NCURA held a Governance Training Workshop, Leadership Convention Part II and a Board of Directors Meeting on July 21-23, 2006, in Washington, DC.

On Friday the 21st, NCURA held a Governance Training Workshop for Regional Officers, National Standing Committee Members and Board of Directors. This workshop was led by an outside consultant, Bud Crouch, who is very familiar with NCURA and routinely works with the Board of Directors. The issues and topics addressed were of specific interest to the participants. Some of the sessions offered were Practices of Effective Committee Members; Latest Trends in Member Needs; Fiduciary Responsibilities of Volunteers; How NCURA’s Standing Committees and Regions Can Work Together; Regional Meeting Site Selection; Finance for Regional Treasurers; and, NCURA’s Governance Structure. Many attendees commented that this training provided them with continuity and quality information that will assist them in serving their regions.

Saturday morning, the Regional Officers and Board of Directors continued the dialogue in the session entitled Leadership Convention, Part II. The morning began with my review of the outcomes resulting from the 2005 Leadership Convention where five major goals were outlined with recommendations (See NCURA Newsletter, September/October 2005, Vol. XXXVII, No. 4, http://www.ncura.edu/data/newsroom/newsletters/pdf/septoctober05.pdf).

As I reviewed for the group the goals and recommendations, it was gratifying to see that significantly all of them were either complete or were in progress. This is an amazing feat considering the number of recommendations that came out of that convention. The group then moved into a review of NCURA’s strategic goals and began discussing regional strategic goals with the assistance from Bud Crouch. The Regional Officers separated into their respective groups and began working on developing regional strategic goals in alignment with the National Organization’s strategic goals. The groups also included board members and NCURA staff members. This session was beneficial because it strengthened the linkage between regional and national leadership and how each supports the other. In the side bar on page 12, our consultant, Bud Crouch, notes the extent of NCURA’s forward thinking. The regional officers left the convention with drafts of their strategic plans to take to their regional executive committees for discussion and completion. You will hear from your regional leadership as your region’s strategic goals are developed.

In addition to the annual Leadership Convention, the national and regional officers hold quarterly conference calls. These

continued on page 12

The entire NCURA Community is saddened by the losses of Scott Blackwood and Frederick Sudermann. See pages 11 and 28, respectively, for information about these treasured colleagues.
As the Baby Boom generation moves toward retirement, replacing these employees has become a chief concern of business leadership. The impact of this demographic phenomenon could leave organizations vulnerable if they do not take succession planning (SP) seriously. The succession planning process develops current employees and recruits superior candidates to ensure that the organization’s future leadership is in place. Although SP may seem to be the new buzz word, for centuries apprentices have been trained to follow in the footsteps of their parents, and since the beginning of the industrial age senior managers have mentored and molded young executives to fill their shoes.

In our own profession, a prime example of succession planning was the replacement of former director of sponsored programs at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Julie Norris, with current director Pat Fitzgerald. When asked at what point she began succession planning, research administration guru Julie Norris’s response was “the day I began the job.” Julie sums up her overall approach to SP as “Hire or identify people in your office who are excellent—hardworking, thoughtful, creative, ‘people persons,’ experts in one field related to research administration and wanting to learn more.” She further explained that she identified staff members with an interest in advancement. After which, she began to consider what skills her replacement would need.

Pat Fitzgerald gives the perspective of a successor in the SP process. Fitzgerald speaks of how he knew when he was ready to take the next step. “I didn’t specifically plan for, or anticipate, my promotion to Director of OSP. However, I have tried to manage my career in a way that prepared me for promotional opportunities so that when an opportunity arose that I was interested in, I would be ready. In fact, I moved to MIT nine years ago primarily for the opportunity to work for Julie Norris and to broaden my knowledge of research administration.”

The “homegrown” approach to SP consists of grooming internal candidates to assume leadership positions as they become available. When done correctly, organizations will position their own employees, in whom they have invested, to be competitive in national searches that are often required to fill high level positions. These searches are important to establish the credibility of an internal candidate. It is imperative that internal candidates be recognized as highly qualified to perform in leadership roles. Otherwise, their authority and effectiveness may likely be questioned by their colleagues and direct reports. Fitzgerald reinforced the value of the search committee to his credibility. “When Julie Norris announced her retirement and recommended me as her successor, I was adamant to senior leadership at MIT that I would not accept the position without a legitimate search.”

When asked to describe how she developed her successor, Norris responded that “Once he (Fitzgerald) was comfortable and confident in the role for which he was hired (initially hired as head of Cost Analysis) I gave him assignments and opportunities which broadened his role. Specifically, in addition to his Cost Analysis duties, I gave him traditional Research Administration duties so he learned much of that side of the business. Also, when an opportunity came up in an extremely complex and long-term activity which would give the person access and exposure to the senior administration (president, provost, VP of Research) I assigned it to him.” She says “the key is to hire the right people, train them carefully and give them both the authority and the responsibility to act. The key is delegation.” She believes that the way to engage your employees in succession planning is through regular performance appraisals that focus on the future.

LEADERSHIP TIPS

As for how development occurs, Fitzgerald says, “The reality is that we will never be totally prepared for the responsibilities and situations we will encounter in a new job, especially if the position is substantially more challenging than our previous position...the reality is that when we assume a new position most of our training occurs “on the job.”

His advice for colleagues aspiring to grow into senior leadership positions is as follows.

1. **Find a mentor** who you will learn from and who will provide you with guidance and opportunities to enable you to reach your career goals.

2. **Be willing to take risks.** The mark of a good leader is the willingness to make decisions. We won’t always make the right decision and we should look at our mistakes as learning opportunities, not failures. Failure comes from being indecisive.

3. **Actively seek the advice of others** and listen carefully to the advice. A leader should not be embarrassed to admit that he/she doesn’t have all the answers.

4. **Look before you leap.** When taking on a new position one should be careful to do a thoughtful assessment of the situation and get a better understanding of the environment (people, organizational structure, resources, etc.) before you start making changes. We can make our mark on our organization over time; normally we are not faced with the need for urgent change. Take your time in order to get it right.

5. **Recognize that you are responsible for your own actions.** Don’t blame others for mistakes and don’t be afraid to acknowledge when you make a mistake. No one is perfect and it isn’t wise to act like we are.

He concludes by stating that each person is responsible for his/her own career and that it is important to find a mentor and to actively seek opportunities for growth. He also advises to “Look for leadership opportunities that fall outside your normal job responsibilities, as the skills you learn will be invaluable and transferable to other situations, now and in the future.”


*Susan Zipkin serves as the Director, Radiology Research Finance at Brigham and Women’s Hospital and Maria Thompson is the Director, Research and Sponsored Programs at Tennessee State University. They are both alumnae of the Leadership Development Institute (LDI), Class of 2005.*
As Congress returns to work in September, most pundits agree members will be focused on November and legislation designed to strengthen political positions as the elections get near. However, one piece of legislation pending before the Senate might be a departure from the election-invoked enmity – Senate Bill 2590, the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006. Introduced by Senators Tom Coburn (R-OK) and Barack Obama (D-IL), the measure directs the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to create a website disclosing the recipients of all federal financial assistance. Approved by the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on July 27, 2006, the bill was sent to the full Senate for consideration when it returns after its August recess. The House of Representatives passed a similar bill, H.R. 5060, on June 21, 2006 making it likely the bill will be passed and sent to the President for signature before the year’s end.

The Senate Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 – as amended – directs OMB to establish by January 1, 2008, a single comprehensive database of federal financial assistance awards beginning with FY 2007 funding. The databases would be available through a public Web site listing all entities receiving federal funds, including the name of each entity with a unique identifier, information on the award, the amount of the award, the location of the entity, and the purpose of the funding. In addition, OMB is required to initiate an 18-month pilot program beginning in July 2007 to test the collection and reporting of subcontractors and subgrantees information and, based on the program, begin incorporating that information into the federal spending database by January 2009. OMB must ensure that the collection of subawardee data minimizes burdens on the awardee and subawardee, and allows recipients to allocate reasonable costs for collecting and reporting the data as indirect costs.

In presenting the bill, Senator Coburn argued that passage of the bill would “ensure that the taxpayers will know how their money is being spent [making] Federal funding more accountable and transparent … and reduce[ing] fraud, abuse, and misallocation of Federal funds.”

As the bill went to the full Senate, Senator Coburn wrote to 111 universities on July 27, asking for their “help.” A vocal opponent of Congressionally earmarked funds, Senator Coburn asked the universities to provide a list of all appropriated (earmarked) funds received since 2000. In addition to a list of the funds, the Senator asks for a summary of program objectives and accomplishments for each allocation; institutional measures for assessing the quality of outcomes; any institutional policy regarding earmarks; whether the institution has considered hiring a lobbyist to assist in obtaining earmarks; and, finally, whether Congressional earmarks “have contributed in a substantive way” to the institution.

In considering their response to Senator Coburn, university representatives have voiced a number of concerns. The short deadline for responses – September 1 – falls during the summer break and adds to the burden of preparing for the next academic year with reduced staff. Some recipients worried about the scope – whether the request is for all federal financial assistance or just Congressionally appropriated funds – for the six year period. But given Coburn’s on-going concern with Congressional earmarks, most agree that earmarked funds are the focus of this request. Finally, most university representatives suggest that the question concerning the hiring of a lobbyist seems to fall outside a reasonable request for information in that it asks for a description of internal discussions.

What this legislation and the request from Senator Coburn demonstrate is a continuing and abiding interest on the part of Congress, and some members of the public, in the nature of federal financial assistance to support research.

The Government Accountability Office has called on Congress to consider the reauthorization of P.L. 106-107 – the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 – that required OMB to ensure agencies streamlined and simplified their grants management systems to the benefit of grantees. This is the Act that has brought the grantee community Grants.gov and various electronic certification, payments, and reporting systems. In a July 2006 report assessing “Grantees’ Concerns with Efforts to Streamline and Simplify Processes” (GAO-06-566), the GAO noted that some progress had been made but the goals of P.L. 106-107 had not yet and would not likely be met by the law’s sunset date of November 2007. The report encourages Congress to consider reauthorization to continue the efforts to streamline grant administration. OMB is required to respond within sixty days to Congress on the GAO’s recommendations.

It’s fair to say that the grantee community would like to see the work on Grants.gov continue, but with greater consultation between grantees and agencies before changes in systems are made and with a clearer sense of timelines so as to better prepare for the changes.

