48th Annual Meeting Speaker Announced
by Judy Fredenberg and Denise Wallen

Like house elves in the popular Harry Potter books, the program committee for NCURA’s 2006 Annual Meeting has been working tirelessly behind the scenes in preparation for the November 5-8 gathering. Vice President Pam Whitlock’s theme – Communicate, Advocate, Educate – successfully embraces all aspects of university research administration across the nation, and the program committee is delighted with, and proud of, the diverse multitude of components that are evolving into a stellar program.

Finalizing facility logistics and planning for workshops, concurrent sessions, and discussion groups are well underway. As is tradition, the committee is fleshing-out interest-specific tracks, identifying moderators, finalizing details, and weaving skill-related threads through the program with the ultimate goal being the production of a final program that will, indeed, provide something for everyone.

We are proud to present the other committee members: Mildred Ofosu (Morgan State), Marti Dunne (New York University), Jan Madole (Oklahoma State University), Pat Green (Vanderbilt), Jaynee Tolle (University of Cincinnati), Vivian Holmes (Harvard), Dick Keogh (InfoEd), Barbara Gray (Desert Research Institute), Maria Thompson (Tennessee State), Kathy Irwin (University of Wisconsin – Madison), and Phillip Myers (Western Kentucky University).

Workshop coordinators Dave Richardson, Virginia Tech, and Bo Bogdanski, Colorado State University, have identified 37 workshops, seven of which are full-day events. Workshop highlights include: hiring, training, and retaining staff; negotiation how-to’s; export controls; and, compliance issues, to name just a few. Most workshops will occur on Sunday, November 5, except for the full-day sessions highlighting NSF and NIH which will be held Thursday, November 9. With such a breadth and depth of choices, professional development opportunities exist for all levels of research administrators, from those that have only been on the job a few weeks to others that are more “seasoned.”

Speaking of seasoning, the Annual Meeting will kick-off Monday morning with a plenary speaker sure to add some spice to the program. Tim Russert, managing editor and moderator of “Meet the Press,” and political analyst for “NBC Nightly News,” and the “Today” program will share what he is hearing about future funding, homeland security and NIH which will be held Thursday, November 9. With such breadth and depth of choices, professional development opportunities exist for all levels of research administrators, from those that have only been on the job a few weeks to others that are more “seasoned.”

We will continue to keep the committee on track as the program develops. Stay tuned for more details in the months ahead!

Judy Fredenberg and Denise Wallen are the co-chairs of the 48th Annual Meeting. Judy Fredenberg serves as the Executive Director of Federal Relations, University of Montana. Denise Wallen is the Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Research, University of New Mexico.

Who’s on First?
What’s on Second?
The Research Community Prepares for Multiple Principal Investigators
by Robert P. Lowman

This year will see a change in one of the bedrock concepts of research administration—the notion that there is one and only one principal investigator (PI) on an award. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) is leading the way in implementing this federal-wide directive by allowing more than one individual to hold the title PI in a select group of program solicitations this spring. By the end of the year, it is likely that policies to allow multiple PIs will crop up across the entire range of federal research as other agencies take steps to meet the mandate. If all goes well, the NIH may be prepared to allow the multiple-PI option on R01 grant proposals submitted in February 2007.

Although dramatic in its potential effect on the way faculty members conduct collaborative research, this change in policy has met little resistance in the research community. It seems to be generally accepted as a good way to facilitate collaborative effort. “Science has been evolving,” says Norka Ruiz Bravo, Deputy Director for Extramural Research at the NIH. “This is a way to recognize the evolution.”

Collaboration notwithstanding, the new policy appears to present challenging administrative issues for federal research agencies and NCURA members, and will likely require significant changes in federal and university business practices. “This policy affects almost every aspect of how we administer grants,” Dr. Ruiz Bravo reports, citing changes in areas as diverse as NIH information systems, budgeting and merit review. She points out that the new policy will even change “how we calculate success rates.”
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I am excited to share with you two new programs for this year. One is the Pre-Award Conference that will be held in August in Portland, Oregon, and the second new program is the Financial Research Administration Workshop.

The program committee for the Pre-Award Conference is co-chaired by Michelle Powell, Georgia Institute of Technology, and Sally Tremaine, Quinnipiac University. The program will have strong tracks in eRA (grants.gov) and for smaller universities. We hope this program will be an on-going conference each year. Your feedback will be essential to determine next year’s program. Please see the PRA Conference article in this newsletter (page 19) for more information.

The Financial Research Administration Workshop is currently being developed. It will be a traveling workshop similar to Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration and SPA II. The workshop is an intensive look at post-award and financial issues and is geared toward an intermediate level. The first offering of this workshop will be in September.

On July 21-22, the Board is bringing the Regional Officers and National Standing Committee Members to Washington, D.C., for training and open discussions. The training will include specific topics geared towards each group as well as general information. Topics for regional officers will include Finance for Regional Treasurers, Regional Meeting Site Selection, A Program Committee Chair’s Guide to Building and Managing a Conference and more. The National Standing Committee Members will attend specific topics such as Latest Trends in Member Needs, Practices of Effective Committee Members and more. The general information for both groups will include How NCURA’s Standing Committees and Regions Can Work Together and Fiduciary Responsibilities for Volunteers. On the last half of the first day, the Board will join the regional officers and national standing committee members for a look at NCURA’s governance and structure with discussions on items such as bylaws, administrative policy, and the decision making process. On day two, Leadership Convention Part II will begin. This session will be a continuing conversation between the national officers, board members, and regional officers. We expect there to be many ideas, questions and comments during this open session. This governance workshop is a continuation from last year’s leadership summit which was also held in July. During last year’s leadership summit, everyone saw that our membership benefited by bringing NCURA’s leadership from all areas together for education and open discussions. After the July meeting, I will give the membership an update on this important meeting.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me, the other officers or the NCURA staff. Thank you.

Laura L. Wade is the NCURA President and serves as Associate Director of Administration, Texas Center for Superconductivity at the University of Houston.

Have you implemented a creative and successful collaboration with counterparts (such as between department and central, sponsored programs and development, compliance and sponsored programs, or pre- and post-award)? If so we want to hear from you! Send a paragraph describing your successful collaboration to Peggy Lowry at peggy.lowry@oregonstate.edu We will select a few successful collaborative models to highlight in upcoming issues of the newsletter.
Access of a Different Sort

Research administrators grapple with questions of access in a variety of contexts – access to records for audit and investigation purposes; access to web sites to find funding opportunities and submit applications; and access to research resources and data to promote scientific advances. All these access questions have their own particular challenges; some have specific agreement terms and conditions while others pose education and training challenges. The issue of access has informed a number of recent events in Washington, D.C. and across the country.

Military Recruiters

The Supreme Court decided the question of required access in its ruling in Rumsfeld et al v. Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights, et al (FAIR) early in March 2006. The Court’s unanimous ruling upheld the Solomon Amendment requirement that colleges and universities must provide military recruiters access equal in quality and scope that they provide all other potential employers on campuses or lose federal funding. First passed in 1996, the most recent Solomon Amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2006 requires recruiter and Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program access by all units of a college or university. If a university or any of its units, e.g., colleges or departments, fail to provide equal access, the university, as a whole, can be denied federal funding, including grants from the National Institutes of Health.

FAIR, an association of law schools and faculties, challenged the Solomon Amendment’s equal access requirements on the grounds that it violates Constitutional freedoms of speech and association, forcing the schools to provide access to an employer, in this case the Department of Defense, which discriminates against persons on the basis of sexual orientation. In the Court’s opinion written by new Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., the Court viewed the linking of recruiter access with federal funding as within Congressional powers and noted that “the Solomon Amendment gives universities a choice: Either allow military recruiters the same access … or forgo federal funds.” The Court goes on to argue that the Amendment does not limit what schools may say “nor requires them to say anything;” it regulates conduct not speech.

NIH Public Access

The Board of Regents of the National Institutes of Health’s (NIH) National Library of Medicine (NLM) has recommended that NIH require submission of author’s final peer-reviewed manuscripts to PubMed Central to further the goals of NIH’s Enhancing Public Access Policy.

The Public Access Policy, implemented in May 2005, made participation in the policy voluntary. Investigators were encouraged but not required to submit the manuscripts of research supported by an NIH award to NLM’s PubMed Central to allow broad public access to the results of federally funded research. The voluntary standard was set in part to address scientific journal publishers concerns that PubMed Central would “compete” with their journals by providing access before publication in the journal.

These concerns were reflected in the FY 2006 Senate Appropriations language for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services/NIH when it called for a “balanced approach” that “maintained the integrity of the peer review system” and “urged NIH to work with all stakeholders” as it implemented the policy.

The House and Senate called for a study or progress report to determine the policy’s effectiveness. In the recently completed study of the policy, NIH found that in the first eight months since the implementation of the policy, less than 4% of the articles eligible have been added to PubMed Central as a result of the policy. Of those submitted (1,636), most allowed access upon the final date of publication (immediate release), with the remaining embargoed for some period of time, most from 10-12 months. Addressing the principal concern, NIH does not believe lack of awareness of the policy is the reason for the low submission rate. A copy of the report is available: http://publicaccess.nih.gov/ (Congressional Appropriations Committee Report on the NIH Public Access Policy, February 2006).

The NLM established a Working Group of its Board of Regents to report to the Board and Congress as required. The majority of members of the Working Group support mandatory submission if NIH hopes to meet its goal of greater public access.

NIH designed the policy to allow submission of an article to PubMed Central to meet the requirement to submit copies of articles with a grantees Progress and Final reports on an award. Administrators may want to remind investigators of this option for submission.

