Administrators’ least favorite phrase “a re-organization of the institutions’ research support” (i.e. job reductions).

Bottom line, verify your MTDC is calculated correctly and consists of all possible allowable costs in accordance with your F&A Rate Agreement.

Hope to trick-or-treat with you in DC.

John Michnowicz is Director Office of Grants and Contracts, Washington University School of Medicine and Jaynee Tolle is Business Administrator, Department of Cell Biology, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine.
by Denise Rouleau

The FRA Neighborhood Committee is continuing their efforts to improve the Neighborhood. Although we have all been faced with the challenges of year-end, audits, and taking much deserved vacations, we have also found some time to start our new Listserv Topic series. The first discussion on “Export Controls, Financial Nightmare?” was posted in mid-July. We have decided that due to the “hot” nature of this topic, we have reposted the topic to the listserv and hope to see many responses regarding what institutions are doing to respond to the Department of Defense (DOD) proposed amendment to the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement adding requirements for protection of export controlled information and technology. The proposed rule, which was published in the July 12 Federal Register, can be viewed at http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars[dfars]/changenoice/2004/20050712/2004d010.htm. Our next topic for discussion will be on Time and Effort Reporting. It is our hope to develop a discussion and a sharing of policies and procedures so that those who would like to perform a review at their institutions will have other examples as well as colleagues to guide them along the path.

Our Library has seen another update. We now have available all handouts from FRA VI for our members to use as a resource. If you attended the meeting and missed a handout, now is your chance to get it. Thanks to Mike Roberts, NCURA’s Webmaster, for his hard work in making this happen! The committee is still hard at work on the task of reorganization and design of our library. We hope to have something new and improved for our members soon.

The Neighborhoods will be once again hosting the Interactive Learning Series (ILS). After a hiatus, this well-received series will be starting up again shortly so be on the look out for the next announcement.

Denise Rouleau serves as Manager, Sponsored Research Accounting, Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

Stay tuned for a 1 1⁄2 day Seminar on Export Controls to be held early December in Washington, DC. Registration and program information coming soon!
The Leadership Development Institute (LDI) Class of 2005 gathered on June 16th 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 January 2005, 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 4 hours per month.

When students entered the classroom in January, 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 members were on hand to assist including: Immediate Past President, Pat Fitzgerald, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; NCURA Executive Director, Kathleen Larmett; Chair of NCURA’s N&LDC, Peggy Lowry of Oregon State University; and Vice Chair of NCURA’s N&LDC, Tommy Coggins, University of South Carolina came armed with their own MBTI analysis and worked along with the group.

On the last day of the leadership retreat, the class was given the assignment of taking on a leadership role to benefit their institution. Each student’s supervisor was notified and will be asked for feedback on the project.

The class has continued to meet virtually and will join together at this year’s Annual Meeting for another in-person workshop. Following the workshop, they will meet with their advisors and both national and regional NCURA leaders at a special reception in their honor. Members of all 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.

Members of the 2005 Class and their NCURA Advisors are:

Susan Cassidy, Brigham and Women’s Hospital; Barbara Cole, Boston University, Advisor; Michelle Powell, Georgia Institute of Technology; Tom Roberts, Florida Gulf Coast University, Advisor; Christine Katsapis, Gallaudet University; Myrta Stager, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, Advisor; Shelley Hesselton-Manan, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center; Steven H. Smartt, Vanderbilt University, Advisor; Robert Holm, Butler University; Dick Seligman, California Institute of Technology, Advisor; Stacy A. Riseman, Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering; Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii, Advisor; Suzanne M. Rivera, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas; Anne Sherman, University of Houston – Downtown, Advisor; Toni Shaklee, Oklahoma State University; John Case, The Cleveland Clinic Foundation, Advisor; Maria Thompson, Tennessee State University; Jamie Caldwell, Loyola University of Chicago, Advisor; Anthony F. Ventimiglia, Auburn University, Advisor.

The LDI retreat is really a leadership immersion experience. Although it takes place in a beautiful calm setting, the retreat is action-packed. It requires you to be on your toes all the time and you find you are in a constant learning mode—even while eating the best meals I’ve ever had at a conference. I believe we all felt we accomplished a huge amount of work in a very short time and were proud of what we had done—individually and collectively.

Toni Shaklee, Oklahoma State University

The LDI retreat was really a first class retreat. It was held in an ideal setting, for a select group of highly motivated individuals sure to become some of tomorrow’s key leaders. We had a chance to interact with each other and current NCURA leadership under the facilitation of Gale Wood. The schedule was tough, Gale challenged us continuously while at the same time made it a really fun and rewarding experience. We learned a lot about ourselves, each other, NCURA and how we can use the information and skills we are developing to grow in our careers.

Susan Cassidy, Brigham & Women’s Hospital
Another year of solid financial growth for NCURA was achieved in 2004. The year also provided a new number of “firsts” for the NCURA Community. Membership in NCURA rose to a record level of over 5,000 individuals. Our Fundamentals program continued to be an area of great demand. A new mark was achieved as 12 sessions were held in 2004 (8 at locations throughout the country and 4 on-campus sites). Our Online Education Programs were expanded to include a new segment – Six-week Online Tutorial Programs. NCURA’s continuing efforts to diversify its non-dues income produced an 84% increase in Sponsorship revenues over 2003.