Maybe there is a way to gather the information from the agencies’ electronic grants management databases into the federal financial assistance database called for by the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 and eliminate any burden on the awardees and subawardees. Too simple?

Carol Blum is Director, Research Compliance and Administration, Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
NCURA AWARD RECIPIENTS

MARY ELLEN SHERIDAN
Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration

MARY ELLEN SHERIDAN, Associate Vice President for Research and Director of University Research Administration at the University of Chicago is the thirteenth recipient of NCURA’s Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration, NCURA’s most prestigious award. Mary Ellen has been in research administration for over 30 years and received her Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Chicago. She has served at the University of Chicago since 1994.

“Mary Ellen has great integrity and a deep understanding of the subtleties related to many issues,” Keith Moffat, from the University of Chicago, avowed. He further added, “I know I can rely on Mary Ellen for timely, thoughtful, well-informed, chapter-and-verse views.” Mary Ellen is the founder of the Research Management Review and was the first editor. The scholarly journal provides a forum for the dissemination of knowledge about the study and practice of the research administration profession. Mary Ellen shares her vast knowledge at NCURA meetings, video conferences, workshops, and special conferences.

Stephen Hansen, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, who is the previous recipient of the Outstanding Achievement in Research Award, nominated Mary Ellen stating, “To merit the honor of receiving the Outstanding Achievement Award, an individual must have demonstrated in depth knowledge of research administration and must have shared that knowledge with colleagues. One means of demonstrating and sharing knowledge is by teaching others in the profession. Another means is by influencing policy and regulations. Mary Ellen has contributed to research administration in both ways, and has had a significant impact upon our profession as a result.”

Fellow colleague Jane Youngers, The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio wrote, “...she has served as a national spokesperson and advocate, including providing congressional testimony, on many research administration issues; and she has written numerous pieces on some of the more difficult areas of our field including scientific misconduct and data rights.” Jane Youngers furthers explains, “she was the second female President of NCURA and, by example, has shown other women members that they can achieve much in our organization...”

Pamela Vargas, Kutztown University, notes the founding of the Research Management Review: “This commitment to the publication process has provided many NCURA members with the opportunity to contribute to the education of others while helping to establish research administration as a profession. In an academic environment, publishing goes a long way toward establishing credibility and proof of expertise, and Mary Ellen’s efforts to get the journal off the ground have certainly benefited all of us by helping prove that there is a body of knowledge and scholarly activity associated with our profession.”

The Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration will be presented November 6, 2006 at the 48th Annual Meeting morning’s Plenary Session.

TOM COOLEY
Joseph F. Carrabino Award

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

NCURA’s Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (N&LDC) selected TOM COOLEY to receive the 2006 Joseph Carrabino award. Tom is the Chief Financial Officer and Director, Office of Budget, Finance and Award Management at the National Science Foundation (NSF).

Tom’s significant contribution to the Government-University Partnership is the creation of the Business and Operations Advisory Committee. Robert Hardy of Council on Government Relations wrote in his letter of endorsement, “I have the unique perspective as a former NSF colleague of both Tom and Joe Carrabino. Tom embodies Joe’s longstanding understanding and concern for assuring that the view of NSF’s customers and stakeholders are consistently sought and taken into account in NSF activities and operations. Tom’s establishment of NSF’s first Business and Operations Advisory Committee and his extensive personal participation in national and regional meetings of NCURA and other university groups well demonstrate his commitment to seeking advice and input from the community.”

Tom’s nominator, Pamela Vargas, Kutztown University, also notes the importance of the Business Operations Advisory Committee and adds, “Tom is also committed to the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), and in addition to attending its meetings, he encourages his staff members to be continually involved in its various committees...yet another way in which he contributes to an atmosphere of interaction with the university research administration community.”

Tom is well known as an enthusiastic, knowledgeable and witty presenter, one of NCURA’s most popular speakers. NCURA Past President, Patrick Fitzgerald from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology adds when Tom served on NCURA’s Board, he “made a substantial contribution to all discussions and decisions, and his thoughtful approach to problem solving and his unassuming leadership style made him a very persuasive Director.”

Tom will be honored at the 48th Annual Meeting during a special recognition luncheon on November 6, 2006.

FIVE MEMBERS SELECTED
Distinguished Service Award

This year the NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee selected five long-time NCURA members to receive the Distinguished Service Award: JAN FOX, Director, Research & Sponsored Projects, Texas Christian University; PATRICIA HAWK, Assistant Director, Sponsored Programs & Research Compliance, Oregon State University; ROBERT KILLOREN, Associate Vice President For Research, The Ohio State University; PEGGY LOWRY, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Compliance, Oregon State University, and CYNTHIA WHITE, Director, Research Office, Washington University, will receive their award at the 48th Annual Meeting during a special Recognition Luncheon on November 6, 2006.
Each recipient has made a great contribution to NCURA in innumerable ways over the years. Their list of contributions is too great to list, here is a summary of their service:

**JAN FOX** is currently serving on the Board of Directors and also served on the former Executive Committee, and at present is sharing her expertise as a Leadership Development Institute (LDI) advisor. From 2004-2005 Jan served on the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee and over the years has served on several committees both on the national and regional level.

**PATRICIA HAWK** is the Co-Chair for Financial Research Administration (FRA) VIII Conference, and has served on past FRA committees and is currently the contributing newsletter editor for the FRA corner. In addition to Patricia serving on the Board of Directors three times, she has presented many sessions at the Annual Meeting and has been Fundamentals faculty from 2004 to present. She has also been an Online Education Program presenter as well as Video Workshop faculty.

**ROBERT KILLOREN** was NCURA President in 2003 and served as a member of the NCURA Executive Committee and as Chair of Region II. Robert has served on a number of NCURA committees, and was the editor of the Research Management Review Journal from 1999-2001. He has led and participated in numerous concurrent sessions at NCURA meetings, both at the regional and national level. Additionally, he has appeared on many Video Workshops as a moderator and faculty member.

**PEGGY LOWRY** currently serves on the Board of Directors and is the Co-Editor and a frequent contributor to the NCURA Newsletter. Peggy served as Chair of the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee from 2004-2005, and chaired NCURA's first live satellite Video Workshop. She has been active on many annual meeting program committees and has frequently presented as Fundamentals and SPA II faculty.

**CYNTHIA WHITE** is currently serving as Fundamentals faculty and was NCURA's Secretary from 2003-2004. Cynthia chaired the 2004 Board working group on the Leadership Development Institute and is currently active as an advisor. She has presented countless times at Annual Meetings and was the NCURA Newsletter Co-Editor in 2000 and a recurrent newsletter contributor.

NCURA relies on volunteers to achieve its mission. Please join us at the Recognition Luncheon to recognize these individuals for their time and talent.

---

**Carfora and Wallen Represent NCURA at the Annual Conference of the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators | Paris, France, 18-20 June, 2006**

John Carfora (Boston College), Chair of NCURA's Commission on International Research Administration, and Denise Wallen (The University of New Mexico), also a member of the Commission, represented NCURA at the Annual Conference of the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA) at France's prestigious Institut Pasteur in June.

John and Denise offered the first ever NCURA workshop at an EARMA Conference, titled: Fundamentals of Sponsored Research Administration: The American Perspective.

They also participated in a discussion with Mark Suskin (Head, NSF's Europe Office, Paris), Beth Strausser (Policy Specialist, NSF's Policy Office, Arlington, Virginia), and Ann Davis (Program Director for Europe and the European Union, NIH).

The theme of the 2006 EARMA Conference was Successful International Research Collaboration: The Changing Research Funding Climate in Europe, and EARMA members attended from throughout Europe and around the world. You can readily access the EARMA website at: www.earma.org/ to learn more about its mission and programs.

At NCURA's forthcoming Annual Meeting in November, Wiktor M. Kurjeja (Acting President of EARMA) and Frank Heemskerk (EARMA's Immediate Past President) will be offering a Workshop titled Fundamentals of Sponsored Research Administration: The European Experience on Sunday afternoon (November 5th).

Next year’s EARMA conference will convene in Warsaw, Poland, in June 2007. In the meantime, a meeting of INORMS (International Network of Research Management Societies) will convene at the October SRA meeting in Canada.

John Carfora is Director, Office For Sponsored Programs, Boston College and Denise Wallen is Director Research Development, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Research, University of New Mexico.

---

**NCURA Leadership Development Institute Class of 2007 Selected**

NCURA's Nominating & Leadership Development Committee has selected the Leadership Development Institute of 2007. LDI class members and their NCURA advisors are as follows:

Alexandra Lewis, University of North Florida, Marianne Rinaldo Woods, The University of Alabama, Advisor; Anita Mills, University of Pennsylvania, Jan Madole, Oklahoma State University, Advisor; Denise Moody, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Laura Wade, University of Houston, Advisor; Leslie Perry, The Johns Hopkins University, Ken Forstmeier, Pennsylvania State University, Advisor; Craig Reynolds, Central Michigan University, Jerry Fife, Vanderbilt University, Advisor; Leerin Shields, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Susan Wyatt Sedwick, University of Texas at Austin, Advisor; Kim Small, Washington State University, Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico, Advisor; Brian Squilla, University of Pennsylvania, Ben Prince, University of Massachusetts Medical School at Worcester, Advisor; Karen Spear, Methodist Research Institute at Clarian Health, Kim Moreland, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Advisor; Ailing Zhang, Morgan State University, Bonny Boice, Research Foundation of SUNY, Advisor.

The Institute starts in January 2007, however, those students who are attending the 48th Annual Meeting will have the opportunity to meet their advisor. Gale Wood, Comet Consulting, is the facilitator for the eleven month course which meets virtually and in person. Good luck to the LDI participants with a valuable year ahead!
he new academic year has begun, and we are all probably back into our regular routines, having enjoyed relaxing vacations and the great American tradition of barbecuing in our backyards. Summer and backyard barbeques go hand-in-hand. It’s a time when men and women all across this great nation of ours proudly put on aprons that have goofy sayings printed across the front declaring that one should “Kiss the Chef” or perform some other equally clever act.