Animal Activists Access Limited

The recent conviction of the animal rights group, Stop Huntington Animal Cruelty (SHAC) and six of its members is the result of the first case brought under the federal Animal Enterprise Protection Act (AEPA), a 1992 law, expanded in 2002, that equates acts of harassment and intimidation with terrorism. The six animal activists were on trial in Trenton, New Jersey on federal charges of orchestrating and waging a national campaign of threats, vandalism and harassment against individuals affiliated with Huntington Life Sciences (HLS). The activists argued that their actions, including threatening telephone, email and fax blitzes, and home vandalism, were protected by the First Amendment and have vowed to appeal the verdict.
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In our field of research administration, change is happening rapidly and many of those changes are not voluntary on our parts. Dealing with change can be especially challenging for leaders who not only have to embrace and initiate change but also have to garner acceptance from others and guide them through it. This article shares insights into the ways people react to and deal with change, and how leaders can recognize these reactions in others and themselves and be better equipped to handle change.

Spencer Johnson, MD’s best-selling book, *Who Moved my Cheese?*, contains an allegorical tale of the search for “cheese” in a maze filled with dark corners, blind alleys and dead ends. The “cheese” symbolizes our goals, achievements, jobs, careers, relationships, and anything and everything important in our lives. The maze represents the journey through life and the dead ends, the confusion, the twists and turns, and the feelings of being lost and afraid that are encountered on that journey. The characters, two mice, Sniff and Scurry, and two little people, Hem and Haw, represent the four main reactions of people when faced with change, or having their “cheese” moved.

- **Sniff.** This type “sniffs out” situations and examines their environment. They anticipate change, see it coming early, and get ready for the “cheese” to move. They also monitor change, smell their “cheese” often, and know when their “cheese” is getting old and stale and when it’s time to find new “cheese.” They are innovative and creative, always coming up with new ideas. Sniffs as leaders: they are visionaries, innovators, the ones who like to “shake things up” in life.

- **Scurry.** This type likes to get things done. Once they smell the new “cheese,” they love to go “scurrying” off into action immediately. They adapt to change quickly, letting go of their old “cheese” so that they can enjoy their new “cheese” sooner. They love implementing change, moving with the “cheese” and enjoying it. They thrive in environments that are flexible, quick to adapt and innovative. Scurrys as leaders: they are the “movers” in life. They don’t spend a lot of time envisioning things; they prefer to be out doing and moving things along.

- **Hem.** This type does not like and does not want to deal with change. They want to stay “hemmed in” in their familiar territory, and they see no reason to believe their “cheese” will ever get old or run out. When change happens, they become angry and afraid, playing the victims and blaming others for “moving their cheese.” Hems either don’t adjust easily or can’t adjust at all. Hems as leaders: they live in the arrogance of their past success, resting on their laurels, and believe what has always worked before, will work now and always will work. They don’t see that their stagnation, lack of vision, and refusal to do things differently over time will eventually lead to their downfall and potential extinction.

- **Haw.** This type initially starts out fighting change, but eventually comes around and changes. They learn that they were taking themselves too seriously and eventually are able to laugh, or “haw,” at themselves. Hems, with some convincing, can be coaxed out of their comfort zone and be made to realize that their “cheese” is stale and running out. Haws as leaders: they are slow to react to changes and often need to be convinced by others that there is a need for change. This can lead to frustration among staff who see change as necessary and inevitable, and to their lack of confidence in the leader’s ability to be successful in quickly changing environments.

As research administrators, we often find ourselves in the roles of leaders, having to deal with these four types of reactions when implementing change. Smart leaders should know who the Sniffs and Scurrys are on their staff. They should be listened to, be allowed to exercise their creativity and forethought, and be part of the planning process and implementation; it could mean the difference between success and stagnation. Scurrys sometimes need to be closely monitored, though, as their eagerness sometimes tends to send them “scurrying” in the wrong directions or before any direction has been decided.

Hems and Haws, on the other hand, are the most difficult types for leaders to deal with. Because of Hems’ and Haws’ overwhelming need to feel safe, a leader needs to appeal to and increase their feeling of security, to explain the changes in a way that makes sense to them and to show how the changes will work to their advantage. Hems and Haws need to be given the tools and the confidence to adjust to the change. One of the hardest things for leaders to manage is Hems that refuse to accept the change. Their incessant complaining, reluctance and fear can be contagious and detrimental to a group and can seriously impact morale and forward progress. We often try to manage the situation by rewriting their job descriptions or relocating them to other positions, but as a very last resort, letting them go.

In our day-to-day activities, we often tend to be managers more than leaders. We manage and react to daily problems as they come up and often do not find the time to look at what lies ahead. As research administrators we will undoubtedly continue to manage daily problems, but we should also be paying attention to where we’re going. We should learn how to balance leading with managing crises, always examining our old “cheese” and looking for new “cheese” (new behaviors, new habits, new ways of thinking, new ways of doing things and so on).

We should challenge ourselves to consider changing the way we are doing things before changing what we are doing. We should look at changing our old behaviors before we look at changing jobs or relationships. Repeating the same old behaviors in a new situation will get the same old results. We should strive to be Sniffs and Scurrys, rather than Hems and Haws, and constantly remind ourselves of the inevitable – “THEY KEEP MOVING THE CHEESE!!”

Shelley Hesselton-Mangan serves as Graduate Student/Research Assistant, Business Studies, Assumption College and Christine Katsapis is Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Gallaudet University.
This article is the last in a series of three addressing some of the questions auditors are currently asking when auditing non-salary costs. Please refer to the July/Aug 2005 and Sept/Oct 2005 issues for the previous two articles.

FILING
When purging or destroying files, make sure that you are not destroying documentation that might be needed in an audit. Everything needed may not be available from the central system repositories. All appropriate individuals should be knowledgeable about which departmental documents are considered original source documents for the purpose of audit. Where are the bits and pieces that would document all aspects of prior approval, authorities, post-review, etc.? Can you find everything for every transaction to provide a “complete” picture of the transaction and all oversight functions?

For documents going to Accounts Payable (AP) or Purchasing (or for E-journals), attach any/all information that would justify the purpose and allowability of the transaction and will help document an appropriate approval/review process. This could include copies of emails or a note to the file that outlines who, why, what. The AP/Purchasing/E-journal source documents may have been scanned or are otherwise available from central systems. If your documentation is with a centralized source, this will prevent the need to retrieve it at a later date from your own files.

GENERAL AUDIT OBSERVATIONS
For all transactions, how do you provide documentary proof that your department conducted a timely post-review of transactions on your account and that a knowledgeable individual with appropriate authority either approved or questioned and removed the transactions?

For all transactions, program auditors are interested in the internal review and approval process by individuals who are “knowledgeable” about the program terms/conditions. The issue of review and approval by “knowledgeable” individuals is separate from whether or not that individual is recognized for “processing” in the departmental or central systems. How are grant-related authorities established and documented?

If the post-review process is essentially an accounting validation (check off), not conducted by an individual with an appropriate level of knowledge about the grant needs and terms/conditions, then the prior approval documentation must substantiate that an appropriate grant-related review occurred.

Budget availability is never an appropriate reason for allocation of costs, except when the cost is split between a grant account and an unrestricted account. In such an instance, the explanation must justify that the purpose of the allocation is to reduce or limit costs to the grant.

Auditors want to see written departmental policies and procedures. They want to see departmental procedures that are in addition to those published at the institutional level. They want to see that the department is aware of the institutional policies and that they understand their own responsibilities and have established their own quality control mechanisms that assure compliance with both institutional policies and grant requirements.

Audits are often conducted years after the transaction occurred. If you do not have the documentation or ready access to the documentation that “proves” appropriate approval procedures, including programmatic and financial oversight and controls, costs can be questioned or disallowed, even if the cost would otherwise have been allowable. Even if costs are not disallowed, weak or inadequate system procedures could lead to management comments that might require extensive and expensive corrective action or might lead to more restrictions in future funding.

Auditors express a “strong” concern about late cost transfers, especially when they are provided information about appropriate quality control procedures. They don’t understand why you would have late transfers if you were following your procedures. Does this mean you are not following your procedures or that your procedures need to be rewritten?

Auditors express a “strong” concern about cost transfers for transactions that clearly have multiple opportunities to get allocated correctly (e.g., travel, P-Card). Why are there additional transfers after multiple reviews? Does this mean reviewers are not following procedures or are not actually reviewing?

Are you ready for your next audit?

Kathleen Hall is Associate Director of Grants and Contracts, Emory University and Marilyn Surbey serves as Senior Manager, Education and Academic Medical Centers, BearingPoint, Inc.
Federal funding agencies have been placing special restrictions and eligibility requirements on proposal submissions with increasing and alarming frequency. Such restrictions and requirements include limits on the number of applications accepted per funding cycle as lead or non-lead institution; the type of institution allowed to submit; the level of established research at an eligible institution; and the level of previous funding from specified sources. This trend is viewed by some in the university community as a cost-cutting effort, which effectively shifts the burden of proposal review from the sponsoring agency to the applicant institution. Despite concerns, no slow down is expected. It is crucial, therefore, that institutions step up their efforts to explore policies that address the challenges presented by sponsor limits and eligibility requirements, and develop effective and efficient procedures to pre-screen proposals and manage internal competitions.

Quickly Identifying the Programs
The first management challenge is how to quickly identify programs. Research administrators commonly use the phrase “limited competition” interchangeably with “internal competitions” to describe any program that would require internal coordination before approval for external submission. The phrase “limited competition,” however, can cause confusion as the industry has yet to adopt a standard definition. For example, some sponsors, such as NIH, use the phrase “limited competition” in their announcements for a group of programs that do not generally require an internal screening system prior to submission. The only way to identify all true limited programs that require internal coordination or competition is to read through each program announcement carefully.

