A Farewell from the Co-Editor
by Peggy S. Lowry

It has been a pleasure this past year to have served as one of the Co-Editors for the NCURA Newsletter, along with Olivia Scriven, Spelman College and Bob Lowman, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Next year the Newsletter will continue under the excellent oversight of Olivia and Bob.

Our job as co-editors was relatively easy given the partnership with the national staff and the contributions from our colleagues. The Contributing Editors have been diligent in finding just the right topics to highlight for your reading pleasure. We thank these individuals for their participation:

- Susan Sedwick, University of Texas at Austin, Senior Corner
- Patricia Hawk, Oregon State University, FRA Corner
- Joyce Freedman, University of California-San Francisco, Biomedical Corner
- Kenneth Forstmeier, The Pennsylvania State University, eRA Corner
- Stephen Hansen, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Management Corner
- Toni Shaklee, Oklahoma State University, Leadership Tips
- Carol Blum, Council on Governmental Relations, Capital View

The Newsletter is yet another example of how NCURA colleagues contribute their time and expertise to each other and to our profession. As I finish my year as one of your Newsletter co-editors, I thank you for the opportunity to be part of this wonderful NCURA publication.

Peggy S. Lowry is Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Compliance at Oregon State University.

COMMUNICATE, ADVOCATE, EDUCATE...These three powerful action verbs encompass everything research administrators do. Activities derived from these words reinforce many of the services we provide our faculty, partners and institutions. The three are completely intertwined.

To COMMUNICATE means to be open and honest in our interactions with ALL our partners. Only through communication can we understand each other’s roles and responsibilities, educate those around us, and advocate for both our profession and our organizations.

continued on page 14

See pages 18-19 for a recap of the NCURA 48th Annual Meeting!
It is a privilege and an honor to be recognized with this award and to be among the company of a distinguished group of previous recipients of the Outstanding Achievement Award from NCURA. I am grateful to Steve [Hansen] and other NCURA friends and colleagues who supported my nomination. And, to my boss at The University of Chicago, Deputy Provost Keith Moffat, who must have been channeling my mother when he wrote his letter of support.

As my bio confesses, I trained as a chemist, but with extraordinary good fortune I found myself, in 1974, the stereotypical trailing spouse at the same time that SUNY-Binghamton (now called Binghamton University) posted a temporary position for a “Sponsored Programs Development Officer.” I had no idea what that was, but there was some urgency to repackage my credentials and explore an alternative career.

At a smaller campus like SUNY-Binghamton I got to know individual research programs on a personal level. One of my first meetings was to help an assistant professor from anthropology to prepare his NSF application. He explained his proposed field research in some Latin American country and I scanned his draft budget. “Bribes to local officials” jumped out. Too much information, I suspected. “How about ‘local access permits?’” This began a long and still ongoing process of learning from faculty what it takes to support their scholarship and how they think about getting their research programs going, keeping them productive and, of course, keeping them funded. Their enthusiasm and curiosity was and has remained contagious.

Albert Einstein is purported to have said: “I have no special talents. I am only passionately curious.” If his career change from postal worker to physicist hadn’t worked out, I suggest that Einstein would have made a great research administrator.

As research administrators we have the advantage of working with intelligent, occasionally eccentric people who are committed to the value of education and whose day job advances the creation and dissemination of knowledge. Those people may be on the campus or in the agencies whose funds support research, education and public service.

We are, and should be, challenged by confronting problems and finding solutions by thinking about them differently. Albert Einstein said: “The significant problems we face cannot be solved at the same level of thinking we were at when we created them.” How did Al know about Grants.gov?

Just as our faculty members do, research administrators must commit to continuous learning to keep up with the evolution of science and changing demands of scholarship. Charles Darwin also must have been a research administrator at heart, when he said: “It is not the strongest of the species that survives, nor the most intelligent, but the one most responsive to change.”

Have you noticed in our institutions that we are often advocates of change? Assessing risk and taking chances with new ways of doing things is research – and in effect we are risk and change managers. As my friend Einstein said: "If we knew what it was we were doing, it would not be called research, would it?" Truthfully, I think I’ve become a research junkie.

And we seem to have fun along the way. I believe Dale Carnegie got it right when he said: “People rarely succeed unless they have fun in what they are doing.”

In receiving the Outstanding Achievement award last year, Steve Hansen spoke eloquently and from the heart about the core value of integrity in research administration and in research administrators. I would offer that another core value is trust. We only have credibility in our jobs to the extent that we are trusted – by our faculty, our colleagues on and off campus and our counterparts in agencies. Without confidence and a knowledge base about what we are doing, we will not be trusted. So, integrity and trust are reinforced through education. Listening, learning, questioning, sharing and teaching – these behaviors engender integrity and trust.

This life as a research administrator is consistently unpredictable, sometimes frustrating, but always changing. It makes demands on you to pay attention, to value and learn from everyone with whom you have the opportunity to interact. Don’t expect knowledge to fall from the ceiling in your own little cubby. This is a people profession – we need one another to do our jobs well.

Einstein did not say, but probably because he just hadn’t met the right auditors yet, “Not everything that counts can be counted, and not everything that can be counted counts.” It is purported to have been a sign on his office wall at Princeton. Nevermind; it is another core value of research administrators – understanding
that our role is to support scholarship and academic values as something that counts even when it can’t be counted. Although intellectual leadership (or as we often call it at The University of Chicago, “the life of the mind”) arises with the faculty, the mission of our institutions could not be accomplished without an infrastructure of research administrators who share that commitment to knowledge creation and dissemination.

There is a certain resonance of the fates in this year ending in ‘6’ that I can’t avoid. In 1976 (yes, I know some of you weren’t even born then, and faculty had only just discovered federal funds came with terms and conditions), I attended my first NCURA meeting. It was held at the Capitol Hilton at 16th and K just a couple of breaths away from the White House. Attendees numbered around 250. In every session I took reams of notes. I was in awe of people who knew so much about subjects that barely were in my vocabulary and used terminology that clearly was in an obscure dialect of English. I was in the presence of experts, and I was soaking up information. I was observing professionalism in my new career.

Just ten years later in 1986, I had the privilege of serving as NCURA’s 21st president. I was an experienced meeting attendee by then. But in those ten years, the most significant thing I did was learn to value volunteering and, through NCURA, to participate in shaping continuous professional development in research administration.

Today we begin NCURA’s 48th Annual Meeting, with Kathleen Larmett advising that NCURA now has 6000 members and over 2000 members in attendance at this meeting.

I would ask your indulgence for some personal notes. I have a special loyalty to Region II where I first began to learn what research administrators do on a daily basis. Shortly after I met Nancy Greenberg, then Director of Sponsored Programs at New York University, she urged me to get involved in NCURA by serving on Region II’s Steering Committee. It was a start with volunteering that has led to wonderful friendships, opportunities to personally get to know my “kindred spirits” (as Dick Seligman and Anne of Green Gables would say) at other institutions, in federal agencies and across the breadth of duties that are swept into the profession of research administration. Nancy has been a mentor and friend of lasting duration, and I am grateful that she is here today so that I can publicly thank her for many years of wise counsel.

I have had the benefit of spending my professional life in Regions II and IV. After 14 years in Binghamton, I moved “out west” – at least as far as New Yorkers are concerned. I returned to my Midwestern roots in Region IV, first at The Ohio State University and since 1994 at The University of Chicago.

In 2000, with my friends Jane Youngers and Jerry Fife, I participated in one of NCURA’s satellite broadcasts on the ever popular subject of indirect costs. In fact we went so far as to call it “Indirect Costs for the Lay Audience.” When I told my mother I was going to be on TV, she expected to find me on CNN or at least C-SPAN. When I finally confessed that I had a tape of the broadcast, Mom not only watched the whole video, she even pretended that she had some notion of what we were all talking about.

This summer my mother passed away and my deepest regret is that she isn’t here to share this wonderful recognition from NCURA, my colleagues, peers, and friends. But members of my family and my extended family including my goddaughter are here this morning. I thank them for being here and celebrating this recognition with me.

Success as a research administrator isn’t measured by outstanding achievements. John Ruskin said, “The highest reward for a person’s work is not what they get for it, but what they become because of it.”

From my heart, I thank NCURA for this recognition today.

Mary Ellen Sheridan is Associate Vice President for Research, University of Chicago.
At some point in our careers, there has been a supervisor that truly heard what we said when we provided input or suggestions for improvement (in some cases, we WERE that supervisor). Unfortunately, this tends to be the exception rather than the rule. In order to be effective, a leader must know how to listen. While this sounds simple in theory, it often proves quite difficult in practice for leaders, depending on their individual personality traits and time commitments/constraints.

The following is provided as guidance for those willing to tackle the “listening” challenge.

1. **A LEADER SHOULD SEEK INPUT.** Ask those with whom you work to share their thoughts and ideas about the direction you are setting for your staff, office, department, etc. People value the opportunity to offer input which often leads to their “buy in” for an idea. A leader must, however, be sincere in their request for input.

2. **A LEADER MUST WANT TO LISTEN.** If you are not interested in what others are saying, you will not adequately focus on what is being said. In this case, both curiosity and empathy are important factors in successful listening. For leaders who adhere to what Belasco and Stayer call the “head buffalo” leadership paradigm—where it is their job to plan, organize, command, coordinate and control—they may hear what is being said to them, but they are not truly listening. Even worse for a true leader is believing that he/she has all of the answers and does not need to seek, or listen to, input from his/her coworkers or staff. If you do not want to listen to input from others then do not ask for it. A word of caution for this approach, your staff will happily stand by the side of the road as they watch you walk off the cliff into the abyss of failure.

3. **A LEADER MUST “ACTIVELY” LISTEN.** When you are listening to an employee or coworker, are you automatically formulating a response while they are still talking? Even worse, are you preparing your list of “things to do” in your head, checking e-mail, looking at your watch, or answering your phone? If so, you are not actively listening. Active listening requires that you focus your attention on what is being said, not what your response will be. If someone has enough respect to bring their thoughts, concerns and ideas to you, it is your responsibility as a leader to actively listen to them. After they have finished speaking, you can work collaboratively to develop a solution or a plan to address their concern or input. This is very difficult for many people.

4. **HEARING VS. LISTENING.** The following summary from the Management Strategies Newsletter by Melissa Shaw, Network World, 09/09/031, is an excellent portrayal of what many of us do to those who are trying to have us listen to what they are saying. Try not to be the one who hears, but the one who empathetically listens.

“When it comes to the similarities between listening and hearing, the only one is you use your ears for both. After that, they’re very different. For instance, have you ever had an employee come in your office and you’re on the computer? You’re busy, you’ve got stuff to do, so while they stand there and talk to you, your body is facing the computer, your eyes are on the computer and an ear, or maybe two, is devoted to the poor soul on the other side of your desk. Aside from the abominable body language you’re displaying (‘What I’m doing on the computer is more important than you’) you’re probably not really listening to what the person’s telling you.

Next time you’re in a conversation with someone, or overhearing another, see how many times one party interrupts the other before he or she is finished speaking. Check yourself if you get the urge to jump in before the other person is through. We’re such a microwave, drive-thru, high-speed society these days; we’re rush-rush-rush, even when it comes to the art of conversation.

To improve your responsive listening skills, management expert Don Andersson suggests you recap what the person says after he or she is through speaking to ensure you got it right, a la, “Here’s what I’ve heard you say, tell me what I may have heard inaccurately.” “Most people will be really open to that,” he says. “Most want to know you’ve really listened, whether you’ve agreed or not.”

Then there’s the skill of listening for what’s not said. If you think a person is holding back or is not stating everything he or she wants, respond with a simple “Like…” “Because…” or “And…”. “Frequently I can use a word like ‘because’ and shut up and listen to them.” Andersson says.

Robert Holm is Director, Institute for Research and Scholarship, Butler University. Tony Ventimiglia is Contract Administrator III, Auburn University. They are both alumni of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute.