In the words of our 2004 President, Patrick Fitzgerald, “the popularity of our new programs and the unparalleled success of our traditional offerings is confirmation that NCURA is providing valuable programming in ways that enable a maximum number of members to participate.”

REVENUES
Increases were posted in many of the areas of operating revenue. Significant gains were achieved in Regional Conferences, Sponsorships and Publications. Regional Conferences revenues in 2004 rose over 51%. This marked increase at the Regional Level is a good sign that members are connecting in their neighborhoods. It also provides a great opportunity to identify new members and open the possibility of their future service to NCURA on the Regional and National levels. The Financial Management Committees’ goal of seeking partnerships with businesses involved in the research community is reflected in the gain of Sponsorships in 2004. Sponsorship income is up from $45,000 in 2003 to $82,000 in 2004. Publications generated a 33% increase with the introduction of a new Report on Research Compliance Newsletter produced by our partnership with Atlantic Information Systems.

Membership in NCURA rose to a record level of over 5,000 members in 2004. Membership revenues posted a decrease of 4% due mainly to switching in 2004 from a calendar year membership to an anniversary year membership. As a result a portion of membership dues income is moved to deferred membership income for 2005.

EXPENDITURES
Expenditures in 2004 increased slightly over 2003 by roughly 8%. Regional conferences expenditures increase is in line with the increase in revenues, although at a smaller rate, 35%. A 21% rise in Fundamentals costs is reflected as a result of increasing the number of sessions form 10 in 2003 to 12 in 2004. Taken together Annual Meeting and Annual Meeting Workshop costs declined 3%. Increases in the level of Sponsorships is the contributing factor in this decrease.

In 2004 NCURA again met the challenge to be a “strong and financially viable” organization, a goal that is achieved by the continuing dedication and efforts of the entire NCURA Community-Board, members and staff.

2004 REVENUE COMPARISON TO 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Dues</td>
<td>$609,037</td>
<td>$634,600</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>$779,823</td>
<td>$771,843</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Mtg Workshops</td>
<td>$100,392</td>
<td>$81,946</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Conferences</td>
<td>$840,208</td>
<td>$763,476</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Conferences</td>
<td>$390,944</td>
<td>$258,542</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Workshops</td>
<td>$442,185</td>
<td>$380,284</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>$44,700</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$133,487</td>
<td>$99,866</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Dividends</td>
<td>$34,159</td>
<td>$25,199</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized/Realized gain Investments</td>
<td>$52,548</td>
<td>$60,208</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$11,747</td>
<td>$13,384</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$3,477,030</td>
<td>$3,134,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2004 EXPENDITURES COMPARISON TO 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Services</td>
<td>$518,886</td>
<td>$552,012</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>$747,911</td>
<td>$677,571</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Workshops</td>
<td>$64,064</td>
<td>$73,872</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Conferences</td>
<td>$746,488</td>
<td>$656,733</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Conferences</td>
<td>$302,577</td>
<td>$223,561</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Workshops</td>
<td>$271,221</td>
<td>$224,151</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$71,386</td>
<td>$65,215</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and General</td>
<td>$347,164</td>
<td>$361,658</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$3,069,697</td>
<td>$2,834,773</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2004 EXPENSES COMPARISON TO 2003

Ed Herran is the Treasurer of NCURA and serves as the Director, Office of Sponsored Projects for Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center; Charles Ells, Manager of Financial Services, NCURA.
NCURA Members Recognized for Service to NCURA and Our Profession

Award Presentations to take place at the NCURA 47th Annual Meeting

Steve Hansen to Receive NCURA Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration

STEVE HANSEN, Dean, Graduate Studies and Research, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville has become the twelfth recipient of NCURA’s Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration. Hansen, a member of NCURA for over 20 years, received his M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Chicago and has served the Southern Illinois University Edwardsville since 1984.

Steve’s quick wit, and easy nature make him approachable to his staff, students, faculty, researchers, and peers. His inspired teaching techniques not only bring mastery of the concept, but understanding of the application. All this, along with his commitment to the people in his professional life, coupled with his tireless efforts to bring the needs and concerns of Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions to the people in his professional life, coupled with the application. All this, along with his commitment to bring mastery of the concept, but understanding of the application.

Milton Cole, Villanova University nominated Steve for this prestigious award and wrote, “He has played a major role in the development of many careers in research administration through his willingness to share information garnered through his singular efforts, and through his personal example…”

From his home institution, many came forward with words of praise and support for Steve. Kent Neely, Dean at SIUE was “especially impressed with his calm and supportive attitude among the newly hired professors, many of whom were quite anxious about maintaining an active research agenda.” SIUE Provost Sharon Hahs shares that Steve “…has managed limited university funds in creative ways, matching his approaches to the university’s long term goals.” Jo Barnes, Director of the Research Office at SIUE describes Steve as a guiding force. “The leadership skills, expertise, compassion and sense of fairness he has exhibited throughout his 15 plus years of service to NCURA are consistent with how he operates at SIUE.”