After identifying which programs will require internal coordination, staff must quickly determine the institution’s eligibility, which is no longer necessarily tied to the DUNS number, 501.c.3 designation, status as a Primarily Undergraduate Institution (PUI) or Historically Minority-Serving and Black Institution (HMBI). New eligibility requirements often require quick access to information that is not easily retrievable either from existing grant databases (such as the expiration dates of existing grants received in response to specific solicitation numbers) or from any university information system (such as the number of years of a faculty member's involvement in a particular field of research). Pre-award offices will ideally have available staff to research institutional eligibility and program limits on a regular basis.

Establishing Internal Peer Review
A second management issue is how to select which proposal will be submitted to the agency. Peer review is the standard method of ensuring an objective and fair evaluation of research proposals, and some institutions use a separate, internal committee for peer review. However, many institutions neither possess adequate resources, nor have institutional structures in place that would make it feasible to conduct a peer review in every case. In such instances, a standing committee model will suffice, yet, even here, challenges may arise.

It may be difficult, for example, to secure commitments from faculty, deans, and department chairs to serve on a selection committee and simultaneously ensure that adequate expertise is represented. Potential conflicts of interest and individual scheduling concerns will inevitably complicate matters further. More importantly, the internal review process can expect to generate several politically delicate challenges, including adequate and/or proportionate representation at the school/college level, equitable voting procedures, appropriate levels of confidentiality, and assurances that the committee considers the interests of the institution and the chances of the success of each proposal in the external competition. Finding adequate solutions to these concerns can have major consequences for the institution on various fronts. It is crucial, therefore, that the sponsored research offices are not expected to manage the review process in isolation. The importance of these internal competitions should not be underestimated and
Managing the Process

A third challenge is how to manage the selection process. Most research administrators would agree that transparent and widely disseminated policies and procedures help promote participatory governance and empowerment at all levels and foster the political backing of faculty, deans, and vice chancellors. An investigator’s predictable disappointment about an unsuccessful outcome may be mitigated if, for example, the process and policy is ratified by the faculty senate.

Simple matters such as what to submit for internal review should be clearly delineated. For example, coordinating staff will need to recognize when the amount of material requested is either unreasonably expansive or so narrow that it will likely prompt a second request for information from the committee. In setting the internal deadline, staff will need to ensure the investigator has adequate time after the internal competition and before the external deadline to prepare the much longer and enormously time-consuming full proposal.

Several administrators have reported that the use of a central website for posting all internal and external deadlines, coupled with email announcements referencing the website, can help ensure faculty members at all schools and colleges remain well-informed. A central website can help coordinate among several schools and offices at institutions with decentralized administrative structures. If the central website is linked to a database of past and present competitions, it can also help to keep track of the ever-increasing volume of the competitions themselves, as well as document the entire process in order to ensure staff and office accountability and control. Tracking and documentation is particularly important since certain aspects of the internal competitions, as well as information about the candidates are often kept confidential.

New Challenges

By all indicators, the research community can expect the trend in sponsor restrictions on proposal submissions to continue to rise. The National Science Foundation’s Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) Program provides a good example. In the past, the institutional limit on IGERT submissions applied only to invited, full proposals. Because there was no specified limit, few administrations kept track at the pre-proposal stage and were therefore often caught off-guard at the last minute when too many full proposals came through the NSF Fastlane stream. This year, the NSF restricted the number of pre-proposals for IGERT as well. Other federal programs have also begun to include separate institutional limits on the number of proposals they will accept from an institution as lead and as non-lead. This opens up an entirely new area in the field of internal competitions. Universities will not only have to conduct separate internal competitions for all pre-proposals, sub-contracts and collaborative projects, but will also have to evaluate proposals from these two separate categories against each other. The policy questions for the institution abound. How is the committee to choose between a proposal from its own faculty as lead investigator, and a collaborative proposal as non-lead with a much larger budget from, say, an institution with a much better research profile, name recognition, and potentially better chance of success? Moreover, should renewal applications be evaluated together in the same competition with new applications or receive special consideration? These are only a few of the areas that will continue to be the subject of discussion for much time to come.

Christa Johnson is Assistant Dean, Graduate Studies and Research, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville.
Can Centers and Institutes within an Institution, because they are more or less financially self-sufficient, be treated as “unlike circumstances” under A-21? Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-21, states that clerical salaries, office supplies, postage, memberships and telephone equipment are normally treated as F&A costs. The circular recognizes exceptions for clerical salaries, office supplies, postage, memberships, and telephone equipment under unusual and compelling circumstances and recognizes that Institutes and/or Centers may arise out of large complex, sponsored agreements. Examples of these exceptions can be found at “Exhibit C – Examples of major project” where direct charging of administrative or clerical staff salaries may be appropriate. (Examples are found at the OMB website. The link is: http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a021/a21_2004.html#exec) However, the existence of an Institute or Center does not, in itself, provide adequate justification for these exceptions.

Even smaller colleges and universities, foundations and non-profits can learn from this discussion. Foundations and non-profits use a different standard than A-21, but there is enough similarity to learn from this discussion. Smaller colleges and universities still need to understand the concepts behind the cost accounting standards in A-21 even if they do not need to submit a Cost Accounting Disclosure Statement (also called a DS-2). Disclosure statements, which are discussed later, are a way to describe your institution’s accounting procedures to the Federal government. Many subunits within your college or university may not be recognized Centers or Institutes, but none the less tout themselves as “different” for the same reasons as mentioned for Centers and Institutes in this article.

The OMB Circular A-21 “establishes principals for determining costs applicable to grants, contracts, and other agreements with educational institutions.” The four core tests that determine if a cost can be charged to a sponsored project are: reasonableness, allowability, allocability and consistency. All four concepts must be present to make a cost allowable under a federal sponsored agreement.

The total costs charged to a sponsored agreement are made up of direct costs and the allowable portion of facilities and administrative (F&A or indirect) costs. Facilities and administrative costs are those costs that cannot be “identified readily and specifically with a particular sponsored project.” The concept of consistency is key to determining unlike circumstances when charging what are normally considered indirect costs as a direct cost to a particular sponsored project. OMB Circular A-21 states in Section 11 a. Consistency in allocating costs incurred for the same purpose: “All costs incurred for the same purpose, in like circumstances, are either direct costs only or F&A costs only with respect to final cost objectives.” … “Further, no final cost objective shall have allocated to it as a direct cost any cost, if other costs incurred for the same purpose, in like circumstances, have been included in any F&A cost pool to be allocated to that or any other final cost objective.”

A “cost objective” is defined in CAS 9905.502 as “a function, organizational subdivision, sponsored agreement, or other work unit for which cost data are desired and for which provision is made to accumulate and measure the cost of processes, products, jobs, capitalized projects, etc.” Most institutions accumulate specific costs by using subcodes (other names may be locally used) with a final cost objective being a project or account. “Final cost objective means a cost objective which has allocated to it both direct and indirect costs, and in the educational institution’s accumulation system, is one of the final accumulation points.”

OMB Circular A-21, paragraph 10, Consistency in estimating, accumulating and reporting costs states, “An educational institution’s practices used in estimating costs in pricing a proposal shall be consistent with the educational institution’s cost accounting practices used in accumulating and reporting costs.” Note that the term “educational institution” means one set of practices for an organization subject to an A-133 (systems) audit and the same organization is required to submit a Disclosure Statement (DS-2). The “educational institution” is the only unit mentioned in the circular. Any subset or subunit does not qualify as an “educational institution.” Small research institutions can define themselves as “educational institution” using similar criteria to above.

Paragraph 10 further states, “An educational institution’s cost accounting practices used in accumulating and reporting actual costs for a sponsored agreement shall be consistent with the educational institution’s practices used in estimating costs in pricing the related proposal or application.” Again, the paragraph refers to the “educational institution” but further defines the unit for accumulating costs is a sponsored agreement. Note there is no intermediate reporting location between an “educational institution” and “sponsored agreement.” “Educational institutions” accumulate costs via a sponsored agreement (sponsored project).

CAS 9905.502 – Consistency in allocating costs incurred for the same purpose by educational institutions (from OMB Circular A-21). “The purpose of this standard is to require that each type of cost is allocated only once and on only one basis (either direct or indirect) to any sponsored agreement or other cost objective. The criteria for determining the allocation of costs to a sponsored agreement or other cost objective should be the same for all similar objectives. Adherence to these cost accounting concepts is necessary to guard against the overcharging of some cost objectives and to prevent double counting.” Note that the standard only speaks to a “sponsored agreement” or a “cost objective.”

The fundamental requirement is: “All costs incurred for the same purpose, in like circumstances, are either direct costs only or indirect costs only with respect to final cost objectives. No final cost objective (sponsored agreement) shall have allocated to it as an indirect cost any cost, if other costs incurred for the same purpose (under other sponsored agreements), in like circumstances, have been included as a direct cost of that or any other final cost objective. Further, no final cost objective (sponsored project) shall have allocated to it as a direct cost any cost, if other costs incurred for the same purpose (in other sponsored agreements), in like circumstances, have been included in any indirect cost pool to be allocated to that or any other final cost objective.”