---


**Remember:**

*Listen to advice and accept instruction and in the end you will be successful…*
Those of you who were fortunate enough to attend the NCURA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC were treated to Tim Russert, news journalist from the weekly television program Meet the Press. Mr. Russert presented to the audience what he thought might be the issues that would swing the 2006 elections in favor of one party or the other. On the top of this list was the use of embryonic stem cells in research. As we all were riveted to the national elections this year, and watched the campaigns of many of the close political races across the nation, we saw time and again the debate surrounding the ethics of the use of stem cells in research, especially embryonic cell lines.

Had the Republican Party kept the majority of power in both houses, the stem cell issues would only be important to those of us who are employed in states that have laws allowing the use of embryonic stem cell research – California, New York, and New Jersey, among others. We would be, as we are currently, trying to figure out how not to co-mingle federal funding with state funding and how to keep the equipment, supplies, and even facilities apart. As trivial as this seems, it has been occupying an enormous amount of our time and energy. We have been required to set up oversight committees, often referred to as ESCRO committees, to assure the proper use of the cell lines. Once again, adding to the ever increasing unfunded mandates and bureaucracy for the research community.

But, the Democratic Party took control of both the House and Senate, and the Speaker-in-waiting of the House of Representatives, Nancy Pelosi, has declared that she will do everything in her power to reverse the federal government’s current restrictions on stem cell research. So, now it is everyone’s issue to watch.

What are the issues? Why the interest? The social and political concerns about stem cell research are outlined in a booklet entitled “Stem Cells and Public Policy” authored by Richard Hayes of the Center for Genetics and Society published by the Century Foundation Press in 2006. Hayes and colleagues assert that although much of the public debate has focused on differences about the acceptability of destroying human embryos, there are those who are equally concerned about particular aspects of the research process and the potential for social and political consequences and fallout. The authors identify six other “issues” surrounding the debate. I will copy freely from this manuscript in an attempt to outline the issues.

[1] ACCESSIBLE AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE
Therapeutic applications are likely to be very expensive. According to Hayes, individualized treatments using stem cell therapies can cost at least $100,000 per patient, per treatment. Egg retrieval alone is estimated to cost over $20,000 per procedure. So the potential for a cure is there but not affordable for the majority.

[2] PATENT AND OWNERSHIP ISSUES
Who owns the research results? Who owns the patents on the stem cell lines? The Patent Office has issued more than 750 patents that mention stem cells in their abstracts, and over a thousand more applications are pending. Could your stem cells – if used in research and are unique – be owned by someone else?

[3] CONSUMERIST EUGENICS AND OTHER ABUSES
Not knowing the meaning of eugenics I looked it up. Eugenics is a social philosophy which advocates the improvement of human hereditary traits through various forms of intervention. The purported goals have variously been to create healthier, more intelligent people, save society’s resources, and lessen human suffering. The question posed by Hayes, et al is “… will technologies be used for socially unacceptable purposes such as ‘designer babies’ without appropriate oversight and regulations?”

[4] WOMEN AS EGG PROVIDERS
Women’s eggs are the critical “raw materials” for embryonic stem cell research. If individualized stem cell therapies are developed for common degenerative conditions such as heart disease, arthritis, and Parkinson’s, the potential for a commercial market for eggs might exploit economically vulnerable women.

[5] OVER-PROMISING RESULTS
There are numbers of scientists and other supporters of stem cell research and cloning that have made highly exaggerated claims about the likelihood of treatments and cures. Unrealistic hopes could cause a backlash of public support.

[6] INTEGRITY IN SCIENCE
Is stem cell research proceeding in a manner and in an environment that is highly conducive to undermining the research’s integrity and that of bio-medical research? The South Korean cloning scandal is a recent and notable instance of the manner in which scientific integrity can be compromised.

In addition, the competition among cities, states and countries to develop research centers and the laws prohibiting stem cell research in other regions have causes researchers to relocate in order to conduct studies in their fields. Additionally, there is the desire of some researchers to publish quick results, creating poor scholarship and the potential to falsify results, which can cause distrust of bio-medical science. Finally, the lack of consistent social and political policies surrounding the use of stem cells creates confusion and lack of appropriate oversight for the field of study.

On the other hand, stem cell research and its applications hold enormous scientific and medical promise. We have just begun to see the power. The current political environment in the US makes researching the potential technologies and therapies a challenge. However, as with any new cutting edge science, we need to educate the population about the realities and the concerns. The public debates involving the use of stem cells in research and therapeutics are reminiscent of the early days of blood transfusions and organ transplants. The concerns then were heartfelt and real. Now these procedures are standard of care.

By the size of the Democratic victory in the 2006 elections, I am of the opinion that embryonic stem cell research is here to stay and will be a strong influence in our futures. As long as we understand the concerns...let the research begin!

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

“BOSS.” The word, laden with implications, sounds harsh. We use it in such expressions as “boss around,” “boss man,” “check with the boss,” and “bossy.” Even the origins sound harsh, since “boss” comes from a Dutch word for “master” — and who among us hasn’t felt the pinch of being subservient to the boss?

A boss-employee relationship can be extremely complex. Stress is built into the relationship. But in order to minimize the stress and negotiate the complexity of the relationship, we must learn to communicate effectively with the boss. How does one do that? How does one bridge the power gulf?

In many ways, communicating with a boss is no different from communicating with anyone. Effective communication always requires understanding the content and character of the message itself, the purpose of the message, and the needs of the audience. With the boss, as with anyone, we must ask what our goals are with the communication, and, perhaps most importantly, what are the boss’s needs. Here are some simple recommendations to follow when communicating with the boss.

KEEP COMMUNICATION PROFESSIONAL

Relationships, including professional relationships, have an inherent personal component. Professional relationships are no exception, although they always balance toward business factors. In a professional relationship with the boss, always monitor the degree of personal information exchanged between you. Generally, it’s wise to let the boss take the lead in establishing the balance.

Even then, remember that the bottom line is always professionalism. Keep limits on personal information. And anytime you speak personally, be ready to cut it off and return to business. The professional obligation is the only constant in a boss-employee relationship.

UNDERSTAND YOUR MUTUAL NEEDS

The boss and the employee have a symbiotic relationship. Each depends on the other. The boss needs information that is complete, accurate and timely. In the Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP), where information is specialized and highly technical, the employee may have skills or information that the boss does not, enhancing the employee’s value to the boss and the OSP team. Conversely, the employee depends on the boss for resources, interconnectedness to the university, to other agencies, and to the larger global picture. The boss and the employee hold a key to each other’s professional success.

ORGANIZE YOUR COMMUNICATION

Employees communicating with the boss should take care in organizing the communication. Bosses in the OSP are often under severe time pressures. To utilize time efficiently, the employee should prepare the message, at least mentally. First, state the central point before explaining it. Put the key piece of information in the lead position. For example, “There’s a question whether we’re in compliance with the NIH policy on human subjects,” or “Dr. Penoyer missed our deadline for Grants.gov submissions,” or “I have a family problem and I need to be out of the office tomorrow.” Second, be so prepared that you can state the essential content with maximum economy. Put the essence in a single, brief sentence. Third, provide supporting information as needed and at the boss’s discretion.

ANTICIPATE THE BOSS’S NEEDS

When presenting information the boss has requested, the employee’s choices should be guided by the boss’s needs and by the boss’s preferences of style. Ask these basic questions:

• What information does the boss need to be effective?
• What calendar issues drive the boss’s need?
• What are the boss’s expectations about information provided by employees?

Before you meet with the boss, do your homework. Be thorough. Organize yourself by learning what the boss needs, and the timeline on which he or she needs it. Anticipate questions the boss may ask about presentations. Will the boss need financial data? If so, how much information and in what form? Will the boss need to read a section of a proposal? Have it available. If action is likely, anticipate implications of the information; or, if push comes to shove, what’s the fallout? For example, if the principal investigator won’t submit a Grants.gov proposal by the deadline, what are the workload implications for OSP staffers? Whether or not the boss asks for that input, you enhance your communication if you have possibilities in mind. If action is called for in a report, anticipate outcomes of the action.

In responding to the boss, be sure you know the boss’s style preferences. Does the boss prefer summaries or detailed reports? Should reports be written or oral? If the material is written, the boss has an opportunity to review at her discretion. If the material is presented orally, she can ask follow-up questions on the spot. Each style has implications for quantity of information you should include, for a timeline to prepare the report, and for the possibility that you must prepare follow-up reports. You may have to alter your own presentational preferences to suit the boss.

KNOW THE BOSS’S MANAGERIAL STYLE

Does the boss delegate or does she give directives? In general, the boss who delegates wants the employee to assume responsibility for problem-solving. A report to this boss should be relatively global and conceptual, featuring essentials only. The boss who issues directives is more likely a hands-on manager who wants details, and who will be actively involved in your daily decisions.

These style differences have implications for timing. The delegating boss usually prefers information on a regular meeting cycle, with the exception of special needs and crises. The directive boss wants information as it is available and wants to be involved in active decision making. Finally, some bosses listen passively as you present information, but others will be more proactive, asking for clarification and further details. Always know what your boss needs and be prepared to provide it.
Regardless of the boss’s style, be careful to suggest solutions without insisting on them. Remember that the boss has an obligation to run the office, so protect yourself by not taking decisions personally. And remember that the boss needs to hear all information, both good and bad. The boss cannot function, cannot properly act, when important information is withheld.

**PREPARE FULLY WHEN MAKING A PITCH TO THE BOSS**

When the employee is approaching the boss, these questions can serve as a guide:

- What do I need from the boss?
- To address my request, what information will the boss need from me?

If you offer a suggestion to the boss, prepare and organize. State the suggestion up front, then give justifications for making it. If background is required before you state the suggestion, keep it extremely brief. Always be prepared to discuss the downside of your suggestion – as well as the upside – and prepare for every question you can anticipate. Once you make the initial pitch, give room for the boss to respond. Follow the boss’s lead. It’s a good practice to keep yourself somewhat disengaged, rather than to become too ego-involved. The decision should rest with the boss, or you wouldn’t be presenting it to the boss in the first place.

In conclusion, communication between an employee and the boss is colored by differences in responsibility and authority. Each person is essential to the proper functioning of the office, and each depends on the other. It’s easy for an employee to see the boss’s dependence on the employee, but do not overlook your dependence on the boss. As an employee, work to support your boss, the office and the institution. To help your communication with the boss, identify the biggest issues before you, and solve them. That calls for each employee to work closely and collaboratively with the OSP team. As head of the team, your boss deserves your most careful and thorough communication. But remember that the biggest single reason people change jobs is unhappiness with the boss.

*Kim Moreland is the Director, Research and Sponsored Programs at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and Kennis Wessel is a freelance writer.*

---

**eRAcorner**

**eRA from a Research Hospital’s Perspective**

_by Tolliver McKinney_

Editors’ Note: All of us, irrespective of institutional size, mission, and focus, are impacted by the need to integrate electronic processes and tools into how we do business. This article focuses on the particular efforts of St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital.

St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital receives the majority of its financial support from ALSAC, the fund-raising organization that has been linked to the hospital since our inception in 1957. But like other non-profit organizations, we must also be able to readily identify, compete for and appropriately administer research funding from outside sources. The ability to secure such funding is critical to fulfilling the St. Jude mission of advancing cures and means of prevention of pediatric catastrophic diseases through research and treatment. This mission is based on the vision of the hospital’s founder, Danny Thomas, that no child would be turned away because of inability to pay. In order to fulfill the St. Jude mission, while also ensuring sufficient funding for research and treatment, our senior management encourages investigators to seek both federal and private grant funding. The Grants and Contracts Management Office (GCMO) supports these efforts by giving investigators access to an electronic data warehouse of potential funding sources. Investigator access to the data warehouse, combined with other electronically-mediated processes, has become a part of the St. Jude business model over the past decade. This article will highlight our efforts in the area of Electronic Research Administration (eRA).