Steve’s impact on the National level is exemplified in the statements of Jean Feldman of NSF. “I have found Steve to be extremely useful as a sounding board – by providing institutional perspectives on the implications (both positive and negative) of proposed changes to Federal policies and procedures – a talent that requires strong problem solving skills, great diplomacy, and a significant understanding of the large variation in types of academic institutions.”

Richard Seligman, California Institute of Technology, highlights Steve’s role in broadening the range of programs on topics and issues that are of particular concern “to individuals working at primarily undergraduate institutions where the responsibilities might be more accurately described as ‘administration of sponsored programs,’ and not just ‘administration of research programs’.”

As a mentor and friend, Ada Sue Selwitz, University of Kentucky laud Steve as an extraordinary individual. Selwitz states, “He mentors colleagues with unselshf dedication and sage advice.” Kim Moreland, University of Wisconsin-Madison shares that “…Steve’s taken a scholar’s limitless intellectual curiosity and applied it to an emerging area of administration.”

Steve Hansen will receive the Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration at NCURA’s 47th Annual Meeting. The award will be presented on Monday morning, October 31, 2005.

Geoff Grant to Receive Joseph F. Carrabino Award

In 2003, the NCURA Board of Directors established the Joseph F. Carrabino Award. The award, named after the late Joe Carrabino, NSF Grants Officer, recognizes a federal partner who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either by a singular innovation or by a lifetime of service.

This year, NCURA’s Nominating and Leadership Development Committee has selected GEOFF GRANT to receive the award. Geoff is the Deputy Director for Management Operations and Policy for the National Science Foundation.

Geoff’s nominator, Betty Farbman of St. John’s University stated, “...I have viewed Geoff Grant as a role model and am honored to have the opportunity to nominate him for this award, made to a federal employee who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either through a singular innovation or by a lifetime of service.” Because (Geoff) has worked both in the federal government and university worlds, he has been able to make a unique contribution to fostering and maintaining the Government-University relationships so critical to both communities. These contributions have served not only the research administration community but also the national interest.”

Bob Killoren, Pennsylvania State University, who brought forth the concept for this award to the Board of Directors while he was President of NCURA, whole heartedly supports Geoff as this year’s recipient. “Geoff is an excellent model for what the recipients of the Carrabino Award are supposed to be: university friendly, dedicated to service and excellence, open to new ideas and solutions, innovative and responsive.”

Geoff will be honored at the 47th Annual Meeting on Monday, October 31, 2005 during the Recognition Luncheon.

Five Members to Receive NCURA Distinguished Service Award

The NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee has selected five long-time NCURA members to receive the Distinguished Service Award. MARTI DUNNE, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, New York University; RICHARD KEOGH, Consultant Services, InfoEd International, Inc.; GUNTA LIDERS, Associate Vice President for Consultant Services, InfoEd International, Inc.; GARRETT SANDERS, Director, Office for Sponsored Research, Ordway Research Institute, Inc., and; MARY ELLEN SHERIDAN, Associate Vice President for Research, University of Chicago, will receive their award during the Recognition Luncheon, on Monday, October 31, 2005 at NCURA’s 47th Annual Meeting.
Moving Tips by Bo Bogdanski

I recently completed a job change, moving from one university to another in a neighboring state. Now that the move is complete and I reflect on the events of the past few months, it occurred to me that I followed a series of steps and decision points. Admittedly, I wasn’t this organized when I began the process. I hope by writing this article, I can assist fellow members who are contemplating a similar move. Here are ten points I suggest you consider if you decide to change locations.

Start networking early
First, define your objective. Do you want a promotion, a lateral position or a career change? Find out what might be available based on your objectives by using networking techniques. Determine if you have the skills and background to be considered for such a position. Talk to as many knowledgeable people as necessary to help you determine if your objectives are truly attainable. If not, develop a plan and timetable to reach your goals. Ask network contacts to refer you to others who may give you objective advice or help you refine, expand or further develop your goals.

I suggest you ask your network contacts to be discrete as you may decide that after this initial analysis a career move may not be appropriate for you in the near future.

Make the commitment
If you decide that a job change is right for you, define some parameters (location, pay, job title, timing etc.). Inform your network contacts of your decision and look for ways to further expand that network. Always ask one contact to refer you to at least two others. Use meetings and conferences to intensify and expand your knowledge of potential opportunities. Decide who within your current organization ought to be part of a “secure” network. I suggest you don’t widely advertise your intentions within your current organization until a job offer is firm and accepted. Continue to perform at the highest level of professionalism at your current position as you continue your search.

Write a resume not a CV
Write or update your resume. Find a good resume book and follow the advice. Although we work in an environment of multi-page curriculum vitae, I still suggest a limit of two page resume and a cover letter specifically addressing the open position. Have someone critically critique your resume. I found many places preferred a down-loaded resume onto a local system and/or the organization used an on-line series of questions as the preferred application method. Be flexible and follow the instructions.