As often as we’ve pulled out the grill over the years, you’d think we would have barbecuing down to a fine art. But have you ever noticed how seldom a cookout goes as planned? Has charcoal ever not failed to light? Worse, have you ever had your eyebrows singed off when the gas grill unexpectedly erupted in flame? Perhaps you’ve gotten ready to sit down at the picnic table to enjoy your perfectly prepared hamburger only to be attacked by a swarm of flying insects with a viciousness that you thought only existed in the Old Testament. Maybe when you’ve gone to the grill to turn the meat you discovered it was so badly burned that you couldn’t tell the difference between a chicken leg and a piece of charcoal briquette. Have you ever confidently begun barbecuing when, all of a sudden and without warning, one small, tiny cloud on the horizon erupted into a thunderstorm with such a fury that it left the dog whimpering and you huddled in the basement?

Management in research administration is like summer barbecuing – often unpredictable. No matter how many times you’ve managed a problem, you can’t count on the problem being the same or the same solution producing the same results. Below are the lessons we’ve learned about management taken fresh off the backyard barbecue grill.

**LESSON 1: Engagement.** Management, like barbecuing, is best when you get everyone involved. You may be great at the grill, but there is a lot more to a barbecue than just cooking the meat. A great barbecue needs the whole family to help by preparing the corn on the cob, potato salad, cole slaw, baked beans, watermelon, iced tea and lemonade, and your Aunt Beverly’s cherry pie. Likewise, with management, there is more than just making decisions. Good management needs the engagement of the entire team, each person using her or his skills to create solutions to problems and to contribute their talent to the operation of the entire enterprise.

**LESSON 2: Have a Plan.** Usually you follow some kind of plan for your backyard cookout, like don’t put the potato salad out in the hot sun before you’ve started lighting the charcoal. With management, a plan is important. It gives you the confidence to get started. It clarifies the direction you intend on going, and it gives the staff a sense that they aren’t wandering aimlessly in the wilderness of research administration.

**LESSON 3: Be Prepared to Ignore the Plan.** When the barbecue fails to light or the thunderstorm strikes, some of us may curse, but all of us adjust. We don’t just sit around the table and wonder what to do next. We move inside or turn on the oven or order pizza. In management, factors outside of our control also disrupt our best made plans. We, too, need to adjust. Disaster only follows if we stubbornly follow the original plan and fail to change to meet the new circumstances.

**LESSON 4: Engage in Trial and Error.** Just because you burn the ribs, whether it is the first time or the seventy-first time you’ve grilled, you don’t give up. You admit your mistake and start over. In management, as in barbecuing, we’ve all made mistakes, dozens of mistakes. Some would say even hundreds of mistakes. Don’t be afraid of admitting that you’ve made a mistake. Learn to laugh at yourself and learn to learn from your mistakes. In order to admit your errors and to learn from them, a good manager has to suppress her or his ego.

**LESSON 5: Accept Responsibility and Encourage Others to Do the Same.** Whether you are the one responsible for grilling the meat at the barbecue or for making the potato salad, you want to do your best. You want everyone to accept their responsibilities and to do their best. The barbecue wouldn’t be as good if the person responsible for the corn on the cob failed to bring it or brought it uncooked. Like the barbecue, you want people who accept responsibility and who are dedicated to doing a good job. Passion for doing a good job, for succeeding, is why we persevere regardless of the mistakes or of the unpredictable happenings.

**LESSON 6: Be Creative.** Are you going to follow to the letter grandma’s barbecue sauce recipe, modify it slightly, or try a new method? Traditional recipes often offer refuge and comfort to fledgling cooks, but the best dishes are often spontaneously created when cooks take creative approaches to established procedures and formulas. Like cooking, management often unfolds as a continuous process of generating new tastes and flavors in response to changing cultural and social environments. While some security can be found in tried-and-true recipes, management decisions require creativity and innovation to meet current needs, tastes, and contingencies. If the burgers are burning on the grill, a pinch of salt as called for by the recipe isn’t going to help, but adding a new sauce may just be what’s needed to save the day! The ability to be flexible and creative with strategies and tactics is also critical to good management. If faculty members are burning about the facilities and administration rate, a memo justifying indirect costs may not help. It may be time for a more creative answer.

**LESSON 7: Have a Sense of Humor.** Laugh, don’t cry! If the dog licks all the cheese off hamburgers or your brother-in-law’s bratty children from a previous marriage stick their fingers in the cherry pie, remember, nothing is gained by letting your anger get the better of you. In management, try to remember to laugh when absurd and outrageous fortune thwarts your best laid plans, no matter how bad the situation appears. Nothing breaks the tension as well as a good sense of humor and a positive approach to solving a problem.

So, even though summer is behind us, we can apply lessons learned from the backyard barbecue to our everyday management responsibilities. Have a plan but remain agile and ready to change as circumstances arise. Engage everyone in the process. Don’t be afraid of making mistakes. Take responsibility and try your best. Be creative and take a positive approach. We may not always grill that perfect hamburger, but in following these rules, the table will be set for a great barbecue.

Stephen Hansen, NCURA newsletter contributing editor for the Management Corner, is Dean of Graduate Studies and Research at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. Christa Johnson is Assistant Dean at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.
The San Jose Mercury News (San Jose, California) has run a series of articles of late regarding financial conflict of interest and what they label as a dangerous equation at medical institutions. These articles have been critical of the lax enforcement of the conflict of interest regulations by the federal agencies, in particular the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The author of the article queried Edward Greg Koski, the former director of DHHS’ Office of Human Research Protections, about the agency’s laissez-faire attitude toward enforcement of their conflict of interest regulations. Koski responded that... “It is largely a ‘don’t ask don’t tell’ scenario.” The Mercury News questioned why the federal agencies leave the monitoring of these complex rules to the institutions that also manage agency funds; in particular, at medical institutions conducting studies using human subjects?

Paul Jacobs, the journalist who produced the series of articles, compared a financial conflict of interest for a faculty member in information technology with one in the medical arena. His take away message is that a conflict of interest in a field in which the worst case scenario is someone getting rich from publicly funded research cannot pretend to be in the same league as a tragedy involving human subjects when a financial conflict results in a loss of objectivity.

Stanford’s President John L. Hennessy thinks that universities are doing an appropriate job of monitoring conflicts of interests. In response to the possibility of too much oversight by the agencies regarding the conflict of interest regulations, Hennessy states, “I’m deathly afraid … you kill the goose that laid the golden egg. You break that process of transferring new technologies from research environment to products. It already takes too long in the medical arena because we have such a focus on safety and risk avoidance. Imagine it taking a lot longer. I view that as a tragedy for all the people who have a disease that technology could help...The golden egg here is that technology that actually gets out there and saves lives.”

In addition to the Mercury News articles, there have been scholarly journal articles about conflict of interest at academic medical centers. Troyen A. Brennan, MD, JD, MPH et al. published an article in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) (January 2006) entitled “Health Industry Practices that Create Conflicts of Interest: A Policy Proposal for Academic Medical Centers.” The abstract starts off stating that “Conflict of interest between physicians’ commitment to patient care and the desire of pharmaceutical companies and their representatives to sell their products pose challenges to the principles of medical professionals. These conflicts occur when physicians have motives or are in situations for which reasonable observers could conclude that the moral requirements of the physician’s role are or will be compromised.” A November 2000, New England Journal of Medicine article, authored by Bernard Lo, MD et al. looked at “Conflict-of-Interest Policies for Investigators in Clinical Trials.” The background for this piece was the concern that financial conflicts of interest on the part of investigators conducting clinical trials may compromise the well-being of research subjects. The conclusion was “…that university scientists who conduct clinical research should be held to a higher standard than researchers employed by commercial organizations…and that financial conflict of interests restrictions should apply to all members of a research team and their immediate families, not just to the investigators with responsibility for the clinical decisions.”

JAMA has recently updated its conflict of interest policy for publication in its journal. JAMA’s update policy requires complete disclosure of all relevant financial relationships and potential financial conflicts of interest. Regardless of amount or value, a disclosure must be made in the acknowledgement section of the author’s article.

Both the New York Times and the San Francisco Chronicle recently ran articles about the relationships between medical practitioners and the pharmaceutical industry. Although not specifically on point about financial conflicts of interest in academe, the features point out that “free lunches” from pharma can “curry favor” and influence the decision-making of the recipient. The San Francisco Chronicle reports that “A 2003 study in the American Journal of Bioethics found that when a person accepts a gift, no matter how small, ‘the obligation to directly reciprocate, whether or not the recipient is conscious of it, tends to influence behavior.”

Those of us who work at public institutions in the State of California have been dealing with two sets of conflict of interest regulations and laws; the federal regulations from the NIH and National Science Foundation (NSF) and the State’s Fair Political Practices Act. The State law requires that faculty receiving research funding from private-sector sponsors disclose all financial ties with the sponsor (including those of their spouses, domestic partners and dependant children). The law is not aimed exclusively at biomedical research, but it does require that we take a closer look at financial relationships between a for-profit sponsor and an individual faculty researcher.

University of California-San Francisco (UCSF) operates under three separate conflict of interest reviews for studies involving human subjects and has one of the strictest conflict of interest policies in the nation. We follow the federal guidelines for NIH and NSF, we follow the State laws for private funding, and we have a financial conflict of interest review for all human-subject protocols. For industry-sponsored research and for human-subject protocols our tolerance for financial conflicts is zero when human subjects are involved.

The first and most important role of medical schools remains the training of physicians and scientists, and of course, providing high-level patient care. Today’s academic medical institutions are also looked to as the leaders for determining the causes of diseases and developing the treatments for such. Current expectations are that medical institutions work collaboratively with the pharmaceutical industry to get discoveries quickly out to the bedside.

The issues posed by the above are two-fold: do academic medical institutions need to have stricter guidelines for conflict of interest when human lives are at risk? And can those institutions monitor the conflicts of interest without further intervention from the federal government?

Based upon the national dialogue, I say yes to both.

References

Joyce Freedman is the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Research at University of California-San Francisco.
Our office recently hired a new research administrator who had spent time working as what is commonly referred to today as a departmental administrator. Just three months into the job, I have been so impressed by how quickly she has picked up on the things we do in what we call the central administration side of the research administration business. While she may not know all of the intricacies of OMB Circular A-21—yet—she sure does understand how to deal with our faculty. Knowing and understanding how to interact with our faculty is such a key component of what everyone does in research administration, it made me take a trip down “Memory Lane” and think about how I got started as the equivalent of a departmental administrator back at the University of Virginia.