Therefore “unlike circumstances” must be defined at the “educational institution” level for unique circumstances associated with a particular sponsored project or group of sponsored projects. Note the OMB circular does not address any sub-unit of the “educational institution” but only addresses the institution as a whole with the implication that all sub-units are a defined piece of that whole and subject to the whole’s accounting practices. The circular allows for cost objectives at any level but most institutions opt to define cost objects at the project/subcode level. The institution can collect and/or segregate costs and/or expenses into any groupings or units it prefers but resultant management reports are not audited nor are they subject to audit. Management data is for internal use by the institution and only the source of the management data needs to be accurate to audit.
Simply stated, the circular does not address the internal structure of the institution and therefore the internal structure in and of itself cannot define unlike circumstances. Unlike circumstances are defined by the “educational institution’s cost accounting practices used in accumulating and reporting actual costs for a sponsored agreement.” A-21 gives “examples of ‘major projects’ where an exception for direct charging of administrative or clerical staff salaries may be appropriate.” Note again, the exception is for a “project.” Finally, Appendix A of A-21 gives written illustrations for “CAS 9905.502 – Consistency in allocating costs incurred for the same purpose by educational institutions” to help clarify the interpretations of the standards. In each case the potential exception was developed as the result of a single new proposal or sponsored agreement and therefore the institution needed to assess its practices as a result of that proposal/agreement.

One method for exception to the above is via the disclosure statement. “The Disclosure Statement to be submitted by the educational institution will require that the educational institution set forth its cost accounting practices with regard to the distinction between direct and indirect costs (for the cost objectives). For those types of cost which are sometimes accounted for as direct and sometimes accounted for as indirect, the educational institution will set forth in its Disclosure Statement the specific criteria and circumstances for making such distinctions. The result is the DS-2 submitted by the educational institution, by distinguishing between direct and indirect costs, and by describing the criteria and circumstances for allocating those items which are sometimes direct and sometimes indirect, will be determinative as to whether or not costs are incurred for the same purpose.” Smaller institutions should develop written procedures similar to a DS-2 to be ready for audit.

Another method available to a large Center or Institute is to have it designed as an “institution” while still affiliated with the larger organization. This method would require a separate A-133 audit for the Center or Institute, a DS-2 unique and designed only to that organization, separately negotiated F&A rates, and cost objectives associated with the Center/Institute would need to be completely segregated from the larger organization. Care would need to be practiced to make sure that costs are not counted for both the Center/Institute and the larger organization. However, costs associated with creating a separate “institution” could be substantial and the ability to create a separate “institution” may be impractical based on the relationships between the Center/Institute faculty and their related facilities and the “parent” institution.

To summarize, OMB Circular A-21 looks for consistency “through (an) educational institution’s cost accounting practices used in accumulating and reporting actual costs for a sponsored agreement.” The internal structure within the institution is of no consequence in defining “like or unlike circumstances.” Centers/Institutes cannot allocate costs which normally would be indirect as direct unless those costs met all the requirements for unlike circumstances. Unlike circumstances are project specific. The method to define “like or unlike” is through the organization’s DS-2, and a Center/Institute could be defined as an exception but the DS-2 is subject to audit. Otherwise, unlike circumstances can only be determined on a project-by-project basis.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of Colorado State University.

Bo Bogdanski is Senior Research Administrator Sponsored Programs, Colorado State University and Pam Harrington serves as Finance Officer, Colorado State University.

Many biomedical research supporters are urging amendments to the Animal Enterprise Protection Act to strengthen the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) ability to investigate and prosecute animal extremists. To address the new tactics employed by groups like SHAC, the proposed Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act (S 1926 and HR 4239) broadens the definition of animal enterprise, increases criminal penalties, and addresses “tertiary” or third-party targeting - a tactic used by SHAC against anyone knowing or doing business with anyone involved in medical research.

The Act, pending before the Senate and House Judiciary committees, would provide criminal penalties for those causing economic damage to “animal enterprises,” including academic and commercial research and testing organizations. It would also make it a crime to trespass, harass, vandalize, and otherwise threaten anyone associated with an animal enterprise, including scientists, researchers, and their families. The legislation would also broaden law enforcement tools, such as wiretapping capabilities, in order to possibly prevent crimes and gather evidence for prosecutions. The new Act would allow victims to seek restitution for economic disruptions as well.

Access in all its configurations – for military recruiters, animal activists, foreign scientists attending meetings, publication of dual-use life science research results, etc. – will continue to inform the debate in Washington, D.C.

Carol Blum is Director, Research Compliance and Administration, Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
**Regional Corner**

**REGION I**

**New England**

Registration is now open for our Spring Meeting scheduled for May 7 - 10 at the Holiday Inn By the Bay in Portland, Maine. Our Program Committee has been hard at work, not only creating a great meeting program, but also scheduling in some fun. On Monday, join us at the Portland Sea Dogs baseball game (AA affiliate of the Red Sox) for a picnic and night of networking. Tuesday will be our traditional dinner, which will be held at The Pavilion, followed by Region I’s very own “The NCURABLES” performing for your music pleasure.

On behalf of Region I, I want to thank the Program Committee for their hard work and dedication to the Region. Members of the Committee are:

- Bethanne Giehl (Co-Chair)
- University of Massachusetts Medical School
- John Harris (Co-Chair)
- Northeastern University
- John Bain
- Huron Consulting Group
- Sara Clabby
- Brown University
- Tim Connors
- Dana-Farber Cancer Institute
- Thomas Egan
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Louise Griffin
- University of Massachusetts - Lowell
- Stacy Riseman
- Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering
- Denise Rouleau
- Brandeis University
- Tammy Raccio
- Yale University
- Joseph Winschel
- Maine Medical Center

For further information about the Spring Meeting and to register, visit the Region I website at [http://web.mit.edu/osp/www/ncura/region1meetings.htm](http://web.mit.edu/osp/www/ncura/region1meetings.htm)

Our next RADG is scheduled for April 27, 2006 at the John Hancock Conference Center in Copley Square, Boston. The meeting will start at 10:00 AM with lunch to follow at noon. The topic will be on compliance. An announcement will be e-mailed in the very near future with further details.

As I mentioned in the last Newsletter, Stacy Riseman from Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering, has agreed to chair the Region I Volunteerism and Membership Committee. The charge of this Committee is to oversee volunteer and membership activities, including dissemination of information and overseeing special activities/events for volunteers and new members aimed at recruitment and retention of volunteers at the regional and national level. Stacy has recently finalized her Committee membership. We should be hearing more from them as this new Committee moves forward. If anyone is interested in learning more about volunteer opportunities within Region I, contact Stacy at (781) 292-2375 or by e-mail at stacy.riseman@olin.edu.

Gary Smith is the Chair for Region I and Administrative Director for Research in the Department of Surgery at Massachusetts General Hospital. He can be reached at (617) 726-4208 or e-mailed at gsmith4@partners.org.

**REGION II**

**Mid-Atlantic**

We will be finishing another successful Region II Spring Meeting, April 23-25 when you receive this newsletter. This time, we are in beautiful Galloway, New Jersey, right on the Jersey shore. Attendees will benefit from the informative concurrent sessions, the interesting and timely keynote presentation on spinal cord injury research and an excellent plenary session on Grants.gov. We aren’t all business and many will enjoy our Monday evening night on the town in Atlantic City, while others will enjoy their golfing skills on the hotel’s world class golf course. We will also have the pleasure of seeing the Region’s inaugural Distinguished Service Awards presented to Betty Farbman and Ann Holmes at our Spring business luncheon. Congratulations again to these two worthy women!

Many, many volunteers worked for months to put our meeting together. Special thanks goes to Program Chair, Jeannie Galvin-Clarke and her indefatigable committee: Katherine Clark, Betsy Colon, Deborah Huggins, Brenda Kavanaugh, Alicia Knoedler, Anita Mills, Camie Morrison, Carastine Prince, Maribel Roman, Barbara Scheehan, Peggy Schoen, Brian Squilla, and Martin Williams for all their efforts with program content and meeting set-up. Thanks also to Region Secretary, Diane Shaw and Kurk Flick, Jr. for managing the meeting’s AV needs and to the Region’s Treasurer, Margie Zack and Shane Crounse for handling all the registration and hotel details. If you are interested in volunteering for next Spring’s meeting in Rochester, New York, or volunteering right now to help with region business, please contact Chair Elect, Ruth Tallman, the Region’s volunteer coordinator, at rt01@lehigh.edu.

Election time is coming up and Ruth Tallman will be sending out an e-blast requesting nominations (including self nominations) for Chair Elect, Treasurer Elect and NCURA Board Member. Please take a few moments to think about people you know who would be good choices for the regional leadership roles.

Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, questions, or suggestions you may have about the Region at cwilliam@orpa.rochester.edu.

Cheryl K. Williams is the 2006 Chair of Region II and serves as Senior Research Administrator in the Office of Research and Project Administration at the University of Rochester.

**REGION III**

**Southeast**

Mary H. Watson retired as Director of Grants and Contracts at Valdosta State University in December 2005, but she did not stay retired long. She recently accepted a one-year position beginning April 3, 2006, at Governors State University, University Park, Illinois, near Chicago, to set up a new grants administration office.

Judith Romano is the new Associate Director of Research and Grants Administration at Furman University in Greenville, South Carolina. The former
associate director, Aynoka Bender, took a position as Associate Research Administrator in the Office of Sponsored Programs at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia.

The election results are final and we congratulate Michelle Joy (Clark) Powell of Georgia Tech for being elected as Chair-Elect of Region III and Cathy Snyder of Vanderbilt for being elected as Secretary/Treasurer. We wish to express special thanks to all of those who ran for office and all of the members who voted.

Angela Horton of Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, is the winner of NCURA’s Region III Travel Award. NCURA’s Region III Membership Committee would like to thank all of the individuals who participated in the nomination process for this regional award. The numerous applications and the quality of professionals applying made it difficult to choose one winner, but overall Ms. Horton’s application was exceptional. We look forward to seeing you in Miami! NCURA Region III Membership Committee includes: Tom Cruise, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; Steve Etheredge, University of South Carolina; Bruxanne E. Hein, Coastal Carolina University; Kamilah Robinson, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; and, Aynoka Bender (Chair), Emory University.