**EARLY eRA EFFORTS** In response to the Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA) Public Law 105-277, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) now receives and processes grant proposals electronically. St. Jude was an early participant in the NIH effort. In 1999, we began using NIH Commons, first participating in the pilot of the electronic Streamlined Non-competing Award Process (eSNAP) and later in the electronic Competitive Grant Application Process (eCGAP).

The eCGAP pilot exposed both the GCMO staff and faculty to changes in the format of each project plan, and the many other modifications that are currently required on all federal electronic applications submissions. As a means of shoring-up competencies, the Grants and Contracts Management Office at St. Jude’s developed hands-on training sessions for investigators and their administrative associates using the NIH Commons online Demo system. Provisions were made for new hires and for one-on-one training of personnel who were not able to attend the scheduled classes. In addition, we schedule quarterly “Lunch and Learn” sessions during which many eRA topics are presented. We’ve offered sessions focused on funding opportunities, use of search engines, NIH eRA Commons, eSNAP, eCGAP, and the NIH plan to transition from paper PHS-398 grant applications to the SF424 R&R electronic submissions through Grants.gov. In fact, the early engagement eCGAP technologies and processes proved invaluable in our migration to Grants.gov.

For the past few years, St. Jude faculty and staff have been preparing all qualifying NIH non-competing continuation progress reports electronically. Our GCMO team then submits them electronically. By partnering with one of the NIH Commons, Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) team members, we prepared and submitted a number of PHS-398 new and competitive grant applications using NIH’s electronic eCGAP.

**COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER eRA SYSTEMS** St. Jude also has developed in-house systems and processes that are compatible with those at the NIH. For example, St. Jude faculty regularly participate in NIH study sections where each reviewer receives an electronic copy of the application that includes images, photos, tables and other illustrations. While copies of traditional paper submissions often provide reviewers with low-resolution black-and-white copies of illustrations, the electronic images are uniformly clear.

Many systems for the electronic submission incorporate checks that help investigators avoid many common errors that, unaddressed before submission, can lead to problems and/or delays in the grant submission and funding process. The benefits associated with reducing funding delays are obvious.

PubMed is another useful electronic research support tool (a service provided by the U.S. National Library of Medicine) that includes more than 16 million citations of biomedical articles dating from the 1950s. PubMed includes links to full-text articles and related resources. Many investigators use PubMed to access journals and citations electronically.

*continued on next page*
Often, investigators write grants as if they were writing articles for journals, using software such as Reference Manager or Endnote – the two most popular such tools at St. Jude. Investigators can use the software to annotate their article or grant and insert the references in the required format. While grants usually don’t have any format guidelines, research journals do. Changes in a manuscript being written for submission to such a journal can throw the entire document out of alignment. In such cases, all that is needed is to rerun the software to reformat the entire document – a great time-saving device for investigators.

ST. JUDE’S INTERNAL eRA ENVIRONMENT A major goal at St. Jude is to create translational research collaborations between basic researchers and clinicians. The goal of such collaborations is to facilitate the translation of laboratory discoveries into new clinical drugs, diagnostic techniques, and treatment protocols that improve the outcomes of children who have catastrophic diseases. This process requires close interaction between basic scientists and clinicians. These interactions are facilitated by software systems that enable the sharing of documents and images. Additionally, email has proved an invaluable tool for asynchronous collaboration.

The Clinical Research Administration (CRA) office participates in collaborations between St. Jude and institutions with which our institutions share clinical protocols. The collaboration begins with a site’s investigators, which occurs prior to patient enrollment. During this videoconference, clinicians at both sites review all relevant clinical and regulatory documents regarding the protocol. The CRA office manages the use of St. Jude protocols by other institutions. The office electronically tracks a protocol modifications and amendments to protocols, and this information to collaborating sites. The office also ensures that each protocol has received Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval and retains current status letters on file.

OTHER eRA INITIATIVES AT ST. JUDE St. Jude is now in the process of configuring and implementing a new pre-award Grant Management System that will enable us to electronically submit grant applications to all federal and non-federal agencies. The pre-award system will reduce our investigators’ administrative burdens and eliminate redundancies in data entry during the preparation and management of their grant applications. It will also interface with our production post-award financial/payroll/personnel system. Applications will be routed electronically for institutional approval. Ultimately, applications will be transmitted system-to-system to funding agencies.

The pre-award system will reduce some of the reporting from our post-award system and provide a user-friendly report generator. Implementation of the grants pre-award system will involve systematic training across the campus. Therefore, we are developing a training schedule for all phases of the grant application process. Each grant and contract administrator will train the departments and sections under his or her jurisdiction. During the design and development phase of our pre-award system, we are also working on detailed instructions tailored to our investigators and staff.

Until our pre-award Grants Management System is in place, St. Jude is preparing and submitting SF424 R&R applications using the PureEdge solution through Grants.gov, as NIH continues to convert each grant mechanism.

CURRENT CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES TO EXCEL Our enterprise post-award financial/payroll/personnel system has been in full production for several years. The transition from paper to electronic submission has increased some aspects of investigator workload. For instance, currently investigators must separate their project plan sections A–F into separate, uploadable sections along with other SF424 R&R requirements.

One of our biggest clinical challenges is managing budgets when we have patient care costs covered by grants. If an investigator has an R01 grant that requires recruitment of participants, all patient care costs are directly related to grant participation. In an environment like St. Jude, there is an overlap between research and treatment since many of the children are treated on research protocols. Keeping track of those costs is a major challenge. However, our system permits electronic ordering and billing, which allows us to more easily track those costs. For example, we have developed a system that allows us to customize billing for tests that are specific to each protocol allowing us to capture all the costs incurred for specific protocols.

In the future, we plan to establish electronic coordination with our Institutional Review Board and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee to enable pre-award processing of applications and post-award reporting. The Office for Human Research Protections requires that our IRB review grant applications that involve human subject activities at the Just-In-Time (JIT) phase of an application’s progress. Our pre-award system will provide e-mail notification to the IRB that a grant is in the JIT phase and will request IRB review of the application. After the IRB meets and files its finding, the system will update the application with the appropriate review date and notify the principal investigator and GCMO to submit the JIT documentation electronically, freeing the application to be processed.

Protocols for research applications that include vertebrates are identified and their approval dates are reviewed. The GCMO verifies and records the status of each protocol during the JIT phase. After the required review and approval processes are completed, GCMO electronically sends the required JIT to the funding agency.

CONCLUSION GCMO strives to keep up with the ever-changing demands being placed on the use of eRA tools. Three of the five current grant and contract administrators, as well as the GCMO director, are CRA certified. Two other grant and contract administrators were scheduled to take the exam in October. We are also adding an information technology supervisor (in addition to our information technology coordinator) and a sixth grants and contracts administrator, who will specialize in subcontract management.

Our institution is also a member in the NIH Commons Working Group and the Federal Demonstration Partnership. Our participation in these groups allows us to be informed, involved and knowledgeable, while having a voice in policy and procedures as they are developed and modified at the federal level.

Our goal is to streamline the grant application process, while saving time, paper and space. It is an important goal for the institution and our investigators that we stay on the cutting edge of electronic research administration.

Tolliver McKinney is the Information Technology Coordinator, Grant and Contract Management Office, St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital.
In the last issue of NCURA Newsletter, my colleague, Pat Hawk, Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Compliance at Oregon State University, explained that almost everything she learned in research administration she learned as a department administrator. This month, I take my turn as a person who first learned about research administration as a central administrator.

Like Pat, I have been amazed at how quickly someone who works in one area of research administration can pick up on the important details in other areas of the job. I have been lucky enough to hire accountants who have worked as departmental research administrators and moved into central positions. Their knowledge of the research mission and the relationships they had with principal investigators at the department level made it easier for them to understand their roles as facilitators in interpreting rules and regulations. The opportunity to start in one area of research administration and move to the other definitely works to your advantage. It is clear that no matter on which “side” you begin your career, those experiences help to make you a more well-rounded administrator.

I started my career in research administration in the Office of Contract and Grant Accounting (OCGA) at the University of Maryland, College Park. There I learned first hand the importance of interpreting and following government regulations and fully understanding the implications of audits. Moreover, I was fortunate enough to be involved in the Facilities and Administrative (F&A) calculation and negotiation. The experience taught me that what Department Administrators do every day in their jobs affects the financial picture of the university.

The position in the central office gave me the opportunity to work on an incredible array of issues from sponsors of all types. Working to resolve problems forced me to become knowledgeable about terms and conditions of sponsored projects from not just the federal government but state and local governments, as well as foundations and other non-profits. Because departmental administrators would often call with complicated questions, I had no choice but to read and re-read the OMB Circulars and other regulations just to be sure that I understood how to answer the questions. Since I was involved in the F&A rate calculation, I found that I could actually explain to researchers what they were paying for when those indirect costs were charged to their awards.

Perhaps the most valuable lesson I learned in central administration is how to work with the audit community. There is nothing like an audit to force you to look at your business practices and review how things are really being done on campus. However painful some of those audits might have been, I can honestly say that I learned from each and every one of them. Auditors have pointed me to little known regulations I never knew existed. They have offered suggestions on improving practices centrally, as well as on campus, and have helped to strengthen the awareness of compliance with sponsor’s terms and conditions.

About four years ago, I changed jobs and became an administrator for a large research center at the University of Maryland. I found out very quickly that it’s not as easy as it looks to manage the daily operations of a research department, and I also agree with Pat Hawk when she talks about the passion of the PIs. She is right, it is contagious!

The opportunity to start in one area of research administration and move to the other definitely works to your advantage.

I believe that my experience in central administration was essential to the success of setting up the new center. The in-depth knowledge I gained about University policies and procedures made it very easy to establish practices in the Center. In addition, I was able to take advantage of the many relationships I had developed as a central administrator. I continue to use these contacts as my “advisory board” for all types of administrative issues including personnel policies, finance and facilities management.

The knowledge I gained in my role as a central administrator helps me every day in my new job. I am still asked hard questions. But I am armed with my dog-eared copies of the Circulars, the FAR and of course the sponsor agreements that make up my center awards. More importantly, I have a rolodex filled with names of people who can help me find the answers. These contacts are not just on my campus, they are colleagues from across the country that I have come to rely on for advice and counsel.

What I know for sure is that no matter where you start in this profession, you have the opportunity to begin building a foundation that will help you throughout your career.

Ann M. Holmes is the Chief Financial Officer, Center for Advanced Study of Language, University of Maryland College Park.
Steps to Preserve the ‘Safe Harbor’

In an effort by the United States Congress to encourage collaborative research between industry and academia, the Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement Act of 2004 (CREATE Act) was passed. The CREATE Act amends existing law to permit the patenting of inventions that result from collaborative research if (1) the collaborators do not have an obligation to assign their patent rights to a common entity (e.g., an organization created to manage the collaboration) and (2) the collaborators have shared non-public information with each other that might be considered a pre-existing invention (e.g., referred to as “prior art”). But, the protections of the CREATE Act only exist if the invention was made under the provisions of a written joint research agreement and are in a field covered by the statement of work contained in that agreement. The CREATE Act can be applied to any patent granted on or after December 10, 2004, and, unless otherwise contractually agreed upon by the parties, can be invoked by any one of the collaborators.

While the “safe harbor” provided under the CREATE Act can benefit universities engaged in collaborative research, it is paramount that research administrators be aware of what constitutes a joint research agreement under the Act and know how to draft and administer agreements to optimize the benefits (and limit any unintended consequences) afforded research institutions under the CREATE Act.

WHAT CONSTITUTES A PATENTABLE INVENTION?