When I think back to my time at the University of Virginia (UVa), I recall some of the things I did there: helping faculty understand program announcements and guidance; helping faculty with proposal budgets and shepherding the proposal through the Office of Sponsored Programs for institutional approval; helping faculty and departmental staff with advice on how to accomplish certain financial transactions, and reviewing and approving of expenditures on grant accounts. I also helped to coordinate submission of cost sharing reports and final technical reports. So, looking back, I really was involved in the full award lifecycle, and I was there to assist the faculty all along the way.

But what I remember most about being a departmental administrator was the faculty interaction. To my mind, departmental administrators are really lucky because they are “on the front line” in terms of being able to deal with faculty on a daily basis. They are able to get a glimpse of a faculty member’s passion—their research. Of course, we in central administration get to see all of those proposals or financial status reports on a daily basis, but do we really get a chance to sit down and talk to our faculty about their projects? I have my conversations with faculty in my current position, but certainly not to the extent or the same degree that I did as a departmental administrator. Maybe the reason I felt like I had more time to chat with faculty is because proposal volume wasn’t as high in those days at UVa. It was really nice, however, to have the time for someone to sit down and explain their project.
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...
When Dave Richardson and I first started talking about this conference, we realized that there are three major and immediate tasks: Come up with a theme, come up with a program committee, and come up with a program “backbone.”

First, we asked each other to think about the key components to financial research administration. After talking back and forth for a few minutes, we both agreed to these three cornerstones: People, Process and Perspective. People, Process and Perspective describes what we all need in order to be successful in financial research administration, so we are using this as the theme for FRA VIII. Immediate Task One accomplished!

Our next step was to choose a program committee. We have chosen a program committee that reflects our theme. We have individuals that focus on all three of these items, and are proud to announce our program committee. They are (in alphabetical order):

- Sharon Boyd (University of Virginia)
- Fred Cantrell (University of Florida)
- Barbara Cole (Boston University)
- Tom Cooley (National Science Foundation)
- Adrienne Cummings (MAXIMUS)
- Joe Gindhart (Washington University)
- Toni Lawson (University of Maryland)
- Denise McCartney (Washington University)
- Beth Seaton (Western Illinois University)
- Brian Squilla (University of Pennsylvania)
- Michelle Vazin (Vanderbilt University)
- Tom Wilson (City of Hope National Medical Center)
- Jane Youngers (University of Texas Health Sciences Center San Antonio)

This is a fantastic group, and I know the program will be fantastic as well. Immediate Task Two accomplished!

In thinking back to last year’s program, Dave and I both liked the format. But we also liked the “short-take” sessions at the Annual Meeting, so we’ve decided to add them to this year’s program. We think this will add even more variety to our program. Expect to see a preliminary program at the 2006 Annual Meeting Booth for FRA VIII. Immediate Task Three accomplished!

Finally, the NCURA staff has secured a terrific location for our meeting—the Gaylord Texas Resort in Grapevine, which is right outside “The Big D” (Dallas). I’ve been told everything is bigger in Texas, and this facility lives up to that expectation. With four and one-half acres of lush greenery—indoors—the Gaylord Texas Resort promises to welcome us with “larger-than-life Texas hospitality and charm.” Information regarding the resort can be found at the following url: http://www.gaylordhotels.com/gaylordtexan/

Reserve your calendars for April 1-3, 2007 and stay tuned for future updates on FRA VIII. Your Program Committee will be working hard to ensure this is the best FRA conference yet!

Patricia Hawk and David Richardson are the Co-Chairs of FRA VIII. Patricia Hawk is the Assistant Director, Sponsored Programs and Research Compliance, Oregon State University. David Richardson is the Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration, Virginia Tech.

Noteworthy!

Milestones

As of September 1st Andy Rudczynski is the Associate Vice President for Research Administration at Yale University

Katherine Ho left the University of California, San Francisco and joined Stanford as its Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Research. After ten years of research administration in medicine, she will be leading the Humanities & Sciences team at Stanford.

Alice Tangredi-Hannon will serve in a brand new position at Yale University as a Research Compliance Officer.

After 13 years at Notre Dame University and then most recently 2 years at the Air Force Institute of Technology, Pamela Vargas is now the Executive Director of the Kutztown University Research Center. The University is located in Kutztown, PA.

Good luck!
As a result of the changes, there will be a possible term as Chair that made these changes vision, hard work and dedication during his our previous Region I Chair. It was Ben's especially would like to thank Ben Prince, the proposed changes and for voting. Also, I membership for taking the time to review www/ncura/index.html. I want to thank the Region I website at http://web.mit.edu/osp/ Administrative Policies are available on the

On the RADG front, we have renewed our position. An e-mail announcement will be thought about nominating someone for this Chair-Elect position. Please give some

As a result of the changes, there will be a call for nominations for the newly created Chair-Elect position. Please give some thought about nominating someone for this position. An e-mail announcement will be sent in the late summer or early fall asking for nominations and the election will be held in the fall.

On the RADG front, we have renewed our contract with the John Hancock Conference Center for another year. The first RADG meeting for the season is scheduled for October 5, 2006. An announcement detailing the topic and speaker will be e-mailed soon. Please save the date. Future RADG dates are listed on the Region I website at http://web.mit.edu/osp/www/ncura/meetings.htm

Finally, I’m happy to announce that our 2007 Annual Spring Meeting will be held in Providence, RI at the Biltmore Hotel on May 6 - 9. I want to thank Lee Picard from Brandeis University and Tim Connors from Dana-Farber Cancer Institute for their efforts in selecting the site. I’m very excited with the location they selected. Providence is a great city and the Biltmore (http://www.providencebiltrmore.com/index.a sp) is an excellent hotel. Please save the date now.

I hope everyone had a great summer. I look forward to seeing you at the next RADG meeting and at the Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C.

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.

I hope you had an excellent summer and are ready for another challenging academic year.

This past July, all of NCURA’s Regional Officers, along with the Board of Directors, attended the NCURA Governance Workshop in Washington. It was an exciting opportunity to brainstorm how best to serve the NCURA membership on a regional level. In upcoming months and at the Region II Business Meeting this November, we will be sharing the goals and strategies developed during the workshop with you.

The call for nominations for Region II officers went out in August and we now have a fine slate of candidates for Chair-elect, Treasurer-elect and Regionally elected Member of the Board of Directors of NCURA. Information and instructions on how to vote should be coming out shortly by e-mail and I urge you to take the time to vote for the candidate of your choice. If you have any questions or concerns about this year’s elections, please contact the head of the Nominating Committee, Chair-elect, Ruth Tallman at rt01@lehigh.edu.

The Region II website should be up soon. We are in the process of purchasing space for a permanent home for Region II and hiring a webmaster to update and maintain the site. We will send out an e-BLAST with the details as soon as they are available.

Meanwhile, we are very grateful to Immediate Past Chair Bob DeMartino, Mary Bigelow and Seton Hall University for housing and maintaining the Region II site for the past two years. Thank you.

I expect many of you will be attending NCURA’s 48th Annual Meeting in Washington, November 5-8, 2006. Region II had over 500 attendees last year! The theme for this year is “Communicate, Advocate, Educate” and the preliminary program is available on the NCURA website at www.ncura.edu. If you are planning to attend, be sure to join your colleagues at the Region II hospitality suite in the evenings and the Regional Business Meeting on Tuesday. I look forward to seeing you there.

It’s not too early to mark your calendars for the Region II spring meeting in Rochester, New York, May 6-8, 2007. A call has gone out to the regional membership for session topics and your input is needed to ensure that you get the most out of the meeting. What sessions are you looking for? What hot topics should be covered? What workshop opportunities would you like? Contact Program Chair, Martin Williams at williamsm@wpunj.edu with your suggestions. The program committee has already met a few times and a working theme for the meeting so far is “Research Administrators: Meeting the Challenge of Change in our Communities.” Stay tuned for further developments.

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.

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

We also encourage you to volunteer. Volunteering is the best way to introduce yourself to NCURA, to learn about the organization, to broaden your professional network, and to stay current on sponsored research developments. Volunteer opportunities are still available for the Registration and On-Site Information Booth.
and the Region III Hospitality Suite. Don’t miss an opportunity to share the Region III spirit with the rest of NCURA!! If you are interested in helping in one of these areas, please e-mail Tony Ventimiglia at ventiaf@auburn.edu.

Rick Smiley who is the chair of the Nomination and Election Committee, will be providing information for an election of a National Board Member from Region III this fall. The nominee that gets elected will be replacing Pat Green whose term expires on December 31, 2006.

Region III is moving – moving in cyberspace that is! Region III will host its own site beginning this fall. The site will be www.ncuraregioniii.com. Surf on by later in the year and check it out!

Noteworthy News

Florida International University
Joseph Barabino, formerly Director of Research at Boston University Medical Campus, has joined our staff as Associate Vice President for Research.

Andres Gil, formerly Director of Research Development for FIU’s College of Health and Urban Affairs, has joined our staff as Associate Vice President for Research Development.

Robert Gutierrez, formerly Assistant Director for Pre-Award has been promoted to Associate Director of the Pre-Award section within the Division’s Office of Sponsored Research Administration.

Barbara Llaneras, formerly a Coordinator for Research Programs within the Pre-Award section of the Office of Sponsored Research Administration has been promoted to Assistant Director for Research Integrity within the Division’s Office of Research Integrity.

Aida Reus, formerly a Senior Grants Financial Manager has been promoted to Associate Director of the Post Award section within the Division’s Office of Sponsored Research Administration.

Eduardo Serrano, formerly a Coordinator for Research Programs has been promoted to Assistant Director of the Pre-Award section within the Division’s Office of Sponsored Research Administration.

University of South Florida
Grace Wang, promoted from Senior Grants Specialist from Research Financial Management (Central Post Award Office) to Coordinator, Research Programs/Services in the College of Education.

Murray State University
Michael S. Wetherbolt, Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs recently received his Certified Research Administrator (CRA) certification this year.

Michelle Vazin is the Region III Chair and serves as the Associate Director, Office of Contracts and Grant Accounting at Vanderbilt University.

REGION IV

Mid-America

Cooler weather is around the corner and reminds us that the Annual Meeting is not far off. Region IV members are well represented among the presenters at the meeting.

Region IV elected new Board Members at their spring meeting. Sara Streich of Northwestern University has been elected Chair-elect and Michelle Meeks of Indiana University Medical Center is our new Secretary. Two new At-large Members were elected: Jaynee Tolle of the University of Cincinnati and Robert Andreason of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Christa Johnson of Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville was elected other Board Member.