It is almost here! The Region III Spring meeting in Miami Beach! May 7 – 10, 2006. The program is going to be packed with great workshops and sessions and will include interaction with many federal agency representatives and vendors whose products and services support research administration. You won’t want to miss this conference so make your registrations and join the fun in Miami Beach in May. Go to the following website for all your conference information: http://www.osp.vt.edu/NCURA/RegionIII/Home.htm.

The Region III Spring Meeting provides a great opportunity for you to learn new things, network with friends and colleagues, and of course VOLUNTEER your time! Volunteers are still needed to assist with registration, technical assistance, and hospitality suite. If you will be attending the meeting and would like to volunteer, please e-mail Tony Ventimiglia at ventiaf@auburn.edu.

Jeanne V. Ware is Director of the Office of Research Programs and Services at New College of Florida and serves as Region III Newsletter Contributor.

REGION IV
Mid-America

Spring Meeting

Region IV is gearing up to “ride the rapids” at its Spring Meeting in Grand Rapids, MI, in April and May. Members can register online at the Region IV website: http://www.ncuraregioniv.com/meetings/index.html. Check out the preliminary program that is available at this site. We’re excited about the workshops being offered and the keynote speaker, Gale Wood, who will be talking to members about “The Abilene Paradox and other Quandaries of Change.” Gale will also lead a workshop on the Meyers Briggs Type Indicator. Other workshops will address management of clinical trials, an introduction to federal circulars—particularly the “A” varieties, a glimpse into the workings of social/behavioral IRBs, how to negotiate contracts, and of course, no meeting would be complete without a workshop on Fundamentals “Lite.”

At our Business Meeting, we will be voting on a bylaw change that would provide for a new Treasurer-elect position. Under the proposed bylaw, the Treasurer-elect would serve a one-year term learning the ropes before assuming the position of Treasurer.

After the Region IV meeting, Heather Offhaus, our regional chair, will rotate out of that office. Thank you, Heather, for all you’ve done for Region IV this year. We look forward to Diane Barrett taking the reins as the new 2006-2007 Region IV Chair.

Hellos and Goodbyes

The Communications Committee is saying goodbye to two members. Erin Nash, who was committee chair this year, is leaving her position as Grants and Contracts Manager at Ohio University for a position as Program Coordinator at the Athens County Child Advocacy Center. Jackie Hinton, our newsletter editor, has left Southwestern Missouri State University and moved to the University of Utah as Grant Writer and Program Administrator. Thank you, Erin and Jackie, for your service to the Communications Committee and to Region IV.

Luckily, the Communications Committee also welcomes two new members. Beth Seaton of Western Illinois University has joined the committee as the newsletter editor, and Stephanie Gray at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, has signed on as the new webmaster for Region IV. Welcome, Beth and Stephanie, and thanks for stepping in when the need was great! The Communications Committee would welcome any new members to write articles for the newsletter, take great photographs at Region IV events, or help out with the website. For more information, contact the committee chair, Karen Spear, at kspear@clarian.org.

Finally, check out the new and improved Region IV website: http://www.ncuraregioniv.com/. Visit the workshop for meeting news, professional development links, member news, job postings, and the Region IV newsletter!

Karen L. Spear is the acting Chair of the Region IV Communications Committee, and serves as Grants Coordinator, Methodist Research Institute at Clarian Health.

REGION V
Southwestern

Greetings!

The Program Committee has put together an excellent program for the spring 2006 meeting in Austin, Texas. The meeting dates are May 7th through the 10th and the meeting will be at the Doubletree Hotel. The hotel is accepting room reservations. Please check the Region V website for program and registration information. Members interested in moderating or volunteering may contact Vicki Cox at vcox@bcm.tmc.edu or me at gonorasi@utmb.edu or any of the regional officers. Additional contact information and general information including directions to The Doubletree Hotel, etc. will be posted on the Region V homepage.

Preliminary discussions and efforts are already underway for the 2007 spring meeting.

The Nominating committee and Awards committee chairs have sent out emails via the region V listserv soliciting nominations for Vice-chair/Chair, Treasurer and for the distinguished service award and travel awards. Election results will be announced at the Regional meeting and/or via Region V listserv.

Subsequent regional corner updates will be provided by Vicki Cox who will be taking over as Chair in May immediately after the Regional meeting adjourns.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all Region V members, officers, and the NCURA Office leadership and staff for the support and guidance they have provided. It truly was a pleasure and honor to serve as the Chair of the best NCURA region... REGION V.

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

continued on page 15
The new policy was several years in the making. In January 2005, John H. Marburger, III, Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), issued a memorandum to all federal research agency heads announcing a requirement that their agencies “accommodate the recognition of two or more Principal Investigators on research projects (grants and contracts).” This change in policy resulted from the work of the Research Business Models Subcommittee of the OSTP Committee on Science, which issued its report in early 2004. The report recommended 10 ways in which government agencies might modify their research business practices, including the suggestion that the federal government have the capability to recognize more than one PI on federal awards. At least two other federal advisory committees were reaching the same conclusion at about the same time.

Following Dr. Marburger’s memorandum, OSTP and NIH both issued requests for comments about the best way to implement the new policy. The grantee community submitted dozens of comments and suggestions, most of which were favorable to the concept and many of which offered ideas for implementation.

The NIH still has some procedures to work out, but the basic outline of its new policy is in place, including a revised agency definition of principal investigator: The individual(s) judged by the applicant organization to have the appropriate level of authority and responsibility to direct the project or program supported by the grant. The applicant organization may designate multiple individuals as PIs who share the authority and responsibility for leading and directing the project, intellectually and logistically. Each PI is responsible and accountable to the applicant organization, or, as appropriate, to a collaborating organization, for the proper conduct of the project or program including the submission of all required reports.

Dr. Ruiz Bravo stresses that it is up to applicant organizations to decide who can be a PI and under what circumstances it may be appropriate to recognize more than one PI. This represents the traditional authority of universities and is unchanged under the new policy. Dr. Ruiz Bravo also believes universities can “expect pressure” from faculty members to allow multiple PIs on proposals. She cites both “credit and budgetary reasons for having multiple PIs” and believes faculty members will want to take advantage of this new opportunity for recognition and flexibility in conducting their work.

NIH makes it clear that being able to recognize more than one PI does not imply the end of single-investigator awards. The newer concept is designed to give grantee institutions additional flexibility to accommodate their needs in an increasingly collaborative research environment where the multi-disciplinary team approach is

PAUL MERCURIO Award-Winning Comedian at 48th Annual Meeting

Paul Mercurio will be the evening entertainment at the 48th annual meeting banquet. Paul is a rising star on today’s comedy scene. He is known for combining his quick wit and intelligent observations with his hilarious innovative improv abilities.

A D.C. hometown graduate from Georgetown Law School, Paul started his career on Wall Street as a lawyer and investment banker. Moonlighting at night he was hired by Jay Leno to write jokes for The Tonight Show and left Wall Street to start his career as a stand-up comedian.

Paul was a staff writer for Comedy Central’s critically acclaimed comedy The Daily Show with Jon Stewart, and won an Emmy Award for his work. Along with other awards, he has made a dozen television appearances on such shows as Late Night with Conan O’Brien and also makes regular appearances on MSNBC and Fox News as a political satirist.

Get ready to chuckle with your NCURA colleagues as Paul delivers his comical humor in Washington, D.C.!
The National Science Foundation (NSF) has long recognized co-PIs, according to John B. Hunt, Senior Advisor in the Office of the Director. Only one person actually holds the title PI, but NSF thinks of that person primarily as the “first responder.” In the NSF system, universities are free to recognize both the PI and co-PIs as having equal authority on a grant, and NSF holds the PI and all Co-PIs responsible in the event of late technical reporting or other problems. In its official definition, however, NSF still recognizes the PI as being first among equals. In practice, many collaborators with NSF funding operate as if they were co-PIs, with the PI as the final responsible party. Dr. Hunt believes that NSF “probably will have to make some changes” in its system to conform to the federal-wide directive from OSTP about multiple PIs, but he does not believe major modifications will be necessary.

In addition to recognizing co-PIs, the NSF also allows what it calls collaborative proposals when scientists or engineers working together are employed at separate institutions. Each partner institution submits its own separate proposal, which is then linked by the lead institution. All the proposals in the partnership share the same technical narrative and the same abstract, but contain separate budgets for the work proposed at each institution. When awarded, there are separate grants to each partner institution, and each collaborative grant has its own PI and can have up to four co-PIs.

NSF has seen tremendous growth in the recognition of co-PIs in the last 20 years. In 1985, only 15 percent of all NSF grants included one or more co-PIs. In 2004, that figure had grown to 45 percent, and awards with multiple PIs received 62 percent of NSF grant dollars. The percent increase suggests the possibility that recognition of more than one PI could be popular.

Colleges and universities are just now beginning to realize that this federal-wide policy change will have an impact on their own business practices. Most institutions will have to modify their internal routing forms; develop a mechanism for recognizing co-PIs in their sponsored programs databases; share credit in internal reports on research funding; adopt new procedures for authorizing expenditures on sponsored programs; institute new financial controls to minimize overdrawn accounts; and work with their Institutional Review Boards and Animal Care and Use Committees, neither of which may currently recognize more than one PI on a research protocol.

NIH contemplates one change in connection with this new policy that may not be universally welcomed at universities. The agency intends to do away with its annual tables that rank institutions, schools and departments according to the dollar value of NIH awards received. Dr. Ruiz Bravo assures the grantee community that discontinuing the tables will be done “in a measured way,” and that NIH will still make the data available for local analysis.