As codified in federal law (see 35 USC 101-103), in order for an invention to be patentable it must, among other things, be useful, novel and non-obvious. To have utility, an invention must be capable of achieving a useful result, either implicitly or explicitly. An invention is considered novel if it was not publicly available prior to the filing of a patent application or the expiration of a “grace period” provided by some countries. For example, the United States provides for the filing of a patent application up to one year after public disclosure of the invention. As long as an application claiming the invention is filed prior to the end of this one year grace period, the invention is considered to be novel. But even if an invention is useful and novel, it may not be patentable if it is judged to be obvious to someone skilled in that field of research.

BRIEF HISTORY LEADING UP TO THE CREATE ACT

Prior to 1984, courts had ruled that a pre-existing invention should be treated as “prior art” when considering the patentability of a later invention if the earlier invention was made by another employee of the same organization, even if the earlier invention had never been made public. Those court decisions had resulted in some later inventions made by different employees in the same organization being ruled un-patentable. In 1984, Congress amended §103 in the Patent Law Amendments Act of 1984 to try to solve the problem. Under this Amendment, a new sentence was added to provide that an invention developed by another person which qualifies as prior art would not preclude patentability of that later invention; provided that such invention was owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same entity at the time the invention was made.

In historical context, this addition was intended to protect patent rights when fellow employees in the same organization were collaborating. The amended wording possibly had unintended consequences, as seen by the court’s decision in OddzOn Products, Inc. v. Just Toys, Inc.

OddzOn held a design patent on its “Vortex” football and claimed that Just Toys’ “Ultra Pass” football infringed its patent and trade rights. Just Toys counter-claimed that the OddzOn patent was invalid because two separate designs from third parties, that is collaborators not employed by OddzOn, had been disclosed to the inventor of the “Vortex” ball under confidentiality provisions and such disclosures constituted “secret prior art.” The Federal Circuit indicated that, in fact, the sharing of confidential information by researchers from more than one organization during an inventive collaboration could render an invention as obvious, and thus non-patentable, if the researchers did not have an obligation to assign their rights to one common entity prior to the inventive collaboration.

THE CREATE ACT

CREATE builds upon the 1984 and 1999 amendments to §103 to address the issue of “no common ownership” raised by the OddzOn decision in order to protect potential patent rights when an invention benefits from the confidential exchange of information by one or more collaborating parties, but only if the invention resulted from activities specifically covered under the terms of a written joint research agreement that was in effect prior to the discovery. It has been argued that the CREATE Act’s impact on collaborative research may be minimal, because it is limited to situations where non-public communications have taken place. But, it is still extremely important for research administrators to understand what constitutes a joint research agreement, how the term “field” may require added diligence when there is a change to the scope of work of a research effort and the implication the wording of such agreements may have on one’s intellectual property.

According to the Act, a joint research agreement is “a written contract, grant, or cooperative agreement entered into by two or more persons or entities for the performance of experimental, developmental, or research work in the field of the claimed invention.” In addition to sponsored research agreements, it is foreseeable that such documents as licenses, material transfer agreements (MTAs), inter-institutional agreements, equipment lease agreements, visiting faculty agreements, Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs), and non-disclosure agreements (CDAs) may constitute a joint research agreement under the Act if such contracts include clauses addressing potential research collaboration between the parties. As such, it is important for research administrators to work with legal counsel to adopt language for various agreements to ensure that contracts would be considered joint research agreements under the CREATE Act only when there is mutual consent and mutual benefit to the collaborating parties.
Additionally, the concept of “in the field of the claimed invention” is important in order to maintain the “safe harbor” and may require diligence on the part of the contracting officer. In order to ensure a university’s ability to invoke the CREATE Act, any modifications to the original statement of work need to be documented and incorporated as an amendment to the joint research agreement. Without such modifications to the contract, it is more likely that discoveries made after such changes in the scope of research could be outside the “field” established by the original statement of work; thereby, hindering the collaborating parties’ ability to invoke the Act.

Kevin Wozniak serves as the Associate Director of Technology Licensing at the Georgia Tech Research Corporation of Georgia Institute of Technology.

NCURA was fortunate, once again, to receive a large pool of impressive applicants for the 2006 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award. The award is available to minority applicants who, because of financial constraints, could not otherwise attend NCURA’s Annual Meeting. The awardees receive up to $1,000 toward expenses associated with attending the Annual Meeting.

The purpose of the award is not only to assist in the financial aspects of attending the meeting; it also offers a wide variety of services and opportunities for the awardees to interact with their peers and colleagues from other educational institutions around the country.

The 2006 Catherine Core Travel Award recipients were:

- Pamela Andrews, Illinois Institute of Technology;
- Maria C. Cortes, Rochester Institute of Technology; and,
- Elena Glatman, Brown University.

The NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (N&LDC) eagerly anticipates the participation and leadership that our winners will bring to future NCURA activities. The application for the 2007 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award will be available shortly.

**Our 2006 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award Recipients**

Pamela Andrews, Research Coordinator, Illinois Institute of Technology

Maria Cortés, Senior Research Administrator, Rochester Institute of Technology

Elena Glatman, Brown University

We look forward to many outstanding applications in 2007!

HERE’S WHAT THIS YEAR’S RECIPIENTS HAD TO SAY ABOUT THEIR EXPERIENCE...

“Upon my arrival to Washington, DC until the day I left, I was treated with the utmost respect and professionalism. My experience was likened to a kid in a candy store in that I met so many seasoned, as well as new, members to exchange ideas with. I met one gentleman who told me interesting stories of his experiences at his institution and urged me to continue growing in the field. I was inspired by our conversation and it invigorated me for my return to my university.”

“Attending the NCURA Annual Meeting was a wonderful educational experience for me. Being a new member, I was unsure of what to expect before coming to the meeting. What I found was a wonderful group of people eager to help and share information that really can make life a lot easier in the grants world. I was really impressed by the diversity of workshops, the expertise of the presenters, and the wealth of information they were able to share.”

“…meeting new people in the field of research administration from various universities and colleges across the country, as well as the workshops, exhibits, discussion groups, and sessions were such an overwhelming delight! As a first timer at the 48th Annual Meeting I can hardly wait for next year’s 49th Annual Meeting in Washington, DC! I want to continue to benefit from future conferences, along with the other training opportunities and networking offered by NCURA.”

“Though a university, or its collaborator, may not need to invoke the CREATE Act frequently, inserting language into research agreements to allow appropriate invocation of the Act when deemed mutually beneficial and ensuring research contracts have updated statements of work are two simple steps research administrators can take to preserve the “safe harbors” afforded under the Act.”

Kevin Wozniak serves as the Associate Director of Technology Licensing at the Georgia Tech Research Corporation of Georgia Institute of Technology.
First, after a long absence, we are bringing back the Region I Fundamentals. This one-day workshop is intended for those looking to get a basic understanding of research administration. If all goes well, we’d like to get back the Region I Fundamentals. This one-day workshop is intended for those looking to get a basic understanding of research administration.

Our last RADG for 2006 was held December 31, 2006. Susan has served the Region with great dedication, commitment and integrity. Thank you Susan!

Gary Smith is the Chair for Region I and serves as 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 many of you were able to attend the National Meeting this past November. What a turnout -- over 2,000 attendees, including 467 from Region II!

One of my pleasures at the National Meeting was the opportunity to introduce our Region II travel award winners at the Monday award lunch. Congratulations go to Gil Harootunian of McDaniel College and Anne Lutkenhouse from The College of Staten Island/CUNY.

It is rainy, cold and dark out right now, so it’s the right time to think about spring, specifically the Spring Meeting in Rochester, New York, May 6-8. Our theme will be “Research Administrators Meeting the Challenge of Change in Our Communities.” Continuing with that theme is the plenary session which will consist of a panel of local university and college presidents discussing the changing relationship of their institutions with their communities. Represented on the panel will be the presidents from the University of Rochester, Rochester Institute of Technology, Nazareth College, State University of New York at Geneseo and Monroe Community College. The moderator will be the mayor of the City of Rochester. Wow. Meanwhile, the program committee is busily planning the workshops and concurrent sessions based on the Region II goals established at last July’s Governance/Leadership Workshop as well as input from the members. The preliminary program will be up on the Region II website by January at

http://ncuraregionii.org. Registration and hotel information will also be posted soon. Please contact Program Chair Martin Williams at williamsrn@wpunj.edu with questions or program topics.

When you do visit our new website at http://ncuraregionii.org, you will notice that we have an .org suffix rather than an .edu. That’s because for the first time in our Region’s history, we are set up at a permanent, commercial site rather than a regional officer’s home institution. Taking this step should give the Region better continuity from year to year and make it easier for members to find the site when they need it. We also have a new webmaster, Anthony Capobianco, from Rochester Institute of Technology who will update and maintain the site and who, of course, welcomes your comments and suggestions.

By the time this is published we will know the results of our election for Region II Chair-Elect, Treasurer-Elect and Board Representative for January 2007. With the excellent field of candidates we had for all positions, whatever the results, the Region is in good hands. Congratulations to all.

Please feel free to contact me with any concerns, questions or suggestions you may have about the Region at cwilhelm@orpa.rochester.edu. My term ends December 2006, and I would like to thank you for your support and the opportunity to get to know and work with so many of you. Your 2007 Chair, Ruth Tallman, can be reached at rt01@lehigh.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.
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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.
If you are interested in helping, please e-mail Tony Ventimiglia at venttiaf@auburn.edu.

New Region III Website
Region III has moved! Moved in cyberspace that is! Region III now hosts its own site. The site is www.ncuraregioniii.com. Surf on by later and check it out! More information will be added as we move ahead so check back often.

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

At this writing, the Annual Meeting in Washington, DC is still a vivid memory for most of us as we hunker in for the holidays. Presenters from Region IV numbered 43 out of approximately 350 total presenters at the Meeting.

We were especially proud on Sunday night to recognize Mary Ellen Sheridan, Associate Vice President for Research and Director of University Research Administration at the University of Chicago. Mary Ellen received the Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration. Steve Hansen best summarized Mary Ellen’s impressive credentials with “When Mary Ellen Sheridan speaks, research administrators listen.” Not to boast, but Region IV members have received this prestigious award for the last three years.

In response to the strategic plan developed by the Region IV board, the Region made a special effort at the Annual Meeting to enhance the feeling of community for Region IV members in attendance. We kicked off the meeting with a tour of Washington, DC on Sunday morning. Newcomers to the association and the region were hosted at a Newcomers Reception and were also recognized at the region’s hospitality suite. To help newcomers break the ice with other members, they were given green Region IV lanyards to give out. The lanyards were a great way to pick out Region IV members from the crowd. There were several Region IV tables at the Sunday night banquet, and members were also invited to sign up for a Region IV Monday dinner group. Approximately 40 people from the region had a great meal at Anna Maria’s, just down the hill from the Hilton.

Region IV is looking forward to an eventful and informative joint 2007 Spring Meeting with Region III in Nashville, TN, May 13-16. Plans are well-underway for a delightful time, including a blow-your-socks-off special event.

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

REGION V
Southwestern

It was good to see everyone at the 48th Annual meeting in Washington, DC. I am proud to announce that Region V had 46 new members registered for the meeting!

I want to congratulate Jan Fox of Texas Christian University who received the NCURA Distinguished Service Award at the National Meeting. Region V would like to thank you, Jan, for all you have done for our region during your 30+ years as a research administrator.

I would also like to congratulate Chris Green from University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio for being a 2006 LDI graduate.

Congratulations to the following award winners of Region V that were given the following awards at the 2006 Spring meeting and recognized again at the National Meeting:

• Merrie Tabbert, University of Texas at Dallas, who received the Quentin Mathews Travel Award
• Myrta Stager, NCURA, who received the Outstanding Achievement Award
• Jan Fox, Texas Christian University, who received the Distinguished Service Award

Door prize winners at the business meeting were:

• Lisa Faulkner, Oklahoma State University
• Suzanne Rivera, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center
• Mechelle Jeanne, Southern Methodist University
• Nikki Ryker, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center

Our Spring Meeting will be held in Arlington, Texas at the Wyndham Hotel, April 29-May 2, 2007. The theme for the meeting is “Knocking it out of the park...How Research Administrators bat clean-up and clear the bases”. Scott Erwin is putting together the program along with his program committee; if you are interested in presenting, being a moderator or volunteering for this meeting please contact Scott Erwin at w10@txstate.edu.