The Region IV board attended the Regional second Leadership Convention in Washington, D.C., where regional NCURA leaders gathered to learn from one another. Planning is also underway for the joint spring meeting between Regions III and IV in Nashville, TN.

Region IV is pleased to recognize two of its own who have been selected for the next Leadership Development Institute class: Craig Reynolds of Central Michigan University and Karen Spear of the Methodist Research Institute at Cianrian Health in Indianapolis.

At least one Region IV institution, Iowa State University, is pioneering the use of Lean Thinking strategies to streamline the sponsored programs process. This Japanese-based approach uses tools like Kaizen (change for the better) to involve and empower employees, add value to the workflow, teach people to see and eliminate waste, and create a rewarding work environment. Watch the Region IV newsletter and RMR to hear about this institution’s experience in implementing Lean Thinking strategies in research administration.

See you at the Annual Meeting!

Diane Barrett serves as the Region IV Chair and is Assistant Director, Pre-Award Services at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

REGION V

Southwestern

As all of you know the Annual Meeting is right around the corner. If you have not made your hotel reservations you might do that now, the rooms are filling up!

Our next Spring meeting will be held in Arlington, Texas at the Wyndham Hotel in April 2007. We are next to the Ballpark at Arlington and just a few blocks away from Six Flags – Texas. Scott Erwin is in charge of the meeting and I know it will be a fantastic program. If you are interested in presenting, being a moderator or volunteering for this meeting please contact Scott Erwin at w10@txstate.edu to get on the program.

Some of the Executive Committee members attended the Leadership Conference on Strategic Governance in Washington, D.C. in July. The workshops were presented by Bud Crouch who is the principal partner for Tecker Consultants. It was a wonderful program and from the meeting the Region V Executive Committee will be putting together a strategic plan for our region in conjunction with the National Organization. Our plan is forthcoming.

We now have a Volunteer Coordinator for Region V. Kay Ellis of Oklahoma State University has filled this position. If you would like to volunteer to help out at the Annual Meeting please let Kay know what you are interested in doing.

I would like to remind all of you to make time while you are in Washington to come by the Region V Hospitality Suite. This is a good place to meet up with old friends and make new ones.

I look forward to seeing all of you at the National Meeting.

Vicki Cox is the Chair of Region V and serves as Administrator for the Department of Radiology at Baylor College of Medicine.

continued on page 14
Governance Training and Leadership Convention, Part II (continued)

conference calls began in 2005 under Jerry Fife’s leadership and as an outcome of the 2005 Leadership Convention. These conference calls are proving to be very beneficial and are well attended. There is a lot of sharing of ideas and assistance between regions and between regional and national officers.

As the bond between national and regional leadership continues to strengthen, we will see our organization become better positioned to respond to our members’ needs. There is also an article in this newsletter from the regional officers’ perspective for more information on the Governance Workshop and Leadership Convention Part II.

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

What does fall mean for NCURA members? (continued)

something from tracks if that suits your needs. Want to learn something totally different than what you do every day – select your topic.

Just don’t forget that after a busy day of learning we have scheduled plenty of time to network and get to know your newly discovered colleagues or visit with long time friends. Sunday’s banquet will feature the incredibly funny Paul Mecurio, a local DC Georgetown Law School graduate who decided comedy was more fun than law. Monday night will again provide opportunities to sample local DC restaurants with a fun group. Stay tuned for the details on more Monday evening activities!

Tuesday evening will offer “An Evening of Music.” NCURA’s party will kick off the evening with dinner in the ballpark where the “Soul Source and No-Cost Extensions” will make their 17th appearance, providing lots of rockin’ music and dancing. Concurrently, I am pleased to announce the debut of a new NCURA group “The Grateful Deadlines,” providing acoustical entertainment as we reflect on what we’ve learned in two days and, of course, studiously deliberate which session will be Wednesday morning’s choice.

Please make plans now to snag that hotel reservation, send that registration in, and make travel arrangements to join us in DC on November 5 – 8, 2006 for a fabulous learning experience! Hope to see you there.

Pamela Whitlock is the NCURA Vice President and serves as the Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of North Carolina at Wilmington. 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 Director of Research Development, Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Research, University of New Mexico.

NCURA Regional Strategic Planning Session

By Bud Crouch

Many National and State associations are finally beginning to build true strategic plans. These plans represent the leadership teams of those organizations coming to consensus on what will constitute success over several time periods in the future. I certainly see this as progress, but it is only half the challenge in direction setting. It is great to have the written document, but it does not mean anything to anyone if the plan is not fully implemented (the proverbial binder on the shelf gathering dust).

Most associations are now indicating that their true major challenge is successfully implementing the strategic plan. The current view of most associations is that implementation means the plan (its strategies) are linked to the operation plan (allocating human and dollar capital) on an annual basis. The focus now is on actually making something happen that delivers on the promises spelled out in the plan. This is good!

However, full implementation of the plan requires an additional effort that very few associations are taking/doing today. This has to do with the notion of strategic intent – developing strategic intent throughout the entire association. I find strategic intent is critical to any association’s ability to execute well and sustain success.

Strategic intent means driving the strategic plan through the entire organization. All elements/parts of the association must be going in the same direction. They can be on different roads or trails, all are headed north. The three to five year direction of any component must fit under and link with the national association’s strategic direction (regions, chapter, etc.). The lack of strategic intent is something like a rocket that after launch has all of its parts decide to go in different directions.

It is important for regional organizations to first understand and have read the National plan. The Regions need to develop their own three to five year under the umbrella of the National Plan. They share National’s core purpose, values and vision B.A.G. (Big Audacious Goal) but develop their own three to five year goals and strategies. Their plan should advance both the Region and the National—strategic intent.

I have only seen planning below the national happen in about 2% of the associations I have worked with over 20 years. So you can imagine my great joy and professional sense of “this is really cool” when we helped the Regions build their plans last month and begin to create strategic intent throughout NCURA.

Bud Crouch is a principal partner of Tecker Consultants, L.L.C. and president of Innovations Plus. He is a consultant who focuses on enhancing the ability of not-for-profit, for-profit and government organizations to be successful. Crouch has developed and instructed several programs for the American Society of Association Executives. He has assisted a large number of noteworthy clients in planning strategically, building knowledge-based strategic governance, reshaping infrastructures, and successfully making strategic changes.

In addition to NCURA his clients include such diverse organizations such as the American Dental Association, the Canadian Dental Association, the Big Ten Athletic Conference, National Bar Association, American Veterinary Association, and the National Patient Safety Foundation.
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Program Committee. David has been a panelist and workshop presenter at numerous national and regional meetings on topics as diverse as the Federal Acquisition Regulation, Federal Demonstration Partnership, PI Transfers, Cost Sharing, Subcontracting, and Publication Restrictions. Upon learning of the election outcome, Mayo stated, “I feel very honored to have been elected Vice President/President Elect of NCURA, and humbled by the confidence the membership has shown in my ability to lead the organization. I look forward to serving in this capacity over the next few years, and will work to enhance NCURA's educational offerings and professional development programs.”

Penny Cook, Executive Director, Office of Grants and Contracts, Yale University School of Medicine, and Marti Dunne, Associate Vice Provost for Research Compliance and Administration, New York University were elected to the Board of Directors.

Cook, a member of NCURA since 1984, has a particular interest in professional development and training and looks forward to exploring how NCURA might expand its training efforts to support not only its members but also the faculty that drive its research enterprise.

Dunne, a member of NCURA since 1978, will work to continue to be part of NCURA's strategic planning efforts as it further develops long-range plans and establishes goals.

Mayo, Cook and Dunne, take office on January 1, 2007.

REGION VI
Western

The NCURA Annual Meeting is scheduled for November 5 - 8 in Washington, D.C. We will convene for both business (at the regional business meeting to be held on Tuesday from 1:25 to 2:25pm), and for pleasure (evenings in the Region VI/VII hospitality suite). If you are new to NCURA or have just rejoined after an absence, please also think about reserving Monday night for a dutch-treat dinner that Nancy Daneau and the rest of the Region VI ad hoc Committee on Membership and Volunteerism are planning so you can meet others and learn about the region, its activities and volunteer opportunities.

Region VI has an Awards Program that includes both travel and recognition awards. We awarded $600 travel grants to Cynthia Lee of UC San Francisco, and David of UC San Diego to support their attendance at the spring regional meeting. And, by the time you read this article, the Region VI Awards Committee will have selected the recipients of two additional travel grants being awarded to help defray the cost of attending the national meeting.

The region has also put out a call for nominations for the Helen Carrier Distinguished Service Award; the Barry Dorfman Research Administration Award; and the Meritorious Contribution Award. Please go to http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/announce.asp for more information about the criteria for these awards and the nomination process. Again our thanks go to the Regional Awards Committee: Dan Nordquist, Washington State University (Chair); Pamela Webb, Stanford; Bruce Morgan, UC Riverside; Vincent Oraegaw, CSU Bakersfield; and Lynn Fister, Washington State University.

Regional elections are in progress as well. If you have not already voted, please do. The Regional Nominating Committee (Linda Patton, California State University, Fullerton (Chair); Joyce Freedman, UCSF; Terry Manns, California State University, Sacramento) deserves tremendous credit for a job well done. We plan to announce new officers at the November Regional Business meeting.

Finally, Kim Small from Washington State University was accepted into the NCURA Leadership Development Institute class of 2007. Linda Patton has also been appointed by NCURA President Laura Wade to the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee. Our congratulations to both.

I hope to see many of you in Washington DC in November.

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

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain

Hello Region VII,

Hope your calendars have been marked and travel arrangements made to attend the NCURA 48th Annual Meeting this year. The program includes a plethora of choices for all who plan to attend. A call for various volunteer opportunities will be sent out shortly and I encourage you to consider volunteering. These opportunities allow you to network with other NCURA members, both regionally and nationally, and you get the opportunity to learn more about the National Organization in the process.

New members who have not attended a National Meeting need to look on the Regional website for a new member travel award opportunity. Region VII provides partial funding to the new member for travel to attend the national meeting. Guidelines, requirements and deadline information are available for this opportunity on the website.

The slates of candidates for three elected positions opening at the end of this year in Region VII have been set, so expect to receive an e-mail in the near future asking for your vote. The three positions available are Chair, Member-at-Large, and the Regional Representative to the Board. Your vote is important in selecting the future leadership of the Region, so please set aside some time to respond.