Develop a well-rounded set of references
Think of people who know you, your abilities, and most of all your potential. Try to find people both within your current environment and outside your daily sphere. Be sure your references are willing to take the time and make the effort if called upon. References must present themselves well on the telephone. I asked three NCURA members from across the country as well as a department chair, a department administrator and a division director from a related organization within my institution.

Prepare for the interview
Hopefully the newly acquired resume book will tell you how to dress and present yourself for the interview. But physical preparation is not enough. Find out about the interviewing organization and the people who will be involved in the interview. Have a few facts ready during the interview to show off that preparation. Use the web, network contacts and the library as possible sources of information. If the job offer is over the phone, clear the phone area of all distractions, shut off your computer, cell phone and radio, and close the door. If the job offer is in-person, there is never a time the interview is over, until after you accept the job offer. Always assume you are being interviewed especially during casual conversations and meals.

Prepare an exit plan from your current organization
Once you have received an offer and are willing to accept, decide if you will consider a “counter offer” from someone at your current location. Sometimes the counter-offer may not materialize which should not deter you if you are fully committed to the transition.

Research your current institution’s resignation policy and analyze the needs of your new organization. Consider personal needs and time needed to transition. When you have developed the plan, I suggest you discuss options with your current supervisor before you prepare the resignation letter especially if you are thinking of something different from the “normal” resignation rules.

Be gracious with accolades, awards or gifts
When you make the final decision and there is some sort of formal “announcement,” various groups of people from your current organization may want to recognize your contribution either through personal contact or some sort of social event. Always keep your discussion or remarks positive, up-beat, and toward the future, this isn’t the time to start “burning bridges.” Accept all invitations to social events because people genuinely want to say “good-bye” and you’ll want to continue to develop professional relationships with many of these people.

Make an extra effort to clean up your desk
Now that your decision is public, you will probably not take on any new long-term projects, so you should have time to get your on-going work into good order. After your current organization helps you develop a transition plan for your work, make a conscience effort to get things as caught up as possible. Make notes for the file, explain difficult long-range issues to a co-worker or tell your agency counterparts you are leaving and ask them to help you complete necessary tasks. Departed workers are an easy scapegoat for blame and you will probably be a “departed” target too, so don’t provide any additional ammunition. The people who count will know you left on a positive note.

Keep your new supervisor informed
An infrequent e-mail or phone call to your new office communicating your transition actions and plans will help your new organization prepare for your arrival. You don’t have to give day by day details but just an occasion “hello” gives both sides the feeling that things are still on track. Also, find one important person in the new office that can answer the day-to-day questions so you aren’t bothering the supervisor with those types of inquiries. Finally, look at your new organization’s web site for answers to Human Relations questions, parking, orientation, and similar items of personal interest. Your objective should be to show up with many of your questions already answered.

Close the door and don’t look back
You have defined your objectives, developed your plan, gone through the interviews and made the decision. So much thought and work should give you a good feeling that you’ve made the right choice. Don’t suffer from “buyer’s remorse.” Surely you are leaving with some good memories (and maybe a few bad ones too) but you are now ready to start that next part of your life. Shut off the light, close the door and don’t look back, there are lots of opportunities in front of you.

Bo Bogdanski serves as Senior Grants and Contracts, Sponsored Programs, Colorado State University.
Comprehensive New NCURA Publication to be Available in January

Sponsored Research Administration
A Guide to Effective Strategies and Recommended Practices

- Looseleaf service with quarterly updates
- Written and reviewed by top campus sponsored research managers
- Comprehensive, reliable and up-to-date
- Includes special coverage for smaller institutions
- Includes searchable CD

20 Highly Practical Chapters Packed With Effective Strategies, Principles and Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>Richard P. Seligman, California Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>An Overview of Sponsored Research Administration</td>
<td>Julie T. Norris, Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>Organizational Models</td>
<td>Elizabeth Mora, Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Kim Moreland, University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Kenneth G. Forstmeier, Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>Electronic Research Administration</td>
<td>Stephen D. Dowdy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>Training and Education</td>
<td>Pamela A. Webb, Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
<td>The Regulatory Environment</td>
<td>Ann M. Holmes, University of Maryland, College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8</td>
<td>Research Compliance</td>
<td>Alice A. Tangredi-Hannon, University of Pennsylvania and Stephen Erickson, Boston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 9</td>
<td>Indirect (Facilities and Administrative) Costs</td>
<td>Patrick Fitzgerald, Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 10</td>
<td>Intellectual Property</td>
<td>Mary Ellen Sheridan, University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 11</td>
<td>Special Issues for Medical Schools</td>
<td>Gunta J. Liders, University of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 12</td>
<td>Special Issues for Undergraduate Institutions</td>
<td>Milton T. Cole, Villanova University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 13</td>
<td>Pre-Award Services</td>
<td>Stephen Hansen, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 14</td>
<td>Administering Research Contracts</td>
<td>David J. Mayo, California Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 15</td>
<td>Legal Considerations</td>
<td>Kathleen S. Irwin, University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 16</td>
<td>Interactions with Auditors</td>
<td>Denise J. Clark, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 17</td>
<td>Post-Award Administration</td>
<td>Jane A. Youngers, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 18</td>
<td>International Research Collaborations</td>
<td>Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico, and John M. Carfora, Boston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 19</td>
<td>Managing Subawards</td>
<td>Robert A. Killoren, Jr., Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 20</td>
<td>Assessing the Sponsored Programs Office</td>
<td>Peggy S. Lowry, Oregon State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, watch your mailbox in late-October, or visit the NCURA Book Store at the October 30 – November 2 Annual Meeting at the Washington Hilton in Washington, DC
ORDER YOUR COPIES OF REGULATION AND COMPLIANCE: 2005 TODAY!