Most people seem to think the effort involved in preparing to recognize Co-PIs will be worth it. “Long overdue” was a refrain often repeated in the comments received by NIH and OSTP. As NIH states in its rationale for the change, there is a “growing consensus that team science would be encouraged” if collaborators can be recognized as full partners through their designation as Co-PIs. While NIH has been the first to move into full compliance with the Marburger memorandum, the other federal research agencies will not be far behind. If the process of recognizing Co-PIs proves to be popular and useful, one can imagine that non-federal sponsors may be asked by investigators to offer the same option down the road.

(For the full set of NIH Q & A’s in a Microsoft Word® file, go to http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/multi_pi/overview.htm#faqs and click on “Frequently Asked Questions” at the bottom of the page.)

Robert Lowman is Associate Vice Chancellor for Research at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
Leadership Opportunities NCURA Offices and Board Positions
This year, you have the opportunity to nominate (or self nominate) individuals for three positions: Vice-President/President-elect and two At-Large Members of the Board of Directors.
For a detailed description of the current responsibilities of these positions, please view: http://www.ncura.edu/members/positions/ Terms of these positions will begin on January 1, 2007. Please email nominations to: nominations@ncura.edu. All nominations and supporting materials from the nominees must be received electronically on or before May 25, 2006.

NCURA Leadership Development Institute
Application and information can be found at www.ncura.edu/awards/ldi2006.pdf
Deadline: May 25, 2006 for applications

NCURA Awards
Detailed information can be found at: http://www.ncura.edu/awards/default.asp

Distinguished Service Award
This award is given to up to five individuals who have made significant contributions to NCURA.
Deadline: May 25, 2006 for nominations
Submit to awards@ncura.edu

Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration
This award is given annually to an individual who has made a significant contribution to the profession of research administration.
Deadline: May 25, 2006 for nominations
Submit to awards@ncura.edu.

Catherine Core Minority Travel Award
This program supports travel to the NCURA annual meeting for up to four individuals from under-represented groups who would not otherwise be able to attend this conference.
Deadline: May 25, 2006 for nominations
Submit to awards@ncura.edu.

Joseph Carrabino Award
NCURA’s newest award is given to a federal employee who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either through a singular innovation or by a lifetime of service.
Deadline: May 25, 2006 for nominations
Submit to awards@ncura.edu.

Grants.gov: Working Towards a Common Vision
Seventy-seven institutions registered to view NCURA’s March 7th program on Grants.gov. The live, interactive program prompted a number of call-in questions along with those that came in via fax. Faculty for the program were Gunta J. Liders, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, Office of Research & Project Administration, University of Rochester; Jean Feldman, Head, Policy Office, Office of Budget, Finance & Award Management, National Science Foundation; Marcia L. Hahn, Director, Division of Grants Policy, Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, OER, National Institutes of Health; Nancy Wray, Director, Office of Sponsored Projects, Dartmouth College and, Terry Nicolsi of the Grants.Gov Program Management Office. While viewers learned a bit about the history of Grants.gov, the primary focus of the broadcast was on today’s world and agency specific requirements. The faculty also shared some of the current challenges along with strategies for implementation. If you were unable to view this broadcast, you may purchase it on DVD by going to the NCURA website.
NCURA’s next broadcast will be on another important topic – National Security Issues. The faculty for this important program is: Susan Sedwick, Associate Vice President for Research & Executive Director of Research Services, University of Oklahoma Norman Campus; Jilda Garton, Associate Vice Provost for Research and General Manager, GTRC, Georgia Institute of Technology; Stephen Erickson, Director, Office of Research Compliance and Intellectual Property Management, Boston College; David Brady, Industrial Research Contracting Officer, Office of Sponsored Programs, Virginia Tech; Elizabeth Scott, General Engineer Technology, Nuclear & Missile Division, Bureau of Industry Security, U.S. Department of Commerce. Registration is available on the NCURA web site.
REGION VI
Western

By the time you read this, we will be weeks if not days from the Region VI/VII spring meeting in Lihue, Hawaii. In addition to pre-meeting workshops and an opening reception on Sunday evening, the conference itself will begin on Monday morning with a keynote speech by Robert Jedidke from the University of Hawaii Institute for Astronomy. Please see http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/meetings.asp for program, hotel and registration information.

Region VI has funded two awards to support travel to the NCURA 2006 Region VI/VII Spring Meeting. The recipients of the awards are Cynthia Lee, UC San Francisco; and Melanie David, UC San Diego. These awards will provide each recipient with up to $600 for expenses associated with transportation, hotel and food costs associated with the meeting. Our thanks go to the Regional Awards Committee: Dan Norquist, Washington State University (Chair); Pamela Webb, Stanford; Bruce Morgan, UC Riverside; and Vincent Oragwam, CSU Bakersfield; and Lynn Fister, Washington State University.

As you may already know, Chris Hansen, UC Irvine; Peggy Lowry, Oregon State University; David Mayo, Cal Tech; Bruce Morgan, UC Riverside; Dan Nordquist, Washington State University; and Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii attended the NCURA Leadership Convention last summer. Discussion there led to proposals for several changes in the regional infrastructure. One involved realignment of the regional officers and the splitting of the Secretary/Treasurer position into two separate roles. That has been considered, discussed both at last November’s Region VI Business Meeting, and subsequently by the Regional Advisory Committee. As a result, a by-law amendment was proposed for consideration by the membership.

Additionally, and in recognition of the fact that NCURA is a volunteer-led organization reliant on the growth development of a solid membership base, establishment of new committees dedicated to volunteer development and leadership were recommended. As a first step toward doing that, Nancy Daneau, Cal Tech, has agreed to chair an ad hoc committee that will focus on membership and volunteer development, reaching out to welcome new members in a variety of ways (yet to be determined) and encouraging participation.

If you will be joining us at the Hawaii meeting, please plan to attend the Regional Business Meeting that will be held during lunch on Tuesday, April 25th. Among other things, we will be discussing the pros and cons of a sponsor program for future regional meetings, reviewing the various recognition awards, deciding whether to support a travel award for the November 2006 national meeting; and talking about ways in which regional membership/volunteer development can be enhanced. Please contact me (apollack@resadmin.ucla.edu) if you have ideas for additional agenda items.

Please also think about the future. Regional elections won’t take place until the late summer or early fall but we need to begin thinking about next year. Linda Patton, CSU Fullerton is chairing the Region VI Nominating Committee on which Terry Manns, SCU Sacramento; and Joyce Freedman, UC San Francisco will also be serving. If you have recommendations about possible candidates, please contact Linda (lpatton@Exchange.FULLERTON.EDU).

My thanks to all of you who are working so hard on behalf of the region.

--

Ann Pollack is the Chair of Region VI and serves as the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Research Administration, University of California-Los Angeles.

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain

Dear Region VII Member,

Spring has sprung, The grass is ris’, I wonder where the hulas is! Hope this gets you to thinking about the upcoming spring meeting in Kauai, Hawaii on April 22-26, 2006. On-line registration was available through April 10 and thereafter registrations will be onsite beginning on April 21. Final preparations are taking place to assure a successful meeting. I look forward to seeing you there!

Election results are in! Please join me in congratulating Ken Felthouse as the incoming Secretary/Treasurer and Dennis Pafraff as the incoming Member-At-Large to their new positions. I want to thank the outgoing representatives, Terrie Ekin (Secretary/Treasurer) and Brian Christian (Member-At-Large) for their two-years of service to the region.

I also would like to take this opportunity to remind you of the upcoming deadlines for the various recognition awards for those to be honored at this year’s national meeting. The following awards are available:

The Catherine Core Minority Travel Award – This program supports travel to the NCURA annual meeting for up to four individuals from underrepresented groups who would not otherwise be able to attend this conference. The awardees receive up to $1,000 toward expenses associated with attending the Annual Meeting. Submit nomination and support materials to catherinecore2006@ncura.edu

NCURA Distinguished Service Award - The Distinguished Service Award is to recognize members of NCURA who have made sustained and distinctive contributions to the organization. The Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration award, in contrast, recognizes an individual’s significant contribution to the profession of research administration. Up to five Distinguished Service Awards may be given in a year. Submit a complete nominations packet to awards@ncura.edu

The Joseph F. Carrabino Award - NCURA wants to recognize our federal partners who work so hard at fostering and maintaining the Government-University relationship. Thus, the NCURA Board of Directors established the annual Joseph F. Carrabino Award. The award is awarded to a federal employee who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either through a singular innovation or by a lifetime of service. Submit a complete nomination packet to awards@ncura.edu

NCURA Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration - Each year NCURA looks to recognize one individual, who has made significant contributions to the profession of Research Administration and has demonstrated noteworthy service to NCURA, by presenting its “Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration.” Submit a complete nominations packet to awards@ncura.edu

The deadline for all award applications is May 25, 2006. Please set aside some time to consider members in the organization who qualify for these awards and nominate them to be recognized for their contributions.

Josie Jimenez is the Chair of Region VII and is the Assistant Director of the Office of Grants & Contracts at New Mexico State University in Las Cruces, New Mexico.
The Compliance Neighborhood website is undergoing a number of changes. For instance, the Town Hall section has been reactivated and will be used to make announcements and report on news related to sponsored projects compliance. Those announcements will also be the subject of messages sent via the Compliance Neighborhood listserv.

Since compliance issues cut across all research administration areas, we encourage NCURA members to subscribe to the Compliance Neighborhood listserv no matter what your primary responsibilities may be. You can sign up for the listserv on the Compliance Neighborhood home page.

The Compliance Neighborhood Committee has also been busy ensuring that our Resources webpage links are frequently checked and updated. We are committed to making this page a valuable resource for NCURA member – a place where links to federal regulations and policies, university policies, and educational materials can be found in a single location. If your institution would be willing to share online links to training programs or compliance-related policies in any of the areas on our Resources page, please contact any member of the Committee.