Debbie Newton, The University of Tulsa, is finalizing an update to our Region V bylaws. It is anticipated they will be submitted to the members for a vote no later than the Spring Meeting. If approved, the bylaws will create
As an ADVOCATE we speak for those who will follow us, as well as those to whom we can provide assistance. EDUCATION is the critical responsibility every research administrator must recognize. We advocate to everyone with whom we come into contact – administration, faculty, the public and each other. If we take these three words to heart and design NCURA’s offerings to reinforce them, we will continue to be the leader in professional and leadership development.

It was my pleasure this past year to have the opportunity to integrate this theme into the 48th Annual Meeting with the support of an outstanding group of colleagues volunteering to be on the program committee, coordinate panels and sessions, moderate discussion groups and, of course, attend the meeting. Sessions, discussions, and workshops all revolved around these three words. Concepts were discussed to improve our communication, move forward advocacy for the profession, and educate our attendees. The meeting culminated in an astounding record attendance of 2081, enabling the growth of our membership to over 6000.

My thanks to the multitude of people who made this meeting the success it was – in particular, my co-chairs Judy Fredenberg and Denise Wallen, the workshop coordinators Dave Richardson and Bo Bogdanski, and the entire program committee. A special thanks to our NCURA staff. Without them, NCURA could not have achieved these milestones.

As my attention shifts from planning the biggest professional development opportunity in our profession to other activities that will complement that meeting, I want to reflect on the many achievements of the past years as well as the future directions I envision.

Our past Boards and Officers have devoted a great deal of time to systematically devise a strategic plan that will be reviewed annually to maintain our focus on current trends and challenges. Our goals revolve around professional development education, advocacy for the profession and individual involvement, and expanding open communication among our members and partners. This strategic plan then drives the initiatives, programming, publications and activities of our organization. Past leaders have addressed areas of increasing partnerships, maintaining the collegiality for which NCURA is so respected, and increased advocacy.

Last year saw new programming targeted at departmental members, planning for more on-line tutorials, increasing fundamentals and “roadshow” offerings, and the creation of a new neighborhood. These initiatives were outgrowths of the strategic planning process and the new regional conversation opportunities.

The second Leadership Conference was held was held to continue the dialogue among regions and the National Organization. We heard and responded to the need for increased communication, membership support, and professional development opportunities. As our membership grows, NCURA must continue to dedicate time and resources so that all members recognize the value of membership and feel connected. In the past two years we have reinforced the interaction among regional and national leadership, seeking ways to encourage open and frank communication to support activities at all levels of the organization. The summer Leadership Conference and quarterly conference calls encouraged sharing across the regions to seek best practices as well as keeping the National Organization knowledgeable about regional issues and needs.

During the coming year, I hope to bring those initiatives still under development to fruition. These include a clinical trials on-line tutorial, a departmental administrator “roadshow,” the continuation of the new highly popular Pre-Award Research Administration (PRA) Conference, the Financial Research Administration VIII Conference, and the Financial Research Administrators “roadshow.”

My vision for NCURA in the coming year also includes new resources and activities designed around the theme “Communicate, Advocate, Educate.” Beyond the outstanding “face to face” professional development conferences and educational opportunities, we must ensure our members have resource materials available at their desks. NCURA has many members unable to attend meetings. One of my objectives this year is to review the printed and on-line materials available so that adequate resources are available to all members. The professional development committee will be charged with supporting new publications both on specialized topics and an assembly of a compendium of learning. We will also seek continued analysis of the needs of our senior administrators and the preparation of broadly educated research administrators.

Your NCURA Board and Standing Committees will also continue to investigate opportunities to generate non-dues revenue to enhance the sound financial base of our organization. Grant opportunities and partnerships with other organizations with similar missions are being explored. I expect the recent activities with our international partners will continue so that our members are knowledgeable about the emerging opportunities to partner and manage projects beyond our borders.

As the profession of research administration has grown, our members have become more specialized and, one could say, segmented. The generalist whose knowledge is broad, understanding how each area of research administration is integrated, is becoming rare. Our senior administrators are part of the “graying” of America and looking toward retirement. An emerging issue is “how do we prepare as a profession and organization for an exodus of broadly based senior administrators?” Offering opportunities to develop and maintain the “complete” research administrator base of broad knowledge will be critical. Primary objectives for the coming year will be continuing leadership development for both the profession and NCURA to enable and educate our members so they are better prepared to move into leadership positions; and, marketing NCURA as the premier source for development of the individual, which will ultimately benefit the institution.

I look forward to being your president in 2007 and serving the needs of our 6000+ members. While a membership this large and diverse could overwhelm an association, we can make it NCURA’s greatest strength. If you are already volunteering in any way, thank you. If you want to be involved, please contact any Board of Directors member, Regional Officer, your Volunteer Coordinator or the National Office. Look for the calls for volunteers and get involved. Remember, to Communicate, Advocate and Educate is the responsibility of everyone. Thank you for the trust you have placed in me.

Pam Whitlock is the incoming President of NCURA and serves as the Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of North Carolina at Wilmington.
International Neighborhood Celebrates Its First Annual Meeting

At NCURA’s 48th Annual Meeting fellow members had the chance to participate in several workshops, concurrent sessions, and discussion groups dealing with a variety of international themes; indeed, the largest number of such opportunities ever offered in the growing area of international research administration. Presenters included Wiktor Kurzeja, President of the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA), Paul Craven, EARMA’s Vice President, and Steve Jerrams, Head of Research, Directorate of Research and Enterprise, Dublin Institute of Technology.

The International Neighborhood also convened the first meeting of its energetic subcommittee, which consists of the following NCURA members: John Carfora, Boston College and Chair of the International Neighborhood; Christine Bothe, Dartmouth College; James Casey, Independent Consultant; Delia Gallinaro, Sam Houston State University; Steve Jerrams, Dublin Institute of Technology; Karin Johnson, University of Washington; Phil Meyers, Western Kentucky University; Ted Mordhorst, University of Washington; Sihn Simmons, University of Washington; Janet Simons, University of Maryland, Baltimore; and Denise Wallen, The University of New Mexico.

Recently published is John Carfora and Denise Wallen’s Chapter titled “Strategies for Building Toward Successful International Research Collaborations.” That now joins other timely and informative works appearing in NCURA’s newest publication Sponsored Research Administration: A Guide to Effective Strategies and Recommended Practices. Finally, the International Neighborhood, the youngest of NCURA’s seven professional neighborhoods, continues to exhibit a growing interest among NCURA members. Please visit the site often, which is recognized for providing the most comprehensive database on international organizations that serve the global community of research administrators. Likewise, please don’t forget to join the International Neighborhood’s popular listserv (http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/international.asp).

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

Pre-Award Neighborhood

A final ruling was published in the Federal Register on December 20, 2004, stating the Federal Acquisition Regulation was amended to require offerors to submit representations and certifications electronically via the Business Partner Network.

The implementation of On-line Representations and Certification Application (ORCA) began on January 1, 2005. ORCA is an e-Gov initiative, and the primary purpose is to provide a web-based application that replaces the historically paper-based process.

Registration for this process can be found at http://orca.bpn.gov. Two items are needed for registration; (1) an active record in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) (2) a Marketing Personal Identification Number (MPIN) from the active CCR. More information about these two items are located in the frequently asked questions of the ORCA website.

Once registered, offerors have the option to update or change their reps and certs whenever necessary. But, updates will be required at least annually. Also, reps and certs provided through ORCA may be supplemented to the sponsor in response to a specific solicitation.

Detailed information about this can be read at FAR 52.204-8 entitled “Annual Representations and Certifications”.

Robin Remotique is a member of the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee and serves as Administrator, Office of Sponsored Programs, Mississippi State University.

Departmental Neighborhood

As the year comes to a close, the Department Administration Neighborhood can take a look back and appreciate many accomplishments and look ahead to many new opportunities in 2007. Throughout 2006 we continued to look at our role in research proposal development and management and tried to define universal roles. But we found that as department administrators in the growing world of research administration, our professional roles touch all areas: financial managers, trainers and coaches, writers, and sometimes even technology support. We are a dedicated group of administrators with many talents to share.

In 2006 we shared those talents at regional and national conferences, creating lively tracks for department administrators across the country. We welcomed new members and offered mentoring support to new administrators entering the field. As we look forward to 2007, we will continue our support with several new members joining our committee: Stephen Block from Syracuse University and LaJauna Guillory from Georgia Institute of Technology.

continued on next page
As always, please join the listserv if you have not yet. We would like to keep our chats lively and informative. We look forward to working with you in 2007!

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

by Denise Rouleau

The buzz word is Audits. If you were at the National Meeting in November then you heard NIH and NSF have both developed audit plans. Auditing of cost transfers and direct charging of administrative and clerical costs seems to be the main focus. Pilot audits have been completed for both agencies and both have posted their audit plans and their audit reports to their websites.

Since we are on the topic of audits, SAS No. 112 has also been released. The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) issued its Statement on Auditing Standards (SAS) No. 112, Communicating Internal Control Related Matters Identified in an Audit in May 2006. SAS No. 112 aligns the definitions of significant deficiency and material weakness to those in place for audits of public companies. This could mean adverse opinions on A-133 audits where previously there were none. To read more on these subjects, visit the FRA Neighborhood homepage.

Denise Rouleau is Chair of the FRA Neighborhood Committee and she serves as Director, Sponsored Programs Accounting, Brandeis University.

by Terry A. May

The Compliance Neighborhood Committee will be using the Town Hall section of its website http://www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods/compliance/2006townhall.asp as a place to locate research compliance notices of proposed rules and other changes in the regulatory environment. The following are examples of the types of items that will be found in the Town Hall. If readers have other suggested items, please contact any member of the Compliance Neighborhood Committee as we want to make this page as useful to the members as possible.

The ORI Model Research Misconduct Policy

As anticipated, the DHHS Office of Research Integrity has released its Model Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct to comply with the PHS Policies on Research Misconduct (42 C.F.R. Part 93) that are applicable to all allegations received on or after June 16, 2005. In addition, the ORI is inviting comments on the model policy that should be sent to Brenda.Harrington@hhs.gov by December 29, 2006. The primary changes from the old rule are summarized as part of their Questions & Answers – 42 CFR Part 93. Institutions too small to handle research misconduct proceedings should be aware of provisions to file a “Small Organization Statement” with ORI in place of having written policies and procedures for addressing research misconduct; however, this does not relieve the institution of complying with any other provision of the rule. As part of the Q/A, ORI describes in general the criteria for an institution to be in compliance.

http://ori.dhhs.gov/policies/model_policy.shtml
http://ori.dhhs.gov/policies/QA-Reg-6-05.shtml

Terry May is a member of the Compliance Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director of Research Development, Michigan State University.

by Jeanne Ware

The Annual Meeting was great and it was nice to get to know all the PUIs. The Dinner Groups this year were wildly successful! I sense a tradition for the future. In an effort to “hear” from other PUIs, I put a call out for articles and the following is just that. Thank you, Fran for this article. As a PUI, we tend to have limited resources and this typically extends into hiring office staff. Given what we do (we do it all, right?), hiring can be tricky and stressful.

Interviewing and Hiring Office Staff

by Frances Jeffries

Hiring a new employee is an opportunity and dilemma for which few of us are prepared. Inevitably, we are placed in the position of defining what it is that our offices do and what tasks will be included in the position.
The uncertainty of the situation is perhaps the most problematic. How can we know that we have hired the “right” person? Can we learn enough during the interview to generalize the “results” to ensure a good fit in the office and institution?