The job of sponsored programs managers brings them into regular contact with citations to federal requirements their colleges or universities must comply with, or face potentially dire consequences. Some are well known (e.g., OMB Circular A-21 or OSHA), others are new (e.g., the 2002 security and bioterrorism law), and many are arcane (e.g., the Anti-Kickback Act of 1986). These wildly diverse requirements have two things in common: (1) failure to comply can be costly for colleges and universities, and (2) they are summarized in REGULATION AND COMPLIANCE:2005... so sponsored programs managers have one reliable reference book at their fingertips, whenever they need it.

Select 1 of 3 Convenient Payment Options:

- Payment enclosed. Please make check payable to AIS. D.C. residents, add 5.75% sales tax.
- Charge my credit card. AmEx_____ Visa_____ MC_____
  Card #_______________ Exp. date ______________
  Charges will appear as Atlantic Information Services, Inc.
  (Signature and phone number required to process)
- Purchase order enclosed. P.O.# __________

Signature and phone number required for credit card orders:

Signature _____________________________ Phone _____________________________
Fax _____________________________
E-mail (optional) _____________________________

TWO CONVENIENT WAYS TO ORDER:

Call 800-521-4323: Atlantic Information Services (AIS), business agent for NCURA, 800-521-4323, and charge your order to a major credit card.
Charges will appear as “Atlantic Information Services.”

Complete this form and mail to: AIS, 1100 17th Street, NW Suite 300, Washington, DC 20036

YES! Please send me REGULATION AND COMPLIANCE: 2005, with practical guidance on more than 75 of the most significant sets of requirements referenced in federal contracts and grants.

Prices: Single Copy $92; 2-9 Copies $57 each, add $5; 10+ copies, 20% off. D.C. customers add 5.75% sales tax.

Regulation and Compliance: 2005:

______copy(ies) @ ______ per copy = $ ____________
D.C. customers add 5.75% sales tax $ ____________
Shipping & Handling $ ____________
Total $ ____________

Please fill in the blanks below, or attach your business card:

Name________________________Title________________________
Organization________________________________________
Address* ____________________________________________
City/State/Zip ________________________________________

*Please include your street address. UPS does not deliver to P.O. Boxes.
In 2005, regulators will focus more attention than ever on the diverse group of federal rules that fall under the umbrella of “research compliance.” This collection of rapidly changing government requirements – Can torpedo the reputation of even the most prestigious U.S. universities, Ranges widely from internal business issues (e.g., effort reporting) to grave matters of international security (e.g., select agents missing from your lab), Can have a very sudden impact on your funding and financial well-being, Is the focus of complex rules and penalties from a dozen federal agencies, Is under constant review on Capitol Hill, where political volleyballs like the Patriot Act now have a direct impact on colleges, universities and teaching hospitals.

To help research administrators manage these complicated issues and do their jobs more effectively, NCURA and AIS are offering Report on Research Compliance, a unique three-part service. Full Year Subscription Includes: Weekly e-mail newsletters, Unlimited Web site access, Monthly 12-page print newsletters. For more information, visit www.ReportonResearchCompliance.com.

Please fill in the blanks below, or attach your business card:

Name
Title
Organization
Address*
City/State/Zip

*Please include your street address. UPS does not deliver to P.O. Boxes.

Select 1 of 3 Convenient Payment Options:  
- Payment enclosed. Please make check payable to AIS. D.C. residents, add 5.75% sales tax.
- Charge my credit card. 
  AmEx_______  Visa_______  MC_______
  Card #________________________  Exp. date_________
  Charges will appear as Atlantic Information Services, Inc. (Signature and phone number required to process)
- Purchase order enclosed.  P.O.# ____________________

Signature and phone number required for credit card orders:

Signature__________________________________________________________
Phone __________________________ Fax ______________________
E-mail (optional) ______________________________________________________

TWO CONVENIENT WAYS TO ORDER:

Call 800-521-4323:
Atlantic Information Services (AIS), business agent for NCURA, 800-521-4323, and charge your order to a major credit card. Charges will appear as “Atlantic Information Services.”

Complete this form and mail to:
AIS
1100 17th Street, NW Suite 300
Washington, DC  20036
Where did the summer go? It’s hard to believe it has come and gone and that it’s October! Before time continues fleeting by, let’s take this opportunity to reflect on summer activities and upcoming fall and spring activities.