Finally, we invite all NCURA members to visit the Compliance Neighborhood website and take a tour around the various sections. Basing our work on the results of the survey we did last year, we are trying to make this site as useful to the membership as possible. Please feel free to make suggestions for improvement – not only on what we currently have on the site, but also any additional items you feel we should include.

Stephen Erickson is Director, Research Compliance and Intellectual Property Management, Boston College and is Chair of the Compliance Neighborhood.

Since the newest of NCURA’s seven Neighborhoods – the International Neighborhood – went live in March, feedback from members has been very positive. Please make sure to visit the site, and if interested add your name to the listserv. Many have found the “Welcoming Note” from Frank Heenskerk, EARMA’s Immediate Past President, to be especially interesting. Please join us in a global conversation about research administration! Visit us at http://www.ncura.edu/members/Neighborhoods/

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

Electronic grant submission through Grants.gov - A few TIPS
Is applying for NIH grants via Grants.gov causing you to dread coming to work? Do your palms get sweaty at the thought? Transitioning to an electronic grant submission process can be quite a change for researchers and more so for research administrators, who deal with multiple grants for the same deadline. Hopefully, the tips and pointers listed below will give all applicants a ‘heads-up’ before planning a grant application and make the transition process less stressful. Note that these tips are specific to NIH grants currently required (or will be in the future) to be submitted via Grants.gov. For the rest of this article and other helpful hints, go to the Pre-award Neighborhood at http://www.ncura.edu/members/Neighborhoods/pan.asp

Holly Benze serves as the Assistant Director, Research Projects Administration, The Johns Hopkins University and is the Chair of the Pre-award Neighborhood.
Summer Salary for Principal Investigators: A Policy Question

Ah! Summertime! It is the perfect time of year to unwind and relax. Unfortunately, you have a PI screaming for their summer money. Unlike our Big U Cousins who encourage faculty to get grants and can offer release time from instruction, most of our institutions encourage faculty to seek out summer grants to supplement their meager salaries since release time is not always a consideration.

A question was posted on the PUI listerv from Trinity University asking how other institutions handle summer salary/stipends for principal investigators. The responses ran the entire spectrum. Before we get into the various responses, let’s review the regulations and policies and then take a look at how the PUI community differs in their own institutional policies. This article tries to be objective and does not place any support or criticism on how institutions adopt and apply their policies.

OMB A-21, J. 10. d. (2), allows for faculty to charge a federal award for summer effort at the same rate as the academic year contract. If assuming a faculty member is a 9-month appointment, then you would take their “base” salary (let’s use $50,000) and divide it by the months in the contract. In this example, it would be $5,556 per month. The maximum on all federal awards to that PI, he or she could receive $16,668 for 3-months summer salary. The National Science Foundation (NSF) however, takes a stricter stance on summer salary by imposing the “two-ninths rule” (GPM Chap VI, Sec 611). This rule only permits the base salary times two months (in our example that would be $11,112). However, in some cases, once the grant is awarded, the PI may rebudget to allow the third month of salary, just as long as it does not impact the scope of work.

Many institutions drew a very hard line in the sand with regard to compensation by providing specific policy language to the amounts that may be requested in an award. Most adopted the NSF two-ninths rule as the institutional rule that governs all awards, not just federal. Of those institutions that followed this rule, they cited uniformity in applying the rule (no confusion with other sources or opportunities) and what it means to be 100% committed over the summer months (as we know that is subject to interpretation by the faculty member). Other institutions, while not following the NSF rule, followed other rules, such as Western Kentucky University uses a 62-work day rule, except for NSF awards, if the granting sponsor allows it. Middle Tennessee State University states they use a bifurcated system based on research versus teaching. Faculty doing research may charge up to 33% of their academic year salary (again, not on an NSF award) and faculty who only teach (up to 8 hours) may earn up to 25%. Depending on the mix of research and teaching, the actual rate may vary, but never exceeds the 33%.

Still, other institutions do not impose any limit (outside of federal awards) on the amount of summer salary earned from grants. Of the rationales cited, Rhode Island College noted that their faculty are on their own over the summer anyway and does not limit them on summer salary. Lincoln University cited their collective bargaining agreement as expressly prohibiting such limitations, unless state or federal regulations apply capping such compensation.
“The days of the mammoth corporations are coming to an end. People are going to have to create their own lives, their own careers, and their own successes. Some people may go kicking and screaming into this new world, but there is only one message there. You’re now in business for yourself”.

- Robert Schen, Former Controller, Ameritech

If you don’t know it yet, the world of work is very different than it was a generation ago. The days of retiring after 30 years with one company are over. The days of employer loyalty (and for that matter, employee loyalty) no longer exist. In the past, as long as you did your job and met expectations, you were paid. According to William Bridges, author of “Creating You and Co” and “Jobshift,” “Jobs were slots, boxes and pigeonholes. Jobs demanded performance in a script that was already written.”

Today’s work world is full of uncertainty. Every day we hear about another corporation or organization going out of business, downsizing, right sizing and on and on. In order to prepare ourselves for these uncertain times, we must take charge of our own careers.

Another factor that is affecting today’s changing world of work is that more and more individuals are looking to find meaning in their work in new ways. Especially since 9/11, people realize how short life can be and want to be doing what is important to them. They want to feel passion in their work, a commitment to their values and personal mission statements. Individuals want to make a difference. They want to know that they are good at work, that their work is important and their work fits with their values.

The hard reality is that your stake in your work satisfaction is greater than your employers’. We can not rely on our employer to provide us with satisfaction in our job. In the highly competitive global economy in which we work, you need to look out for your own best interests. You must take responsibility and manage your own career. It is no longer an option to wait for your employer to manage it for you. Whether you are in a job search now or preparing ourselves for these uncertain times, we must take charge of our own careers.

You’re now in business for yourself”. People are going to have to create their own lives, their own careers, and their own successes. Some people may go kicking and screaming into this new world, but there is only one message there. You’re now in business for yourself”.

- Robert Schen, Former Controller, Ameritech

Marshall Brown will be presenting “Take Charge of Your Career” at this year’s Annual Meeting on Tuesday, November 7, 2006. Visit the members’ section of NCURA’s Career Opportunity Page for more information on Marshall, to ask him a question, or to read one of hìs quarterly articles. http://www.ncura.edu/careers/ncareers.asp

Take Charge of Your Career

by Marshall A. Brown

1. Be self-managing. Think of yourself as working for yourself. You are the person in control of your own career and have to manage it. No one else can do it for you. Put a marketing plan together for YOU and just do it!

2. Know what you have to offer. It is imperative in today’s competitive job market to know YOU. Know what you have to offer and then market yourself as a person who brings value to the workplace. This will help to separate you from your competition. Your marketability will depend on your ability to demonstrate, on paper and verbally, your skills (even if within the same organization). Today, whether you are working in a “for profit” or “not for profit,” employers pay for results and what you can produce for them. And those who are succeeding are the ones who know what they have to offer and what they can do better than some of their competition. What do you bring to the table in the way of assets, strengths and values?

3. Keep on learning. Look beyond your current skill set and look at developing additional benefits of “marketing you.” By asking yourself the following questions (and discussing with your peers, friends, family and/or “board of advisors”), you should be able to come up with specific ways you might want to work on improving your product—you—in the next 6 months.

- I am known among my peers or co-workers for these projects or skills.
- My current project is challenging and provocative to me in these ways.
- In the past three months, I have learned the following new things that will help me to move forward.
- Three important people that I have added to my Rolodex (or Palm Pilot) in the last three months.
- By next year at this time, I would like to be known for these skills or projects.

4. Understand business trends. Yes, education is an industry. Read industry papers, keep track of the fast changing economic and social landscape and understand your competition. Stay current in your field(s).

5. Prepare yourself for areas of competence, not jobs. Focus on developing core competencies that your employer or another employer is likely to require in the future. Define yourself by what you do and how to get it done—NOT by your job title.

6. Find a mentor. Find someone who will provide honest and effective feedback to you. A good mentor takes an interest in your development and will support you in your career progression.

7. Build financial independence. When your finances are in good shape, you can make career (and life) decisions based on what is really important to you. You won’t feel like “I really have to take this job because I need the money.” To manage your career effectively, you must also be able to manage your personal finances.

8. Network, network, network!! Even if you are not looking for a new job or career right now, develop your network. NOW is the time to do it, not when you decide to look (or have to look). Become active in NCURA and other networking groups. Get involved; don’t just be a checkbook member. Develop your network by meeting with people on a regular basis. Make it part of your schedule to meet with one new person each month. Get to know people who are doing what you are doing—or want to be doing. I encourage my clients to spend at least 85% of their job search time networking. If you can only devote 2 hours a month, fine. Then spend 85% of the 2 hours meeting with “like minded people.”

9. Keep your resume up-to-date. Don’t wait until you get a call asking for your resume right away. That is the worst time to develop it. You will be anxious, stressed and might not be able to remember some of your significant accomplishments. Add your new expertise, skills and memberships as you have accomplished them and do it on a regular basis.

10. Create a vision. Picture yourself doing what you would like to be doing. Think, and verbalize it in “I am” statements. “I am director of post-award accounting. I am responsible for the fiscal management of all sponsored programs.” Envision what you want to be doing and put it out there! What do you have to lose?

The old ways of thinking about how and why we work are no longer useful. In order to survive in today’s world of work, each of us must know what we have to offer, realize our potential and take charge of our own careers. As stated in the Talmud, “If not now, when?” Wishing you much happiness and success!!