Is humor a mandatory qualification or just a desirable quality?
In a recent PUI discussion, John Falconer (University of Nebraska at Kearney) offered that “…everything you are looking for has to be connected to the job…..” While many PUIers lobbied for a sense of humor as a desirable trait, others put “good sense of humor” explicitly in the job descriptions. The interviewers at those institutions also discuss the sense of humor in detail during the interviews with candidates, and give it some context. The responses of the candidates give you some added and beneficial insight into the person who is being interviewed. Say the major proponents of this approach, “We’re serious about one’s sense of humor!!!!!”, and “There are so many wonderful, interesting, nutty, exciting, nerve-wracking and frustrating people and situations that we deal with – a sense of humor is often the only thing that gets you through the day!”

On the other hand, several other more cautious PUIers acknowledged that “sense of humor” could not be specified in the job posting itself. Rather, the wording would need to suggest that the successful candidate should have a balanced perspective, flexibility, and cheerfulness. Such wording then allows for the qualities to be directly linked to one of the aspects of the job.

In one example, it was clear that a good sense of humor was very useful. At one unnamed PUI, two US Department of Education grants were awarded. “Good news! Congratulations!” you say. But wait! The Principal Investigator no longer works there? And no internal approvals were obtained before submitting the grant? So the good news is really bad news, requiring a Sponsored Research Administration sense of humor!

What other qualities and qualifications are sought?
The most commonly cited qualities that research administrators value in employees include:

- loving to work with other people;
- ability to handle difficult people and situations;
- ability to put the needs of the office before needs of self on most occasions;
- ability to “multi-task”;
- outstanding character;
- terrific personality;
- delivers excellent customer service;
- use of good judgment;
- ability to have fun;
- care and attention to detail; and,
- discretion (especially able to keep confidences).

The majority of research administrators concurred that most technical skills can be taught to new employees if they are inclined to pay attention to details.

What tools and techniques help you gather the most useful and valid information?
The most helpful tools often come from among “our own.”

The favorite interview question offered by Frannie Nuttall (West Texas A&M University) is “Briefly, tell me about a time when you had a situation with a difficult client/boss and how did you handle the situation?” The tough part for the interviewer is to sit quietly and let the interviewee talk. Most people are extremely uncomfortable with the silence and begin almost immediately to fill it. The interviewer will be surprised at what the candidate will say, allowing you to discern much from their response. But a word of caution: if the candidate says, “I’ve never had such a situation” – pass them by!

Beth Koenig at the College of St. Catherine shared the following questions to use in an interview:

- Why are you interested in this position at this time? How does it fit into your overall career plan?
- What do you enjoy most about being in an academic environment?
- This position often needs to work with excel spreadsheets and computer applications other than word processing and lotus notes. How are your computer skills? Do you like fiddling around with new programs? Do you have any experience working with web pages?
- How would you go about establishing relationships and working with critical/difficult people?
- Describe a difficult situation you have been in with a faculty member and how did you handle it?
- How would your current supervisor describe your work?
- What do you need from a supervisor? (Working style, etc?)
- What kinds of things typically frustrate you? What kinds of things typically drive you crazy?
- What do you need to make you feel satisfied in a job?
- What questions do you have for me?

Good luck in your hiring!

Frances Jeffries is a member of the Predominately Undergraduate Institution Neighborhood and serves as Special Assistant to the Provost, Wheaton College.

Jeanne Ware is Director of Research Programs at New College of Florida and is Chair of the Predominately Undergraduate Institutions Neighborhood.
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NCURA 49th Annual Meeting Program Committee
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Leadership

Wicktor Kuezeja, President of the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators brings greetings to NCURA members from EARMA

Sunday events
Laura Wade, Pam Whitlock, Denise Wallen & Judy Fredenberg welcome members to the Sunday night banquet

Comedian Paul Mercurio’s quick wit keeps the crowd entertained following the Sunday night Banquet

Keynote address
Pam Whitlock introduces and welcomes Tim Russert
Russert in action
Members line up to ask the keynote speaker questions
Larmett welcomes over 2,000 members to the 48th and introduces chair of N&LDC, Tommy Coggins, who awards certificates of completion to the LDI Class of 2006.

Wade also offers a welcome and introduces Steve Hansen who introduces the 2006 recipient of the Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration, Mary Ellen Sheridan.

Sheridan receives standing ovation!

Monday events

NCURA Distinguished Service Award Recipients, L-R: Jan Fox, Peggy Lowry, Bob Killoren, Cindy White. (not pictured, Pat Hawk); Carrabino Award Recipient, Tom Cooley

Outgoing PDC Chair, Tom Roberts receives a thank you gift at Monday’s luncheon

Gary Smith, Region I Chair, introduces regional award recipients: Raquel Espinosa, Christina DeVries and Marilyn Moir

Education

Networking

Community

Networking
Regional Corner continued

REGION V
Southwestern (continued)
a Volunteer Coordinator officer’s position for Region V which will be filled during our Spring 2007 election process. Debbie has agreed to serve on an interim basis until the election has been held and the position has been formally filled.

I hope everyone has a safe and happy holiday season. I look forward to seeing everyone at the Spring Meeting in April 2007.

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

REGION VI
Western

Dear Region VI,

It was a great pleasure to see many of you at the NCURA Annual Meeting. Of the 2,081 NCURA members who attended the 2006 Annual Meeting, 255 were members of Region VI. Of the 2,081 NCURA members who attended the NCURA Annual Meeting. Of the 2006 Annual Meeting, 255 were members of Region VI. And, of the 255 Region VI attendees, 96 were new members.

The year went by in a blur but in this last regional corner article of the year I want to highlight some of our activities. The long discussed by-law changes resulted in amendments that created separate Secretary and Treasurer positions (rather than the joint Secretary/Treasurer role of the past); the Awards Committee is now a standing rather than ad hoc committee; the nominating committee will actually be appointed early enough in the year to ensure that the process can be completed prior to the Annual meeting; and, we have built in a mechanism to handle the possibility of tie votes.

Additionally, an ad hoc committee on Volunteer/Leadership was established. That group chaired by Nancy Daneau of Caltech, actively reached out to new members in a variety of ways, including new member welcome letters and dutch-treat for new members held in conjunction with the Annual Meeting. They also actively encouraged Region VI members to apply to the Leadership Development Institute resulting in the selection of Kimberlie Small, Washington State University, to join the LDI class of 2007.

The Region awarded two $600 travel grants to support attendance at the National Meeting. They went to Csilla Csaplár, Stanford University, and Susan Pfeifer, Washington State University. Again our thanks go to the Regional Awards Committee chaired by Dan Nordquist, Washington State University.

Those of you who attended the Regional Business meeting already know that the Region will be providing two additional travel awards this spring to support attendance at the April 2007 Region VI/VII Meeting. Information about eligibility criteria and the application process for these travel awards will be posted to the regional website soon, as with information about the meeting.

In addition to the travel awards, 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. For more information about the criteria for these awards and the nomination process please go to http://www.oigr.wsu.edu/encura/announce.asp. The deadline for nominations is January 15, 2007. I encourage you to consider these recognition programs and submit your nominations.

Please mark your calendars now for the Region VI/VII Spring Meeting. The meeting is scheduled for April 23 – 25, 2007 in Park City, Utah. A series of workshops will be offered on Sunday, April 22, the day before the actual meeting begins. Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii and Region VI Chair-elect is serving as Chair of the Regional Meeting Program Committee. The preliminary program will be ready soon and will be posted to the regional website. Please look for it there.

With the elections complete, newly elected officers were introduced at the November Business Meeting by Linda Patton, California State University – Fullerton and Chair of the Nominating Committee. She and others on the Committee (Joyce Freedman, UCSF, and Terry Manns, California State University, Sacramento) did a wonderful job. Newly elected officers include Bruce Morgan, UC Riverside – Chair-elect; Samantha Westcott, Caltech – Secretary-elect; and, Cora Diaz, UC Santa Barbara – Treasurer-elect.

Finally, let me add a personal note. My year as Chair of Region VI is almost over. Serving as Chair has been a great pleasure. It was also made easier by the contributions and participation of all of the other regional leaders and committee members, and by your enthusiasm and appreciation. I wish you all a happy holiday season and healthy new year.

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

REGION VII
Rocky Mountain

Dear Region VII Members,

It was a pleasure to see so many of you during the NCURA Annual Meeting and hats off for being one of the record breaking number of attendees! Thank you for making the meeting such a success! Also, thank you to the Region VII members who volunteered at various functions during the Annual Meeting. Without members like you, NCURA could not be a continued success! Keep up the good work!

Results from the regional elections are as follows and individuals will take their respective responsibilities effective January 1, 2007:

- Winnie Ennenga, Northern Arizona University – Chair
- Debra Murphy, Arizona State University – Member-at-Large
- Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State University – Representative to the Board

Thank you to the candidates who stepped forward for this election and congratulations to all of you for your support during the election.

Also, thank you to Dianne Horrocks, Idaho State University, outgoing Representative to the Board, and Jeanne Cox, Northern Arizona University, outgoing Member-at-Large, for all of their diligent and dedicated work during their terms as representatives for Region VII.

Hotel information and a preliminary program for the 2007 Joint Region VI/VII Spring Meeting in Park City, Utah should be out shortly so start marking your calendars to attend. Check out the Region VI and VII websites for more information.

I want to take this opportunity to thank every one of you for your support during my term as Region VII Chair. I appreciate the increased volunteerism from the membership and appeal to you to continue volunteering in the various capacities available. I also appreciate your confidence and support related to the Representative to the Board position. I will strive to represent Region VII and the NCURA membership to the best of my abilities and work toward making NCURA an even better organization in meeting the membership’s changing needs.

Happy Holidays and a Happy New Year!

Josie Jimenez is the Chair of Region VII and serves as Associate Director, Office of Grants & Contracts, New Mexico State University.
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NCURA is proud to announce it’s newest publication!

SPONSORED RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION: A GUIDE TO EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES AND RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

Scores of important questions arise in the day-to-day world of sponsored research. Now, there's one authoritative guide that provides practical answers to questions about managing sponsored programs. Published by NCURA and Atlantic Information Services, Inc., **SPONSORED RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION: A Guide to Effective Strategies and Recommended Practices** will provide college and university research administrators — and others involved in sponsored programs on campus — with a “living textbook” on the wide range of research management challenges they face each day. It features principles and practices, sample policies and procedures, effective strategies to pursue, critical success factors, and pitfalls to avoid.