This summer the NCURA National Organization provided an opportunity for delegates from each region to convene at a Leadership Convention in Philadelphia, PA from July 29-31. The focus of the Leadership Convention was to discuss leadership and volunteerism within the organization and at the regional levels. I want to thank Lisa Laatsch from the University of Arizona and Dennis Patfrath from Utah State University for representing Region VII in the delegation at the convention. The input provide by these individuals is invaluable and will assist in implementing future initiatives within the region. Stay tuned for upcoming initiatives that will be undertaken to address these topics.

I anticipate that you have marked your calendar for the 47th Annual NCURA meeting which will be held October 29-November 2, 2005 in Washington, D.C. If you haven’t registered, it’s not too late. The final program is posted on the National NCURA site and is packed with an overabundance of workshops and sessions to meet your needs. This year’s Program Committee has done an outstanding job of planning this meeting; join me in a Big “THANK YOU” for a job well done. Also, don’t forget to attend the Regional Business Meeting on Tuesday, November 1, to find out what type of programming and initiatives Region VII will be involved in for the upcoming year.

Lastly, in anticipation of future events, mark your calendars for the Joint Region VI/VII Spring Meeting at the Radisson Kauai Beach Resort in Kauai on April 23-26, 2005. Planning for the Spring 2006 Meeting is underway and if you would like to serve on the Program Committee or participate in any other way, please contact me at (505) 646-3573 or via e-mail at josefjm@nmsu.edu.

Look forward to seeing you at the NCURA Annual Meeting!
Josie Jimenez is Chair of Region VII and is an Assistant Director in the Office of Grants and Contracts at New Mexico State University.

Regional Corner

ADVERTISEMENT

Director, Office of Human Research Compliance Review

The Office of the Vice President for Research, University of Michigan, is seeking candidates for Director of a newly established Office of Human Research Compliance Review (OHRCR). OHRCR is one component of the U of M’s Human Subject Compliance Initiative. OHRCR will (a) conduct not-for-cause audits of research projects involving human participants for compliance with OHRP, FDA, other federal agencies, and University policies; (b) conduct requested reviews for compliance with OHRP, FDA, and other federal agency policies; (c) conduct periodic reviews of operations of the University’s Human Subject Compliance sub-systems (including IRBs, COI committees, Radioactive Drug Review Committee, Investigational Drug Service, the General Clinical Research Center, and the Center for Advancement of Clinical Research) for compliance with OHRP, FDA, other federal agencies, and University policies, in each case reporting findings and recommendations to the Vice President for Research; and (d) direct the initiative leading to accreditation by the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs (AAHRPP). The Director will be a full-time member of the University administrative (non-faculty) staff. Essential qualifications include an advanced bio-medical degree (M.D., D.O., Ph.D., M.P.H. or its equivalent). The ideal candidate will have extensive experience in clinical investigation involving human subjects in greater-than-minimal-risk research, FDA compliance experience with industry (GCP, GMP, or both), prior administrative experience, and knowledge of academic medical centers and university cultures. Candidates should submit a curriculum vita, a list of three references, and a letter of application to: Ms. Jane C. Ritter, PHR; University of Michigan Office of the Vice President for Research; 4080 Fleming Building; 503 Thompson Street; Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1340; E-mail: ritterj@umich.edu

Review of applications will begin October 17, 2005, and will continue until the position is filled. The University of Michigan is an equal opportunity affirmative action employer and encourages nominations and applications from women and minorities.
YOUR INSTITUTION COULD BE AT RISK

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.

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

Senior Associate Director

The University of Iowa, Division of Sponsored Programs (DSP) seeks a highly motivated, service-oriented professional to assume a key leadership position. The Senior Associate Director (AD) position will provide operational management in the Funding and Grants Section of DSP. The AD will provide expertise and specialized knowledge in developing systems and supporting principal investigators and administrators in identifying funding opportunities, developing and reviewing grant applications for University and sponsor issues, and administering awards. The AD will also serve as the key liaison with funding agencies representatives.

Required qualifications are:
• Masters of Business Administration (or related field) or an equivalent combination of education and related experience.
• Extensive (at least 5-7 years) related, professional-level grants application and administrative experience (preferably in an academic setting); which must have included at least three years in a centralized grants and contracts office and one year of management responsibilities.
• Thorough knowledge of federal and non-federal grant application processes and award terms and conditions. Strong, supportive leadership skills. Open to and experience implementing change. Excellent oral and written communication skills. Competent in budgeting and math skills and have experience with spreadsheet and other computer software applications. Ability allowing for occasional travel. Demonstrated job-related experience with and/or commitment to diversity in the work/academic environment.

Salary Range: $52,551 to $84,500

Applicants should submit letter of application and resume through http://jobs.uiowa.edu/

Requisition #51888. Initial screening of applications begins on November 16, 2005. For full position description go to http://www.research.uiowa.edu/dsp/main/?get=staffdirectory

The University of Iowa is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.
Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.
EMORY UNIVERSITY IS HIRING

Senior and Associate Research Administrators

For these positions, Emory University will offer a competitive salary and benefits, moving expenses (where applicable) and a signing bonus.