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

by John Carfora

International Neighborhood Preparing for Its First On-Line Interactive Learning Series (ILS)

John Carfora, Chair of NCURA’s Commission on International Research Administration, and Denise Wallen, a Member of the Commission, are working with NCURA staff and European colleagues to develop an online chat for September 27 at 1pm Eastern. Paul Craven, Deputy Scientific Secretary, Institute of Cancer Research, University of London and current Vice President of the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA) will join them for the September ILS chat. The focus will intentionally be broad and include discussion of new developments in European research administration, and John and Denise’s work on Strategies for Building Toward Successful International Research Collaboration and their forthcoming Chapter on that theme that will appear in print in October as part of NCURA’s newest publication Sponsored Research Administration: A Guide to Effective Strategies and Recommended Practices. For a transcript of the chat visit the Neighborhood homepage at http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/

John Carfora is the Chair of the International Research Administration Neighborhood and serves as Director, Office for Sponsored Programs at Boston College.

Pre-Award Neighborhood

by Holly Benze

In July the Pre-Award Neighborhood published the On Campus Interview with Cheryl-Lee Howard, Assistant Provost for Research Administration at Johns Hopkins University. Ms. Howard has worked in Research Administration for over 35 years and told us some of her secrets of success. To read more about her, the implementation of Coeus, and other pre-award issues, go to http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/pan.asp.

Work on updating our website continues-albeit slower than we anticipated. We try to post changes in regulations or agency requirements as quickly as we can. Recent postings have been on the ever-popular topic of Grants.gov and NIH changes in signature requirements on SF424. NIH just released NOT-OD-06-086, an update and clarification on their policy on late submission of grant applications. Go to our neighborhood website for more information.

If you work in a pre-award research administration office, visit our neighborhood. It’s only a few clicks away. Sign up for our listserv and benefit from the combined knowledge and experience of all our members.

Holly Benze is Chair of the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee and serves as Assistant Director, Research Project Administration, The Johns Hopkins University.

Departmental Neighborhood

by Kirsten Yehl

Cost Transfers. Ugh.

Even with the threat of a federal auditors’ visit looming over us all, and the hefty fees that usually accompany those visits, we still often push cost transfers to the bottom of the pile in our effort to keep up with all the effort certifications, salary transfers, budgets, applications, etc., etc. at the top of the heap. Even though we know there should be no unexpected errors in our spending on sponsored accounts, we’re all human and mistakes do happen. So most of us have a cost transfer or two, waiting for us in our ‘to do’ pile.

With that in mind, the Departmental Administration Neighborhood recently sponsored an Interactive Learning Series chat with Susan Beals (Director, Office of Research Administration, Thomas Jefferson University) and Colleen Ravenfeld (Associate Director for Post Award Services, Thomas Jefferson University). It was a lively discussion with lots of tips for department administrators. In case you missed it, here some highlights from Susan and Colleen you might find helpful:

continued on next page
Guidelines for cost transfer policy and procedures can be found in two places:

- OMB circular A-21 section C3-4

Cost transfers must occur within 90 days, it is a federal requirement. Auditors use 90 days as the standard. You need to include a strong justification for the cost transfer; you need to document how the mistake occurred, how it is being fixed, and what preventative action is being taken.

In the event of an audit, timeliness and appropriateness of cost transfers seem to be the guiding principles. The “lean staff” argument is not sufficient – you had enough staff to post the charges incorrectly, why not enough to remove them?

The cost of any charge transferred beyond 90 days is shared by the department at Thomas Jefferson University – from non-grant sources. The forced cost-share has really slowed down the number of late cost transfers.

How can pre-award help? By making sure faculty and staff are not over-committed and processing the awards in a timely fashion.

What's the best tool to keep on top of salary changes? Right now, a simple, helpful Excel spreadsheet.

These are just the highlights. You can check out the entire discussion online at: http://www.ncura.edu/members/Neighborhoods/chat/cost_transfer.pdf

Kirsten Yehl is a member of the Departmental Research Administration Neighborhood Committee and serves as a Research Administrator at Northwestern University.

Did you know that you can now file financial status reports and invention statements via the NIH Commons?

Appropriate cost allocations among multiple grants and cost transfers are hot topics in both financial compliance and financial research administration. The recent Interactive Learning Series on cost transfers is especially timely and useful. Check out the transcript by visiting the NCURA Neighborhoods and selecting the ILS hyperlink or visit the cost transfer chat directly http://www.ncura.edu/members/Neighborhoods/ils.asp. Visit the ILS Archive for to find other topics of interest. While you’re in the neighborhood, visit the FRA Neighborhood for examples of university Cost Transfer Policies.

What are the implications for financial research administration of having multiple PI’s? How will this change how we divvy up the pie and report awards internally? We are considering exploring this topic and would like your feedback. If you don’t already belong, join the FRA listserv at http://www.ncura.edu/members/Neighborhoods/fra.asp.

Peggy Vigiolto is a member of the FRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as the Associate Vice Provost for Research Administration at Drexel University.

E-gov projects delayed because of funding issues:

“Grants.gov’s program management office has program management controls in place to ensure that the initiative can stay operational and within budget,” said Terry Nicolosi, Grants.gov Deputy Program Manager. “Any potential and actual funding shortfall that impacts the initiative is analyzed, and an alleviation plan is constructed and communicated to the Office of Management and Budget] and our governance board that is made up of the 26 federal grant-making agencies before being incorporated into our operating plan.”

And:

“The E-Authentication initiative has prioritized spending to focus on growing the federation, continuing operations and maintenance support, and providing customer service,” Kareis said. “Critical services continue as usual.”

For the full article visit http://www.gcn.com/print/25_21/41449-1.html

Tammy Custer is a member of the eRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Grant & Contract Officer/Electronic Systems Specialist at Cornell University.
Our F&A Conundrum: What Happens at a PUI?

Nothing pulls at the heartstrings more (or is that heartburn?) than to bring up the sordid details and rationalizations of why and how PUIs allocate recovered F&A costs. What was a quiet listerv throughout most of the summer, ended in an explosion of postings. When a member asked the innocent question of what do other institutions do with their F&A and how do they distribute it on campus, it was met with a firestorm of responses. This article will summarize the many responses and provide some points to consider especially if you are just establishing or reworking your allocation method at your institution (or just want to feel better about your system!).

To understand why there is an allocation is first to understand what it is that you are collecting. OMB Circular A-21, B. 4. states, “Facilities and administrative (F&A) costs … means costs that are incurred for common or joint objectives and, therefore, cannot be identified readily and specifically with a particular sponsored project, an instructional activity, or any other institutional activity.” Every institution negotiates a rate that is based on actual costs of carrying out the research activity (such as utilities, copying, support staff, etc.) and supporting an institution’s facilities (research centers, labs, etc.). F&A recovery “supports” or “pays” for these real costs that are involved in supporting the research endeavor.

Interestingly, and contrary to what some believed, OMB places no prohibition as direct costs in an award. F&A recovery “supports” or “pays” for these real costs that are involved in supporting the research endeavor. Additionally, after the funds are distributed (if they are at your institution), of those who responded shared the same problem of getting those who received the funds to use it for research related activities. Again, institutional leaders, the SPO and other decision-makers coupled with a cultural and political history makes untangling and tracking fund usage problematic. The general consensus of respondents was that once a system is in place, the more difficult it will be to change it in the future.

Finally, regardless of the distribution method or mechanisms, consistent application of any perceived fair and equitable system will build faculty morale and confidence in the SPO or university supporting the research endeavor.

Jeanne Ware is the Chair of the PUI Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director Office of Research Programs and Services, New College of Florida.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public or Private</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>College or Dean</th>
<th>SPO</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>65 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>48 (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, without a more rigorous exploration of the data (for instance, are institutions that distribute F&A back to PIs, Departments or Deans more or less likely to increase grantsmanship at their institution than those who do not?), this is merely anecdotal evidence. Key to getting at why an institution chooses a distribution method for recovered F&A (not factoring in if the state statutorily mandates a particular distribution for a public institution) can involve a variety of variables: how new is the research endeavor, historical distribution patterns, and what institutional leaders believe is the proper use of those funds. What is certain is that the factor which seems to impact the distribution the most, the human factor, cannot be held constant. Personalities, management styles, philosophies will always run at cross purposes regardless of the best laid (institutional) plans. Given all the dynamics, a few institutions choose to retain all indirect in the general fund by choice, while others only see it as seeding future grant endeavors and thus, distribute all or almost all the funds back to the deans, colleges and PIs. The majority of institutions however, fit somewhere in between.

Additionally, after the funds are distributed (if they are at your institution), of those who responded shared the same problem of getting those who received the funds to use it for research related activities. Again, institutional leaders, the SPO and other decision-makers coupled with a cultural and political history makes untangling and tracking fund usage problematic. The general consensus of respondents was that once a system is in place, the more difficult it will be to change it in the future.

Finally, regardless of the distribution method or mechanisms, consistent application of any perceived fair and equitable system will build faculty morale and confidence in the SPO or university supporting the research endeavor.

Jeanne Ware is the Chair of the PUI Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director Office of Research Programs and Services, New College of Florida.
Faced with shrinking budgets and the pressure to secure external dollars, all too often, we get trapped into viewing faculty grant support as being about money. It is never just about money. Rather, the work of applying for and securing external funding is more fundamentally about faculty development— that ongoing process of becoming better educators, researchers, scholars and practitioners who contribute new knowledge to their disciplines and bring greater visibility and prestige to the institution. With this view in mind, professionals working in sponsored programs administration, as well as deans, provosts, and department chairs, can promote the grants application process in ways that will benefit faculty across all disciplines and at all stages of their careers. Here are some suggestions:

First and foremost, keep the focus on the applicants and on the process as much as on the product. This is not to say that the desired outcome—a successfully funded proposal—isn’t important, but the process itself promotes professional development and benefits faculty and their projects.

Help faculty view the proposal development process as an integral part of research and as a creative activity in itself. Writing a grant application can provide faculty with the opportunity to think critically about their work and to articulate ideas more fully, as well as to identify goals, possible outcomes, and the intellectual merit of the project. Proposal development itself is a form of scholarship because it helps focus on the larger context for the project and express why it matters beyond the individual’s interest or program. In this way, proposals can serve as incentives to think clearly and in-depth about the work’s relevance. For example, a junior faculty member in English needed to write a short proposal for a library residency to conduct archival research. The application activity helped him to focus on how the chapter of his manuscript that would be based on the library’s collections related to the whole of his book. As a result of crafting the proposal, he ended up with a chapter outline and greater clarification of how the chapter fit into his overall interpretation.