Sponsored Research Administration is written by more than 20 of the top sponsored research administrators in the U.S., chosen for their unique expertise in the subject areas covered (see Table of Contents for individual authors) and overseen by Editorial Director Richard P. Seligman, Ed.D., who is responsible for identifying topics for chapters, outlining content, selecting authors and managing the work of the project’s Editorial Advisory Panel, including:

- **Chair**: Richard P. Seligman, Ed.D., Senior Director, Office of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology
- **Michele M. Codd**, Assistant Director, Institute for Software Integrated Systems, Vanderbilt University
- **Marti L. Dunne**, Associate Vice Provost for Research Compliance and Administration, New York University
- **Christina K. Hansen**, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Research Administration, University of California, Irvine
- **Stephen Hansen**, Dean, Graduate Studies and Research, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

**Table of Contents**

| Foreword | Richard P. Seligman, Ed.D., Senior Director, Office of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology |
| An Overview of Sponsored Research Administration | Julie T. Norris, Director Emeritus, Office of Sponsored Programs, Massachusetts Institute of Technology |
| Electronic Research Administration | Stephen D. Douds, Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Massachusetts Institute of Technology |
| Training and Education | Pamela A. Webb, Senior Director for Sponsored Research, Stanford University |
| The Regulatory Environment | Ann M. Holmes, Chief Operating Officer, Center for Advanced Study of Language, University of Maryland, College Park |
| Information Technology | Kenneth G. Forstmeier, Director, Office of Research Information Systems, Pennsylvania State University |
| Research Compliance | Alice Tangredi-Hannon, Institutional Compliance Officer, Office of Institutional Compliance, The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania and Stephen Erskine, Director, Research Compliance and Intellectual Property, Boston College |
| Indirect (Facilities and Administrative) Costs | Patrick Fitzgerald, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Massachusetts Institute of Technology |
| Intellectual Property | Mary Ellen Sheridan, Associate Vice President for Research, University of Chicago |
| Special Issues for Medical Schools | Gunta J. Liders, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, University of Rochester |
| Research Compliance Administration | Alice Tangredi-Hannon, Institutional Compliance Officer, Office of Institutional Compliance, The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania and Stephen Erskine, Director, Research Compliance and Intellectual Property, Boston College |
| Special Issues for Undergraduate Institutions | Milton T. Cole, Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs, Villanova University |
| Preaward Services | Stephen Hansen, Dean, Graduate Studies and Research, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville |
| Managing Research Contracts | David J. Mayo, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology |
| Legal Considerations | Kathleen S. Iruw, Senior University Legal Counsel, University of Wisconsin, Madison |
| Interactions With Auditors | Denise J. Clark, Director of Research Administration and Finance, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute |

**Select 1 of 3 Convenient Payment Options:**

- Payment enclosed.
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  - Card # __________________________ Exp. date ________________
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Call 800-521-4323: Atlantic Information Services (AIS), business agent for NCURA, 800-521-4323, and change your order to a major credit card. Charges will appear as "Atlantic Information Services."

Complete this form and mail to: AIS, 1100 17th Street, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20036
ORDER YOUR COPIES TODAY! In 2007, regulators will focus more attention than ever on the diverse group of federal rules that fall under the umbrella of "research compliance." This collection of rapidly changing government requirements – Can torpedo the reputation of even the most prestigious U.S. universities, Ranges widely from internal business issues (e.g., effort reporting) to grave matters of international security (e.g., select agents missing from your lab), Can have a very sudden impact on your funding and financial well-being, Is the focus of complex rules and penalties from a dozen federal agencies, Is under constant review on Capitol Hill, where political volleyballs like the Patriot Act now have a direct impact on colleges, universities and teaching hospitals. To help research administrators manage these complicated issues and do their jobs more effectively, NCURA and AIS are offering Report on Research Compliance, a unique three-part service. Full Year Subscription Includes: Weekly e-mail newsletters, Unlimited Web site access, Monthly 12-page print newsletters. For more information, visit www.ReportonResearchCompliance.com.

Select 1 of 3 Convenient Payment Options:

- **Payment enclosed.**
  - Please make check payable to AIS. D.C. residents, add 5.75% sales tax.

- **Charge my credit card (circle one).**
  - AmEx  Visa  MC
  - Card # ___________________________ Exp. date ________________
  - Charges will appear as Atlantic Information Services, Inc. (Signature and phone number required to process)

- **Purchase order enclosed.** P.O.# ___________________________

Signature and phone number required for credit card orders:

Signature ___________________________ Phone ___________________________ Fax ___________________________

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

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

**REGULATION AND COMPLIANCE: 2007**

The job of sponsored programs managers brings them into regular contact with citations to federal requirements their colleges or universities must comply with, or face potentially dire consequences. Some are well known (e.g., OMB Circular A-21 or OSHA), others are new (e.g., the 2002 security and bioterrorism law), and many are arcane (e.g., the Anti-Kickback Act of 1986). These wildly diverse requirements have two things in common: (1) failure to comply can be costly for colleges and universities, and (2) they are summarized in **REGULATION AND COMPLIANCE: 2007**... so sponsored programs managers have one reliable reference book at their fingertips, whenever they need it.

Select 1 of 3 Convenient Payment Options:

- **Payment enclosed.**
  - Please make check payable to AIS. D.C. residents, add 5.75% sales tax.

- **Charge my credit card (circle one).**
  - AmEx  Visa  MC
  - Card # ___________________________ Exp. date ________________
  - Charges will appear as Atlantic Information Services, Inc. (Signature and phone number required to process)

- **Purchase order enclosed.** P.O.# ___________________________

Signature and phone number required for credit card orders:

Signature ___________________________ Phone ___________________________ Fax ___________________________

E-mail (optional) ______________________________________________________

TWO CONVENIENT WAYS TO ORDER:

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

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

---

**REPORT ON RESEARCH COMPLIANCE**

**Prices**

- Single Copy  $435
- Multiple copies – please call AIS for pricing.

**Report on Research Compliance: Total Order**

- Copy(ies) @ per copy = $ ______________
- D.C. customers add 5.75% sales tax $ ______________
- Shipping & Handling $ ______________
- TOTAL $ ______________

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

Name ___________________________________________

Title ___________________________________________

Organization ____________________________________

Address* _______________________________________

City/State/Zip __________________________________

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

**Please make check payable to AIS. D.C. residents, add 5.75% sales tax.**

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

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

**More than 10– please call AIS for pricing**

**Prices**

- Single Copy  $992
- Multiple copies – please call AIS for pricing.

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

**Report on Research Compliance: Total Order**

- Copy(ies) @ per copy = $ ______________
- D.C. customers add 5.75% sales tax $ ______________
- Shipping & Handling $ ______________
- TOTAL $ ______________

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

Name ___________________________________________

Title ___________________________________________

Organization ____________________________________

Address* _______________________________________

City/State/Zip __________________________________

*Please include your street address. UPS does not deliver to P.O. Boxes.
Managing sponsored programs effectively has never been more challenging... and with today’s tight budgets it has never been more important. The challenges you face on campus now are technological, administrative, and regulatory. The pace of change from Washington — new regs, new policies, new interpretations of existing policies, changes to circulars, mandatory education programs... not to mention the government’s and agencies’ move towards the electronic grant process — is accelerating at a dizzying rate.

To help your college or university limit its exposure to disallowed costs, loss of federal funding, and public relations nightmares, NACUBO, NCURA, and AIS have teamed up to publish A Guide to Managing Federal Grants for Colleges and Universities. This comprehensive 900+ page looseleaf (also available on CD) helps you manage federal funds effectively and saves you time and money while you’re at it. Among its many benefits, the Guide:

- Includes coverage of the latest federal policies and requirements.
- Is written especially for higher education by campus-based leaders in sponsored research administration.
- Has useful tips to make sure your management practices don’t raise flags during an audit.
- Teaches you how to manage your intellectual property to your advantage.
- Has useful tips to make sure your management practices don’t raise flags during an audit.
- Provides step-by-step guidance on managing your subrecipients.
- Guides you to an effective institutional compliance plan, including responsible conduct of research.
- Puts the full text of important OMB circulars and related documents at your fingertips, including revisions as they become final.
- Has a logical organization that walks you through the entire grant process, from solicitation to audit.
- Is updated quarterly (in print and CD formats) to ensure the information you rely on is up to date.
- Includes a monthly newsletter, Federal Grants News, written by experienced sponsored program directors.

A Guide to Managing Federal Grants for Colleges and Universities and Federal Grants News provide the help you need to maximize your institution’s federal funding!

Select 1 of 3 Convenient Payment Options:

- Payment enclosed.
  Please make check payable to AIS. D.C. residents, add 5.75% sales tax.
- Charge my credit card (circle one). AmEx Visa MC
  Card #__________________________ Exp. date______________
  Charges will appear as Atlantic Information Services, Inc.
  (Signature and phone number required to process)
- Purchase order enclosed. P.O.#_____________________

Signature and phone number required for credit card orders:
Signature________________________________________
Phone________________________Fax____________________
E-mail (optional)___________________________________

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

Complete this form and mail to: AIS, 1100 17th Street, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20036
THESE PROGRAMS ARE A GREAT ADDITION TO YOUR OFFICE’S EDUCATIONAL LIBRARY AND ARE A GREAT VALUE!

ONLINE EDUCATION CD ROM/AUDIO SEMINARS
(NINETY MINUTE PROGRAMS)

- Preparing for Federal Audits-Lessons Learned, How It Can Help You
- Reconciling Effort Reporting & Commitments
- Electronic Routing Forms and Pre-Award Tracking
- Grants.gov Update
- Export Controls and Embargoes: Some Basics for All
- What Am I Signing Anyway? Proposal Review From an Institutional Point of View
- Cost Sharing - Denial No Longer Works
- But I’ve Still Got Checks in My Checkbook: Guiding Faculty on Managing Funds
- Surviving An Audit
- Effective Proposal Development Programs for Faculty and Staff at Smaller Institutions

For program descriptions or to purchase any of the above programs visit http://online.krm.com/iebms/coe/coe_p1_all.aspx?oc=10&cc=0015568P

2006 VIDEO WORKSHOP SERIES (VHS/DVD)
(3.5 HOUR PROGRAMS)

- Post-award Issues for the Pre-award and Departmental Administrator
- Grants.gov: Working Towards a Common Vision
- National Security Issues
- Technology Transfer for the Research Administrator

Order the series today at http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/videoseries/2006/schedule.htm

Prior Programs

- Sponsored Research Financial Management: Current Pre and Post Award Issues (VHS/DVD)
- International Sponsored Programs Administration (VHS/DVD)
- Principles of R&D Contracting (VHS/DVD)
- What Departmental Administrators Need to Know about Compliance Issues (VHS Only)
- Compliance Issues for Clinical Trials (VHS Only)
- The True Costs of Compliance and Why We Must Invest (VHS/DVD)
- Intellectual Property Issues for the Research Administrator (VHS Only)
- Divergent Views and Issues When Contracting with Industry (VHS Only)
- Compliance Issues Impacting Financial Research Administration (VHS Only)

For program descriptions or to purchase any of the above programs visit http://www.ncura.edu/bookstore/default.asp
SPONSORED PROJECTS ESSENTIALS

In an ever-changing environment, the core building blocks of sponsored project administration are essential. Whether you are new to the profession or a seasoned veteran, this workshop is intended to help you look at basic principles from a different perspective. Every time you approve or sign on the dotted line, you should be thinking about reasonable, allocable, allowable and consistent. And, if you have forgotten some of the basics and have fooled yourself into believing everything will be all right…it won’t.

This veteran workshop faculty will address due diligence when making decisions and, what the process should be. They will discuss the underlying themes that every research administrator (pre-award, post-award, departmental, costing, audit and compliance) should be thinking about with every transaction they process.

Areas to be covered include:
- Proposal Phase – Budget Development
- Revised Budget Phase
- Award Acceptance Review of Final Budget
- Sub-recipient Monitoring
- Purchase Orders
- Accounts Payment Vouchers
- Cost Transfers
- Financial Reporting
- Time and Effort
- Project Monitoring

This interactive workshop will provide a number of case studies that will cover the gambit of the good, the bad, and the ugly. You’ll hear about the best ways of ensuring compliance and…how to stay out of trouble.

FACULTY: Denise J. Clark, Director, Research Administration and Finance, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; F. Edward Herran, Director of Sponsored Projects, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center; Jerry G. Fife, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Finance, Vanderbilt University; Laura L. Wade, Associate Director, Research Center Administration, Texas Center for Superconductivity, University of Houston; Pam Whitlock, Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of North Carolina at Wilmington

March 6, 2007

EFFORT REPORTING

Auditors’ continued attention on effort reporting has sparked numerous findings and -- stories in the press. This program will give the audience guidance on everything from bare-bones reporting necessary to stay in compliance to what some institutions are developing to help streamline their process. Whether you are in central administration or – in the “thick of things” out in the department, be sure to watch this program as our expert faculty offers their insight on what they believe the government is currently focusing on and shares some best practices in use at several institutions to help you and your institution, stay out of the spotlight, out of trouble, and…out the newspaper.