In a customer-oriented office under the umbrella of the University’s Office of Research, Senior and Associate Research Administrators will guide faculty and staff in all pre-award and non-financial post-award activities from identification of funding sources, through submission of a proposal to negotiation, acceptance and monitoring of various awards including contracts, grants and cooperative agreements.

The Administrators will be expected to work in a team environment. Responsibilities include: assisting faculty and staff in the preparation of proposals to funding agencies; processing and reviewing proposal submissions; assuring compliance with state and federal regulations and institutional policies at the proposal and award stages. Prepare, process and negotiate agreements, including but not limited to clinical trial agreements, research agreements and teaming agreements with federal agencies, state and local governments, non-profit foundations and universities. Interact with funding agencies to resolve legal/project issues and to determine award status. Respond to agency requests for additional information and/or clarification. Coordinate acquisition of required approvals from appropriate organizational committees, issue award notifications, and handle non-financial post-award activities. Knowledge of research regulations and guidelines including but not limited to protection of human and animal subjects, conflict of interest, etc. is required.

Ideal candidates must have a bachelor’s degree; a Master’s degree in business or public administration is preferred for the Senior Research Administrator position. Experience in grants and contract administration is required. Applicants must have strong communication skills, the ability to work well with university faculty and staff and proficiency with Word, Access and Excel. Strong problem-solving skills and the ability to work well under tight deadlines with minimal supervision is a must.

Interested candidates send your resume to
Shawn Akkerman, PharmD: sakkerm@emory.edu

Emory University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
Don’t wait another second to minimize your effort reporting risks.

Higher Education institutions are under significant pressure to effectively manage the growing demands of the research enterprise. As federal regulations and scrutiny continues to add more burdens and complexities to the research administration environment, institutions are looking for innovative ways to improve compliance while mitigating the impact on the research community.

More and more, institutions are turning to Huron Consulting Group to help them better understand the issues and expectations, clarify the regulations, and improve compliance in all aspects of labor distribution and effort reporting. Our Higher Education professionals partnered with a top research university to develop a total solution using our Effort Certification and Reporting Technology.

Huron’s state-of-the-art web-based technology can transition your institution to an automated environment to help reduce human error, improve accuracy of date, provide audit capabilities, and foster greater compliance.

You can learn about the benefits of ECRT during your own personal demonstration at the upcoming NCURA’s 47th Annual Meeting, October 30 to November 2. At your half-hour session, Huron experts will show you how ECRT can improve –

- **Resource utilization**: automated process minimizes the level of administrative burden with the certification process.
- **Accountability**: researchers approving effort reports can verify assignments first hand – wherever they are – from their own computers.
- **Accuracy**: ensures completion and return of effort reports in a timely manner because certification is based on actual time spent versus budgeted payroll charges.
- **Management reports**: helps to provide consistency, validation, and elimination of errors.
- **Data centralization**: enable electronic archiving of certification date.

**Times are limited...**

Go to www.huronconsultinggroup.com/ECRT right now to find out how to schedule your personal demonstration of Huron’s ECRT at the NCURA Annual Conference or call Greg Bedell at 312-880-3010.
The MAXIMUS Higher Education Practice, founded in 1985, provides software and consulting solutions to institutions of all sizes. Our specialty is in the area of Federal Grants and Contracts management and Compliance services.

**Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Services**

- F&A Rate Proposal Development
- Comprehensive Rate Information System Software (CRIS)
- Web-based, on-line Space Survey tool
- Institutional Costing and Compliance
  - DS-2 Development
  - Fringe Benefit rates
  - Recharge Centers
  - Animal Care
  - Other SSFs (specialized service facilities)
  - Auxiliary overhead analysis
  - Dean’s and Departmental cost studies
- Negotiation Assistance and Rate Maximization

**Effort Reporting System (ERS) and Committed Effort Management (CEM)**

- Needs and Gap Analysis of current processes
- Review and Develop Policies and Procedures
- ERS/CEM web-based, on-line Software
  - Track PI and Key Personnel commitments at multiple levels
  - Facilitate Labor Cost Transfers
  - Flexible Management Reporting
  - Increase Federal Compliance

---

David Kennedy, Vice President
davidkennedy@maximus.com
(extension 111)

Doyle Smith, Director
doylesmith@maximus.com
(extension 159)

Jim Carter, Director
jimcarter@maximus.com
(extension 113)

Damaris Garcia, Marketing
damarisgarcia@maximus.com
(extension 117)

Contact us, toll free, at 800.709.2747, or visit
Experienced, focused, insightful*

PricewaterhouseCoopers is a leading provider of audit and regulatory services to public and private colleges, universities, academic medical centers, and research centers in the U.S. Our leadership position allows us to provide our clients with valuable insight and leading practices amid changing legislative priorities and emerging industry developments. We back up our industry depth with widely recognized thought leadership. Copies of the following PwC papers can be downloaded at no charge from our website at: www.pwc.com/education. Click on “Publications” on the left-hand navigator.