The preliminary program for NCURA’s inaugural Pre-award Research Administration (PRA) Conference will be available in May.

The PRA conference will have concurrent sessions, open forums, discussion groups, workshops and exhibits from our vendor partners who support Pre-award activities. In addition to a strong eRA and PUI track, the conference will feature sessions designed around the following topic areas: departmental, central, contracting/compliance and communication. To complement this array of sessions, we also have 12 discussion groups and 4 workshops to round out the offerings.

You can look forward to seeing sessions such as Foundations: Strategies for Effective Communication to Finance Your Expedition, Working with the Media: The Path to Successful Communication, Faculty as Customers: Undertaking the Journey Together, The Brave New World of ERA at PUI’s: Maps and Directions on the Information Superhighway, and Alternatives to the Bench: Building a Strong Sponsored Program Base in a Non-Research Intensive Environment.

The PRA conference is being held in the Rose City, Portland, OR. Portland is located near the end of the Lewis and Clark trail and has several parks, restaurants, and shops. Portland is well known for its culinary establishments.

“One of the 10 perfect places in North America to spend your summer holiday” – Money Magazine

“For a place its size, there is no better eating city in the world than food-obsessed Portland. Each year for the past 5 years, at least 3 restaurants make the Top 50 of Gourmet, Food & Wine, and Wine Spectator” New York Times

The program committee is currently putting the preliminary program together, and once it is complete it will be posted on our website, www.ncura.edu. NCURA is very excited about this new conference and looks forward to seeing you there!

Sally Tremaine and Michelle Joy Powell will serve as the Co-Chairs of PRA.

Sally is Director, Corporate and Foundation Relations Office of Development and Alumni Affairs at Quinnipiac University and Michelle is the Training Program Manager at Georgia Institute of Technology.

Program Committee

Julie Cole, Director of Research Services and Sponsored Programs, Executive Director, GSUFdn, Georgia Southern University

Mark Davis, Managing Director, BearingPoint, Inc.

Joyce Freedman, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Research, University of California-San Francisco

Pamela Napier, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Western Kentucky University

Debbie Newton, Associate Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, The University of Tulsa

Dan Nordquist, Assistant Vice Provost for Research Administration/Director, Washington State University

Heather Offhaus, Director, Grant Review & Analysis, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Dennis Paffrath, Director of Sponsored Programs, Utah State University

Velera Pate, Financial Manager II, School of Physics, Georgia Institute of Technology

Pamela Webb, Senior Director for Sponsored Research, Director, Office of Research Administration, Stanford University

Marianne Rinaldo Woods, Associate Vice President for Research, The University of Alabama

David Wright, Executive Director, Federal Demonstration Partnership
IS YOUR GRANT CLOSEOUT PROCESS KEEPING UP?

Have your sponsor invoices fallen behind?
Are your grant accounts reconciled to your FSRs?
Do you know the risks and problems due to the backlog of grant closeouts and reporting?
Is your grant closeout backlog number in the hundreds or the thousands?
Are you concerned about grant deficits, residual balances or early account set-ups?

Don’t risk serious compliance and financial risks, get a partner who can help. **RACS LLC can reduce your backlog and help minimize backlog in the future.**
Our staff is already trained and experienced to manage these outstanding issues.

Put your CFO’s mind at ease with a cost-effective solution, contact Charlie Tardivo at 216-403-8176 or email at grantsresearch@yahoo.com

Your research faculty and grant sponsors will be glad you did.

Many not-for-profit universities and colleges voluntarily disclose more financial information than is required by generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP).

Some disclose less.

Our intent is not for institutions to disclose everything. Or nothing. But rather to make the right choices. How transparent? How much information?

We have framed these issues with the idea of helping university business officers determine an appropriate standard of transparency for financial reporting.

It is in our latest paper, Enhancing the Transparency of Financial Reporting. You can download it at no charge from our website at: www.pwc.com/education.

If you’d like more information or if you would like to engage in a broader discussion of the topic, call us at 1.888.272.3236.
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 (ECRT).

Huron’s state-of-the-art web-based technology 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 data.

Times are limited...

If you missed us at NCURA FRA, go to www.huronconsultinggroup.com/ECRT to schedule your personal demonstration of Huron's ECRT or call Greg Bedell at 312-880-3010.

**ECRT v2.1 with enhanced functionality available in June 2006!**

2006 NCURA Gold Partner

1-866-229-8700
www.huronconsultinggroup.com
Employment Opportunity
Grants and Contracts Officer
Job #38 (Be sure to refer to job number when applying)

The Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute at Harbor-UCLA Medical Center (LA BioMed) invites applications for the position of Grants and Contracts Officer. LA BioMed is an independent, 501 © (3) institution having primary affiliations with the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA and the Harbor-UCLA Medical Center. The Grants and Contracts Officer is a senior member of the administrative staff of the Grants and Contracts Office at LA BioMed with annual research, education and service funding of approximately $73 million.

The Grants and Contracts Officer reports to the Vice President of Research Administration and Research Services and is responsible for all pre-award and non-financial post-award activities for all non-industry programs within selected academic medical departments and divisions. Major responsibilities include: providing assistance to faculty in the development and submission of proposals; review and negotiation of awards; creating accounts for project expenditures; monitoring the financial status of assigned accounts; and ensuring compliance with applicable state, federal, institute, and sponsoring agencies’ policies and regulations.

The qualified applicant should have a Bachelors degree, up to five years experience in sponsored research administration at a major university or non-profit institution, knowledge of governmental regulations and compliance requirements, strong interpersonal skills, and a demonstrated ability to work enthusiastically with creative professionals. The successful applicant will be expected to foster an environment that encourages faculty to pursue external funding for their research, scholarly and creative activity.

Compensation and benefits are highly competitive.

Applicants must submit a letter of interest, a resume and the names of three (3) references.

How to Apply:
Apply on-line www.labiomed.org and click on Employment Opportunities
Submit your resume by FAX: 310-222-3640
Apply in-person: 1124 W. Carson St. Human Resources Bldg N-12
Torrance, CA 90502

This position requires a successful criminal conviction search for employment.
NCURA 2006 Calendar of Education and Events

April 20, 2006
Online Education Program
Electronic Routing Forms and Pre-Award Tracking
Live, interactive web/audio conference that you can join from your office

April 23-25, 2006
Region II Spring Meeting
Galloway, NJ (by Atlantic City)

April 23-26, 2006
Joint Region VII Spring Meeting
Kauai, HI

April 29 - May 2, 2006
Region IV Spring Meeting
Grand Rapids, MI

May 3, 2006
Interactive Learning Series (ILS) Chat on Financial Closeout

May 6-10, 2006
Region V Spring Meeting
Austin, TX

May 7-10, 2006
Region I Spring Meeting
Portland, Maine

May 7-10, 2006
Region III Spring Meeting
Miami, FL

May 17-19, 2006
Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
Albuquerque, NM

June 13, 2006
2006 NCURA Video Workshop Series
National Security Issues

June 22, 2006
FRA VII Online Education Program
Live, interactive web/audio conference that you can join from your office

June 26-28, 2006
Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
Madison, WI

July 13-14, 2006
Export Controls, Embargoes and Sanctions: Beyond the Basics
Alexandria, VA

July 20-21, 2006
Export Controls, Embargoes and Sanctions: Beyond the Basics
Alexandria, VA

July 24-26, 2006
Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
Sponsored Project Administration II
St. Louis, MO

August 14-16, 2006
Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
Sponsored Project Administration II
Burlington, VT

August 20-22, 2006
Pre-award Research Administration (PRA) Conference
Portland, OR

September 12, 2006
2006 NCURA Video Workshop Series
Technology Transfer for the Research Administrator

September 21, 2006
Online Education Program
Live, interactive web/audio conference that you can join from your office

September 27-29, 2006
Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
San Antonio, TX

November 5-8, 2006
48th Annual Meeting
Washington, D.C.

NEWSLETTER DEADLINES:
July/August 2006 Issue
Submission of Articles: June 16, 2006
Space Reservation for Ads: June 16, 2006
Submission of Display Ads: June 23, 2006

Visit www.ncura.edu for updates and additional information.
FRA VII Record Breaking Attendance!

FRA VII in La Quinta, California had a record breaking attendance with close to 800 attendees. The beautiful location was great for members to learn and relax together. Thank you to the program committee, attendees, and staff, for making the event such a success!

FRA VII Program Committee

*Back Row (l to r):* Geoffrey Grant, National Science Foundation; Marilyn Surbey, BearingPoint, Inc., Conference Co-chair; Win Ann Schumi, University of Minnesota; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director; Kim Moreland, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Cheryl-Lee Howard, The Johns Hopkins University; Jane Youngers, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; Vivian Holmes, Harvard Medical School; Sara Streich, Northwestern University; Michael Anthony, University of Washington; Patrick Fitzgerald, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. *Front Row (l to r):* David Kennedy, COGR; Gunta Liders, University of Rochester; Jean Feldman, National Science Foundation; Tara Bishop, NCURA; John Case, University of Akron, Conference Co-chair; Mark Daniel, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute. *(Not pictured: Denise Clark, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Michele Codd, Vanderbilt University; Deborah Galloway, University of Cincinnati; Shandy Husmann, Huron Consulting Group; Peggy Lowry, Oregon State University; Phil Myers, Western Kentucky University; Tim Reuter, University of Cincinnati; Barbara Siegel, Whitehead Institute of Biomedical Research.)*

*(l to r)* Laura Wade, University of Houston Center for Superconductivity; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA Executive Director; Charles Elachi, Jet Propulsion Laboratory; Marilyn Surbey, BearingPoint, Inc., Conference Co-chair; John Case, University of Akron, Conference Co-chair.

Members network during break.