In the long-term, faculty can use the proposal format to begin articulating new ideas or areas of research and to reflect on one’s own intellectual development and direction. The advanced planning necessary to apply for grants creates a timeline for professional activities, allowing faculty to chart their careers three or more years ahead. Developing such a professional plan can involve activities such as outlining a project, establishing a research agenda, an experiment or field work schedule, or a writing plan, and identifying what kinds of results (e.g., conference papers, articles, and book chapters) can be anticipated at set points in the future. Newly-tenured faculty can plan for a sabbatical year or a longer-term project, such as a translation. More senior faculty can pursue interests with broader effects, such as a science outreach program.

Encourage faculty to approach proposals as a scholarly work in progress. Because many proposals are peer-reviewed, the application process can require the same level of academic rigor needed for drafting a scholarly article or conference paper. Both share similar expectations of critical consideration and constructive feedback. This process of incorporating high levels of academic rigor can be especially important for junior faculty applying for highly competitive federal grants. As research administrators, we should encourage junior faculty to submit proposals knowing that external review may help shape their project’s development. For instance, early in her tenure-track position, a chemist applied to the National Science Foundation and to the National Institutes of Health, anticipating at least two preliminary rejections before success in getting the grant. She planned ahead and sought smaller grants from private funders while she intentionally used the process of applying to the NSF and to the NIH and getting peer review to clarify and improve both her successive proposals and the project’s structure.

Sponsored research officers can help faculty view grant activity as the basis for later work, reframing the text created for proposals for subsequent uses. A short, targeted application could become material for an article or conference paper abstract, while a longer one that describes a whole project could serve as the basis for a later book proposal. Difficult though it may be, faculty should never view grant applications as an isolated effort, but rather expect them to serve other purposes and weave them into longer-term professional development plans. Faculty can even use proposal text as draft material for third-year review or tenure files or for other forms of professional development plans. Time spent articulating ideas and trying to communicate them more clearly is not time wasted; this focus will ultimately strengthen the project. Viewing grant applications as part of a larger professional activity can help remove some of the sting of inevitable rejections.

Grant and research support can be tailored to support to all phases of faculty careers in all disciplines. Sponsored programs administrators can help to make clear the role that grants can play for junior faculty, for recently tenured faculty, and for senior faculty who may be seeking new directions or trying collaborative projects. In the case of junior faculty, whether in the humanities or the sciences, applying for a number of grants of varied types and sizes can be an important way to get their work in front of peer-review panels, which can be as much a part of career building as winning the award.

Established faculty can be more targeted in their applications, because they may already be known to the reviewers, have proven their ability to complete the proposed work, and have a successful track record of getting grants. For the established faculty at his or her mid-career, a prestigious national award can be used to leverage a promotion. The award can also lead to invitations to serve on the editorial or governing board of a prominent journal or give a lecture at a prominent event.

In a similar vein, senior faculty can use high-profile grants to secure invitations to coveted visiting professor positions or can use external funding to explore new lines of collaborative research with colleagues elsewhere, whether at a social science institute or a research lab in another country. Small colleges in rural areas may especially benefit from international grants for faculty exchanges. Proposals and the resultant grants can be another way to be an active, visible part of the profession, connect with others in or beyond the discipline, and can lead to new professional networks. For example, a senior faculty member in European Studies, in need of time more than monetary support, applied for a residency at a writer’s colony where freedom from campus and domestic obligations and interaction with other writers assisted her in revising her novel. Publication of her creative work will enable her to contribute to the literature of her native culture after decades of studying and writing about the literary contributions of others, and it will put her work before a larger audience, including a nonacademic one.

In another case, a faculty member in religious studies at a rural college who works on Native American religious rights received a...
small grant early in his career to enhance a service-learning component in one of his courses. At a grant-related conference hosted by an Ivy League research university, the religious studies faculty member made connections with colleagues from other institutions and discovered ways to become more involved with public scholarship that addresses the needs of tribal communities. During the faculty member’s leave, he sought additional training in law and identified the kinds of applied research in which he could involve his students after his return to the classroom. Grant support can have effects not only on individual faculty careers but can also enhance the relationship between faculty and the institution. The proposal planning process can be an occasion for faculty to consider the connections between their research interests and the needs and goals of the college, and to think more about what potential effects an external award would have on the institution. Will the research or project result in a new course? Will the grant add expertise in a certain area or initiate campus-wide discussions on a certain topic? Will it create outreach possibilities or lead to professional activity elsewhere and a potential for sustained collaboration? Externally funded research can provide the faculty and the administration with an opportunity to discuss the relationship between individual scholarly activities, teaching, and the broader campus climate. Grants can enable a small group of faculty to host a conference or a summer institute that brings in colleagues with a range of expertise or fund a visiting scholar who is able to assist with course development and research training for students. Similarly, grant administrators can help successful applicants see the informal mentoring potential in their activities and use their grant experiences as a way to develop internal leadership. Those who have received grants can serve on campus grant panels or do peer-to-peer advising on seeking external funding. Through such activities, faculty can talk with their colleagues about what they’ve learned through the grant application and project management process – what works and what doesn’t, administering the grant, implementing the project, reporting progress, and sustaining a positive and productive relationship with the funding agency. Sharing experiences with other faculty colleagues helps to maximize learning and deepen the kind of college culture that supports grant-seeking and creative scholarship.

In summary, as sponsored programs and research administrators, we need to be mindful of individual needs and connect with faculty on a personal basis before they begin the process of identifying and applying for grants. This prior contact makes it possible to be better prepared to help faculty navigate the entire process – when they’re ready – and keeps the focus first and foremost on individuals. The personal and professional goals of faculty are intertwined so we should always be aware that grant-seeking and success in securing external funds can have lasting effects on individuals, their departments, and the larger institution.

Sally J. Southwick is Director of Sponsored Research at Colorado College.
The Professional Development Committee (PDC) is one of three standing committees reporting to the NCURA Board of Directors and is responsible for professional and program development, program evaluation oversight, and publication oversight. In February 2006 the PDC was charged by President Laura Wade with completing the development of an on-line tutorial for mid-level managers, exploring potential opportunities for program development, and evaluation of teams for Fundamentals and SPA II.

The on-line tutorial developed for 2006 is on the topic of federal contracting, and will be offered September 18 – November 20, 2006. In addition, a preliminary list of suggested topics for 2007 has been suggested to the NCURA Board for consideration. In terms of exploring potential opportunities for program development the PDC has discussed numerous opportunities and determined that there is a strong need to formalize the education and training of research administration professionals. The impact of leading such an initiative has potential to catapult the profession (and NCURA as an organization) to a more widely respected, organized, and popular profession. This would be no small task, but could be accomplished in incremental steps, and has enormous potential for impact on the profession of research administration. Potential funding sources, partners, and suggestions on how to accomplish the initiative have been presented to the NCURA Board.

Admittedly, the last Presidential charge was the easiest of the three for the PDC to address since fact finding revealed consistent increased demand for Fundamentals offerings, and faculty teaching loads that exceeded capacity. The net result was a recommendation to the Board to establish two new Fundamental faculty teams, and more affiliate faculty to transition to a full faculty role.

Addressing the Presidential charges is only a part of what the PDC has been engaged in. In addition, the Committee develops future video workshop broadcast topics. Two new sub-committees have been formed in response to member requests for professional development and training opportunities focused on departmental research administrators and clinical trials. A stand alone workshop and on-line tutorial are currently being explored respectively by two PDC sub-committees for these important topics of special current interest to our membership.

Finally, a Financial Research Administration Workshop pilot program is scheduled for its first public offering in Boston, MA this fall with at least three additional offerings planned for 2007.

The PDC is committed to providing the very best professional development and training opportunities to research administration professionals. None of the aforementioned work could be accomplished without the hard work and dedication of all PDC members.

As Chair of the PDC it is my sincere pleasure to work with such an esteemed and talented group of peers. Each and every one of the PDC members are passionate contributing members of the PDC who have sincere interest in making the field of research administration the best it can possibly be through development of meaningful professional development and training opportunities.

Thomas J. Roberts is Chair of the Professional Development Committee and serves as the Associate Vice President for Research at Florida Gulf Coast University.

THE CURRENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS INCLUDE:

- Thomas J. Roberts, Florida Gulf Coast University
  Chair
- Susan Wyatt Sedwick, University of Texas at Austin
  Vice-chair
- Rebecca J. Balentine, Yale University
- Diane Barrett, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Dawn Boatman, University of North Florida
- Julie Cole, Georgia Southern University
- Anita Gildea-Phillips, Stanford University
- Robert Lowman, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- Peggy Lowry, Oregon State University
- Jerry Pogatshnik, Eastern Kentucky University
- Michelle J. Powell, Georgia Institute of Technology
- Olivia A. Scriven, Spelman College
- William Sharp, University of Kansas
- Deborah Smith, University of Tennessee Health Science Center
- Pamela Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington
- Thomas Wilson, City of Hope National Medical Center
- Susan Zipkin, Brigham & Women’s Hospital
In the summer of 2005, the NCURA Board of Directors convened a Leadership Convention in Philadelphia (Villanova, PA). Participating in the meeting were members of the national Board of Directors and three representatives from each region. The purpose of the Convention was three-fold: to brainstorm ways to make the NCURA experience more vital for all members, to share best-practices among the regions, and to forge stronger links between the regions and the national Board and standing committees. A number of ideas emerged from the Convention, which after review by the Board, led to some immediate actions. One immediate action was the creation of a full-time position to assist at both the regional and national level. Myrta Stager was subsequently hired as the Volunteer and Regional Assistance Coordinator. Another action resulted in quarterly teleconferences with regional and national officers.

The Board recognized that information sharing is an ongoing process and scheduled the Leadership Convention II: A Continuing Conversation in conjunction with a Governance Workshop in D.C. from July 21-22, 2006. The Governance Workshop was held July 21, 2006 and included national standing committee members and regional officers. This workshop included such topics as effective communications, membership needs, and continuing education for regional officers on the volunteer management of their regions—everything from finance to picking a meeting site to planning a spring meeting.