Internal Controls: The Key to Accountability, published in 2005, provides guidance about the components of an effective system of internal controls as well as how internal controls can be enhanced.

The Changing Role of the Audit Committee, published in 2004, discusses leading practices for college and university audit committees.

A Foundation for Integrity, published in 2004, provides board members and senior executives with an overview of the issues surrounding codes of conduct, conflicts of interest and executive compensation.

For more information on PricewaterhouseCoopers’ services for higher education, call us at 1-888-272-3236 or visit our website at www.pwc.com/education.

*connectedthinking

© 2005 PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP. “PricewaterhouseCoopers” refers to PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, a Delaware limited liability partnership or, as the context requires, the network of member firms of PricewaterhouseCoopers International Limited, each of which is a separate and independent legal entity. *connectedthinking is a trademark of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP.
Awards continued from 16

Each recipient has contributed to NCURA’s success in numerous ways and for many years. Since there is not enough room in this column to list all of the contributions these distinguished members have made to NCURA, we are only giving our membership a snapshot of their service:

MARTI DUNNE is currently serving as the Board Member from Region II and also served on the Board as a Presidential appointment in 2003. Marti has served on numerous program committees on both National and Regional levels, and has moderated and spoken on dozens of NCURA panels and workshops.

RICHARD KEOGH served as chair of NCURA’s Professional Development Committee, member of the Board of Directors, Chair of NCURA’s Annual Meeting and Co-Editor of NCURA’s Newsletter. In addition, Dick has spoken at numerous conferences and workshops and served on program committees for NCURA conferences and standing committees.

GUNTA LIDERS currently serves on the faculty of Sponsored Project Administration: Level II. Gunta has contributed nationally as Co-Editor of the Newsletter, Program Chair of FRA IV and as Annual Meeting workshop faculty since 1999. Gunta has spoken on numerous panels and discussion groups, as well as speaking on “NCURA TV” as a faculty member for the Video Workshops.
NCURA Leadership Development Institute Class of 2006 Selected

NCURA’s Nominating & Leadership Development Committee has selected the Leadership Development Institute Class of 2006. Class members and their NCURA Advisors follow:

Holly Benze, The Johns Hopkins University; Denise Clark, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Advisor; Sara Clabby, Brown University; Vivian Holmes, Harvard Medical School, Advisor; Jeanne Galvin-Clarke, University of Maryland, Baltimore; Jan Fox, Texas Christian University, Advisor; M. Wayne Finley, University of South Florida; Marilyn Surbey, Emory University, Advisor; Christopher Green, The University of Texas Health & Science Center at San Antonio; Bo Bogdanski, Colorado State University, Advisor; E. Jacqueline Hinton, Southwest Missouri State University; Cindy White, Washington University, Advisor; Tammy Raccio, Yale University; Kerry Peluso, University of Pennsylvania, Advisor; Sinh Simmons, University of Washington; David Mayo, California Institute of Technology, Advisor; Danielle Woodman, Daemen College; Pat Fitzgerald, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Advisor; Michael S. Wetherholt, Murray State University; Pat Green, Vanderbilt University, Advisor.

The doors will officially open for the 2006 Institute in January, but those students who are attending this year’s annual meeting will have the opportunity to get a jump start on the year when they meet their advisors and past graduates form the classes of 2003, 2004 & 2005 at the Tuesday night LDI reception. This gathering is also open to all Annual Meeting participants. In addition to the reception, LDI alum will host a booth in the exhibit hall and are prepared to answer all your questions, so don’t hesitate to stop by.

Classes for LDI participants occur over an eleven month period both virtually and in person with LDI Facilitator, Gale Wood. The Leadership Development Institute is sponsored by NCURA, to help cultivate and grow our leaders of tomorrow. Watch for the “Call for Applications” for the 2007, in 2006, if you are interested in becoming a participant.

FRA VII Preliminary Program and Registration to be Released at 47th Annual Meeting

By the time you are leaving to come to Washington, DC for NCURA’s 47th Annual Meeting, the preliminary program and registration materials will be released for NCURA’s Financial Research Administration VII Conference at the La Quinta Resort near Palm Springs, CA. The conference will be held April 2-4, 2006.

The FRA VII Program Committee are working very hard to deliver this preliminary program to you, and will be available to talk with you and answer any questions about the program during the refreshment breaks at the 47th Annual Meeting at the FRA VII Booth. Check the annual meeting onsite materials for the location.

We look forward to see you at FRA VII.

The last Video Workshop of 2005, Best Practices in Research Compliance, took place September 13, 2005. Cast left to right: Marianne Woods, University of Alabama; Benjamin Fontes, Yale University; Linda Triemer, Michigan State University; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA; Daniel Vasgird, University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Carol Weil, DHHS Office for Human Research Protections, Todd Guttman, The Ohio State University. The 2005 Video Workshop Series is available on VHS or DVD. Visit www.ncura.edu for information. Watch the NCURA Calendar for information about the 2006 Series!