On the morning of July 22nd, the Leadership Convention II was held, attended by regional officers and the national Board of Directors. Where the first convention focused primarily on barriers to NCURA’s overall effectiveness as an organization, the second convention focused on strategic planning and direction setting. Attendees were guided by a professional facilitator. The results were very exciting and laid the groundwork for an ongoing discussion about how the national organization and regions can work in concert to best serve our membership.

WHY ARE WE UNDERTAKING SUCH STRATEGIC PLANNING?

- Changing demographics. NCURA’s constituency is becoming both younger and more specialized.
- Changing technology. The regions were developed at a time when global communication in an instant was not possible. As we consider our future we have to assess the structures of the organization and insure that those structures continue to serve the membership.
- Tighter budgets. It is often more cost-effective to send employees to regional meetings than national meetings.

The good news is that, as NCURA now has more than 5,000 members, the regions have an increasingly important role to play in building and maintaining a community. The biggest challenge for all of the regions appears to be the shortage of volunteers. Are there steps we can take that will help with succession planning? How can we identify and develop NCURA’s future leaders? Are current infrastructures the most appropriate? How can we best market ourselves to potential members, to our constituents, and to their bosses? Clearly there must be both evident and perceived value in what we have to offer.

These questions were foremost in our deliberations. Discussions will continue at every level – the National Board, National Standing Committees, and each Region’s Board, Committees, and Leaders. The conversation that began last year and shaped this year’s discussions will continue as we move forward.

Robert Aull, Region IV Treasurer, Fiscal Compliance Manager, Sponsored Programs, Indiana University Medical School; Diane Barrett, Region IV Chair, Assistant Director, Pre-award Services, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Ann Pollack, Region VI Chair, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Research Administration, University of California-Los Angeles; and, Marjorie Zack, Region II Treasurer, Director, Sponsored Research Services, Rochester Institute of Technology.
YOUR INSTITUTION COULD BE AT RISK

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

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

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

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

Our clients demand a different kind of success.

Sustainable success. It’s the reason why so many respected enterprises turn to the management & technology consultants at BearingPoint. Our consultants in regulatory costing and grants management work with our clients to not only think about the problems at hand but also help them roll up their sleeves and execute direct, practical solutions. For a different kind of success, turn in a new direction. Turn to BearingPoint.

For detailed case studies and perspectives on success, visit www.bearingpoint.com.
Yes, it’s powerful.  

Yes, it’s easy to use. 

And yes, it’s actually Affordable.

The only scalable Research Management solution created just for you. Only from IT Works.

It’s the first Research, Financial & HR Management solution created for colleges, universities and departments just like yours. Powerful and easy to use, it’s priced thousands below the big-box solutions. That’s because it was built from the ground up with you in mind. It easily integrates with your existing systems to handle all your pre- and post-award grant tracking and management, including compliance, time & effort tracking, cost sharing, F&A, accounting and HR cost management.

919.232.5332 | sales@itworks-inc.com | itworks-inc.com
The Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies position at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) is seeking an individual to provide vision and leadership to advance the university’s commitment to graduate education and sponsored research. The position involves leading the School of Graduate Studies and Research and working directly with the university’s six colleges and the independent IUP Research Institute. The successful candidate will have the opportunity to nurture and develop a sound and workable relationship between the graduate school and the independent IUP Research Institute, and to enhance the graduate culture and doctoral mission at IUP through the development of new graduate programs using both traditional and online modalities.

Qualifications include a doctoral degree and experience in graduate teaching and mentoring master’s and/or doctoral students and a knowledge of state, federal, corporate, and private funding agencies and procedures. Candidates must be work-eligible, communicate effectively, and perform well during the interview(s).

How to Apply: Send letter of interest and curriculum vitae or nomination to: Dr. Claire J. Dandeneau, Co-Chair, Search Committee for Vice Provost and Graduate Dean, Weyandt 305, IUP, Indiana, PA 15705. Review of applications will begin immediately and continue until the position is filled. Although the position will be open until filled, to receive full consideration, applications must be received by October 20, 2006.

IUP is a member of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education and is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer committed to excellence through diversity and through providing equal employment to minorities, females, veterans, and disabled individuals.
there’s no substitute for higher learning.*

Every college and university is faced with complex and critical challenges. How do you best address pressures, demands and expectations of stakeholders, the public and boards? How do you tap into and implement best practices and industry insights? Whom do you turn to for in-depth industry-focused advice? The best answer to those challenges is knowledge.

PricewaterhouseCoopers knows colleges and universities. We pride ourselves on over a century of experience providing tax, advisory and assurance services to top colleges and universities. We want to use that knowledge to help you achieve better ways to manage your institution.

For more information, visit us at www.pwc.com/education or send an email to us at education.nonprofit@us.pwc.com or call us toll-free at 888-272-3236.

*connectedthinking
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MAXIMUS provides Compliance/Risk Assessments to assist Universities with ensuring full adherence to federal regulations in 10 High Risk Areas involving sponsored agreements:

1. Direct Charging
2. Effort Certification
3. Cost Transfers
4. Institution-wide Compliance Monitoring Procurement
5. Service/Recharge Centers
6. Sub-recipient Monitoring
7. Cost Sharing/Matching
8. Program Income
10. Budget Revisions

**Benefits for Clients**

**Comprehensiveness**
- Major areas identified as high-risk during federal reviews
- Determination of whether University Policies/Procedures/Practices meet federal regulations

**Systemic Approach**
- Independent/objective appraisal of Institutional Compliance
- Detailed work plan overseen by experienced professionals

**Deliverables**
- Full report detailing areas of full compliance and areas for improvement
- Presentation of findings and recommendations to Institutional managers

MAXIMUS professionals have over 30 years experience as former senior managers at large research institutions — *We Know Compliance!*

**Other Software and Consulting Solutions**

- Effort Reporting System and Diagnostics
- F&A Rate Development
- Space Surveys

Contact us at:
1-800-709-2747
http://highereducation.maximus.com
48th Annual Meeting Evening Events

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2006

Banquet and Entertainment

Don’t miss the chance to hear the quick wit and intelligent observations of Paul Mecurio, a rising star on today's comedy scene! A graduate of the Georgetown Law School, Paul's experience includes writing jokes for the Tonight Show while working on Wall Street as a lawyer and investment banker, and also was a staff writer for Comedy Central's critically acclaimed comedy The Daily Show with John Stewart, for which Paul won the Emmy Award for Outstanding Individual Achievement in Writing in A Variety, Music or Comedy Program.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2006

NCURA Food Network!

NCURA and the Hilton Washington are pleased to present Chef Andre Cote, Executive Chef, in an evening designed to help you begin planning your holiday entertaining. Registrants for this program will have the opportunity to not only watch and learn how to prepare food items but, will also have the enjoyment of tasting. This program is limited to 50 people. Watch for registration information coming soon.

Monday Evening Dinner Groups

Whether you’re looking to meet new people or this is your first time dining in DC, be a part of this annual event where the ice is broken over great food and excellent company. This year the online neighborhoods will also offer dinner groups, so you can join a group of your colleagues from your sub-specialty of research administration who deal with similar daily challenges.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2006

Night of Music

Join us for our traditional Tuesday night buffet in the ballroom of the Hilton Washington at 7:00 pm. Then enjoy this year’s “buffet” of music options when NCURA presents a Night of Music.

Election Central

Tuesday, November 7 is Election Day so stop by election central to keep up on the returns as they come in! Remember to cast your absentee ballot before heading out to this year’s Annual Meeting!
NCURA Past President, Frederick Sudermann, passed away on August 9, 2006, in Wichita, Kansas. Frequently sought out for his political savvy and common sense approach to governance, Fred was instrumental in helping the NCURA Office establish its current home in the National Center for Higher Education. Fellow Region IV colleague and past president, Steve Hansen of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville remembered Fred as, “tough, insightful, and funny” Other past presidents and friends such as Ardis Savory, Emeritus Member, University of South Carolina noted, “I never had a good chance to work closely with Fred, but I always listened closely to what he said, and I watched closely what he did. I was almost always taught, encouraged, enlightened, amused, and sometimes comforted by what I saw and heard. He will be missed by hundreds of NCURA members who had the same experiences!” Eric Rude, Emeritus Member, University of Wisconsin – Madison stated, “I have been privileged to have been a colleague and GOOD FRIEND for a long time. He was a true professional as well as a fine human being. I will surely miss him!”

Sudermann joined in NCURA in 1974 and began volunteering almost immediately. He served as chair of the Nominating committee in 1977 and as a member of the Executive Committee. In 1978, while continuing to serve on the Executive Committee, he chaired NCURA’s Long Range Planning Committee and pushed to win approval of a number of their recommendations which helped cement the foundation of today’s organization. He was elected Vice President and served in that office in 1981, succeeding to the presidency the following year.

Fred Sudermann began his career at Wichita State in 1963. At the time of his death he served as senior advisor to the National Institute for Aviation Research. During his years at WSU, Fred also served as Vice President of Research and Governmental relations and senior advisor to former WSU president Eugene Armstrong. In addition, Fred served as Vice President for Governmental and Industrial Relations and Executive Assistant to former WSU president Warren Armstrong. Retired from full-time work, Fred spent a portion of his time attending to his love of art and was a talented artist with numerous sculptures and paintings to his credit.

NCURA member and past president, Steve Erickson of Boston College remembered Fred as, “… really one of a kind. He had a common sense approach to things that would serve us all well. Fred will be missed by those who knew him well and by those with whom he had a casual acquaintance. Maybe the best thing we can say about him is that, in this day and age when we need them so badly, we have lost a good person.”

He is survived by his wife, Jane, daughters, Jessica (Tim) Goodpasture, Megan (Steve) Workman; sons, Michael (Emily) Sudermann, Mark (Jean) Sudermann, Charles (Teresa) Young; grandchildren, Savannah & Josie Goodpasture, Jackson Sudermann, Ava & Mason Sudermann, Susannah, Rowan & Mia Young; sister, Dorothy Rosenboom; brothers, Dick Sudermann, George Sudermann, Jim Sudermann. Memorials have been established with Fundamental Learning Center, 917 S. Glendale, Wichita, KS 67218, W.S.U. Endowment Association, 1845 Fairmount, Wichita, KS 67260, Trees for life, 3006 W. St. Louis, Wichita, KS, 67203.

As noted in the August 11 edition of the “Wichita Eagle,” Fred was very passionate about life and living. He loved his role as ambassador for Wichita State, second only to his family and friends. His unique creativity, sense of humor, and respect for others were shared generously with his family and friends.”