FACULTY: Richard Seligman, Senior Director, Office of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology; Laura Yaeger, Managing Director, Higher Education Practice, Huron Consulting Group; David Kennedy, Director, Costing Policy and Studies, Council on Governmental Relations; Gunta Liders, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, University of Rochester; Michele Codd, Assistant Director, Institute for Software Integrated Systems, Vanderbilt University

Celebrating 10 years of broadcasting professional development training to the research administration community!

continued on next page
**June 12, 2007**

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST: HOW TO SPOT AND MANAGE IT**

The words “Conflict of Interest” have been known to strike fear into the hearts of even the most seasoned research administrators. As institutions increase their research enterprise, the gateway for conflicts widens. Our job is to first identify it – whether real or perceived – and then, if possible, determine ways in which to manage it. The faculty will give tips on what to do when you uncover a conflict and, in particular, for those out in the department, where they can go for help. This program, with its expert panel, will relate best practices in managing a COI and give examples of what works, and what doesn’t.

**FACULTY:** Christina Hansen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Research Administration, University of California-Irvine; Mary Ellen Sheridan, Associate Vice President for Research, University of Chicago; Vivian Holmes, Director, Finance & Administration, Division of Medical Sciences, Harvard Medical School; Alex Dreier, Partner, Hogan & Hartson, LLP

---

**September 11, 2007**

**SUB-AWARDS: A SURVIVOR’S GUIDE OF KEY CONCEPTS AND PRINCIPLES**

Drawn from NCURA’s seven-week on-line tutorial, this broadcast is intended as a review for mid-level research administrators and will provide enough basic information to help those who are new to the world of subcontracting to – survive! The faculty, who designed and developed NCURA’s tutorial, will share a number of case studies, discuss the Dos and Don’ts and dispel myths that may have been creating high anxiety to those new to this arena.

Faculty will touch on the following areas:
- Key concepts and terminology associated with subawards
- An overview of the typical flow of activity from the time a proposal is first put together by the prime recipient through the awarding of both prime awards and sub-awards to their closeout
- Factors to consider when issuing a sub-award
- Elements of a sub-award
- Basic principles of sub-award negotiation
- Terms and Conditions – do they all “flow down?”
- Administering sub-awards

**FACULTY:** David Mayo, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology; Steve Erickson, Director, Office for Research Compliance and Intellectual Property Management, Boston College; Ruth Farrell, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, University of Vermont

---

To register, see next page!
The cost of the full series (all four workshops) is $2,950 per campus. To purchase an individual session the cost is $975.00 per campus. All Broadcast Workshops will be aired from 11:30 am – 3:30 pm, Eastern Time. NCURA will transmit a test signal one hour (10:30 – 11:30 am, Eastern Time) prior to air time!

### Registration Form

**Live Web Polling**
NCURA will offer live web polling during the broadcast. Campuses will want to have a computer with internet access so you can participate in this new, interactive feature of NCURATV.

**Email your questions during the live Broadcast**
Institutions can email their questions during the broadcast for the faculty to address live on air.

**Your Follow Up Questions Answered**
We will provide your institution with a special email address to submit questions to the faculty for up to one week after the live broadcast. A full transcript of all questions and answers will be sent to all participating schools.

**Live:** Those institutions that choose the live program will receive the handout information and satellite coordinates to receive the show live on their campus, and a license to tape the shows for future on-campus training.

**DVD:** Those who select the DVD option will receive handout information, and the follow up transcript when they receive their copy of the DVD.

**CONTACT NAME**

**TITLE**

**INSTITUTION**

**ADDRESS**

**CITY** ____________ **STATE** ____________ **ZIP** ____________

**PHONE** ____________ **FAX** ____________

**E-MAIL** ____________ **WEB SITE** ____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Live: $2,950.00</td>
<td>□ Live: $975.00</td>
<td>□ Live: $975.00</td>
<td>□ Live: $975.00</td>
<td>□ Live: $975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ DVD: $2,950.00</td>
<td>□ DVD: $975.00</td>
<td>□ DVD: $975.00</td>
<td>□ DVD: $975.00</td>
<td>□ DVD: $975.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Amount Due: $__________________

A check must accompany this registration form. Registrations received without payment will not be processed. Please make check payable in U.S. currency to NCURA and send payment and registration to NCURA, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 220, Washington, DC 20036.

**Credit Cards Accepted Exclusively Online**
Credit Card payments will not be accepted via fax or mail. If you would like to pay by credit card, you must do it by using the following Online Registration option: http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/videoseries/2007/registration.htm

**CANCELLATIONS:** Notification of cancellation must be received in writing no later than 14 business days prior to each telecast and are subject to a $75 cancellation fee. Cancellations received after the deadline will not be refunded. You must receive confirmation from NCURA to receive a refund.
NCURA Board of Directors and Committees 2007

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**President**
Pamela B. Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington

**Vice President**
David Mayo, California Institute of Technology

**Treasurer**
Kerry Peluso, University of Pennsylvania

**Secretary**
Denise Clark, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

**Immediate Past President**
Laura Wade, University of Houston

**Executive Director**
Kathleen M. Larmett, National Council of University Research Administrators

Bo Bogdanski, Colorado State University
James J. Casey, Jr., Independent Consultant and Attorney
Penny Cook, Yale University
Marti L. Dunne, New York University
Kenneth Forstmeier, The Pennsylvania State University
Barbara Gray, Valdosta State University
Patrick Green, Vanderbilt University
Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State University
Erica Kropp, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science
Gunta Liders, University of Rochester
Jan Madole, Oklahoma State University
Ann Pollack, University of California - Los Angeles
Ben Prince, University of Massachusetts Medical School at Worcester
David Richardson, The Pennsylvania State University

**NOMINATING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**Chair**
Christina Hansen, University of California-Irvine

**Vice Chair**
Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana

Judy Cook, North Harris-Montgomery County College District
Louise Griffin, University of Massachusetts Lowell
Ed Herran, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center
Dianne Horrocks, Idaho State University
David Lynch, Mayo Clinic Rochester
Linda Patton, California State University-Fullerton
Harlan M. Sands, Florida International University

**Immediate Past President**
Laura Wade, University of Houston

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**Chair**
Susan Wyatt Sedwick, University of Texas at Austin

**Vice Chair**
Thomas E. Wilson, City of Hope National Medical Center
Rebecca J. Balentine, Yale University School of Medicine
Stephen Etheredge, University of South Carolina
Erica Kropp, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science
Velera Pate, Georgia Institute of Technology
Michelle Joy Powell (NCURA Evaluation Coordinator), Georgia Institute of Technology
Beth Seaton, Western Illinois University
Susan Zipkin, Brigham & Women’s Hospital

**Ex-Officio Appointments:**
Robert P. Lowman (Newsletter Editor)
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
David J. Mayo (Vice President)
California Institute of Technology
Denise Rouleau (Neighborhood Program Committee Chair)
Brandeis University
Olivia A. Scriven (Newsletter Editor)
Spelman College
William Sharp (RMR Editor)
University of Kansas

**FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**Chair**
Kerry Peluso, University of Pennsylvania

Robert Andresen, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Jennifer Crockett, Social Sectors Development Strategies Inc.
Barbara Cole, Boston University Medical Campus

**Past Treasurer**
F. Edward Herran, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center
The Gaylord Texan has many venues where its guests can get together to continue networking. In addition to great restaurants and lounges, the Gaylord is famous for its river walk, reminiscent of the famous river walk in San Antonio. The Riverwalk has daily events and entertainers. This is an excellent place to stroll and chat as you find your way to the Riverwalk Market District.

The preliminary program for FRA VIII is now available! We encourage you to book your room reservations early! See y'all there!

http://www.ncura.edu/conferences/fra8/

The conference program committee represents a wide range of organizations, including our federal partners. This year’s program has expanded the number of sessions to choose from such as essential fundamentals found under the primer track, and in-depth analysis, which are included in the senior and federal tracks. The program will also include first – time short take sessions, adding an additional time slot which increases the total number and variety of sessions.

“I attend FRA because the conference is focused. FRA concentrates on financial issues, with special emphasis on issues related to post award administration. FRA attracts administrators with similar responsibilities; it is more conducive to networking. There is great value in meeting with colleagues who share similar backgrounds and job duties and are dealing with the same issues.”

Patrick Fitzgerald, Harvard University

“I attend FRA because the conference is focused. FRA concentrates on financial issues, with special emphasis on issues related to post award administration. FRA attracts administrators with similar responsibilities; it is more conducive to networking. There is great value in meeting with colleagues who share similar backgrounds and job duties and are dealing with the same issues.”

Shannon Sutton, Western Illinois University

Achieve a new kind of success at BearingPoint.

Join a team committed to achieving success, not once, but over and over again. The management and technology consultants at BearingPoint help Global 2000 companies and government organizations in 60 countries take on their most important challenges and opportunities with practical solutions that deliver results.

BearingPoint’s Regulatory Costing and Grants Management team serves 80 percent of US research colleges and universities and academic medical centers, helping clients recover the costs of their investments in sponsored programs. Rapid growth in this segment has created opportunities for professionals seeking a new kind of success to join our team.

Immediate openings are available for consultants (job #36287) and senior consultants (job #36473). Learn why joining BearingPoint could be the best career move you could make. Apply online at www.bearingpoint.com/careers.
Vice Chair - Research Administration

*Mayo Clinic in Rochester, MN* (MCR) is in search of candidates for the position of Vice Chair of Research Administration reporting to the Chair for Mayo Clinic Research. The Vice Chair has responsibility for directing and overseeing all operational aspects of Mayo Clinic Rochester’s (MCR’s) Research Administrative Services and responsibility for system-wide research activity across Mayo Clinic’s three group practice sites (Arizona, Jacksonville, and Rochester). The Vice Chair is responsible for ensuring Mayo Clinic Research Administration maintains strong organizational relationships with our customers, key business partners, external sponsors, and internal Mayo leaders. This individual works collaboratively with physician and administration leadership system-wide, providing consistency in compliance, policy administration, administrative support, issue resolution, communications and operational systems for the research vision, themes, strategies and initiatives.

Medical research at Mayo Clinic covers the spectrum, from laboratory and applied investigations to population-based studies and the latest in biotechnology, genomics and proteomics. In addition to our outstanding scientists, eighty percent of Mayo Clinic physicians participate in some form of research with over 6,000 employees engaged in research. Our long history of patient-based research provides a unique foundation for advancing tomorrow’s medical care. Mayo Clinic’s three locations offer diverse demographics for the more than four thousand clinical investigations conducted annually. Investigators work closely with clinicians to translate discoveries into therapies in a matter of months, rather than years. Mayo’s ability to improve patient care through targeted research has helped make it a major recipient of funding from the National Institutes of Health, contributing to Mayo’s total annual research budget of over $400 million.

Candidates must have a bachelor’s degree in business, healthcare administration or a similar field (master’s preferred), plus 8 years demonstrated competencies in leadership, strategic management, finance, personnel management, and operational management in a healthcare or research environment. Experience must also include working directly with physicians and/or scientists. Operational experience working in an institutional research environment is desired. Evidence of continuing education toward a pertinent professional certification and participation in national associations and meetings of research administration societies and associations considered a plus.

*Mayo Clinic offers an excellent salary and benefits package. To apply or learn more about this opportunity, please visit www.mayoclinic.org and reference job posting #12172.*

*Mayo Clinic*
Anna Wilcox - Human Resources
Phone: 800-562-7984
Email: wilcox.anna@mayo.edu
Think Small!

Remember when a dozen kids crammed into it? When you got 32 miles per gallon? When the engine was in the trunk? Fifty years ago, the VW bug was a big hit on college campuses.

Think Small Today, RACS llc is continuing to prove that small can be mighty. If you are looking to maximize your oversight of sponsored research and want an experienced team to provide proven interim management and direction in all areas of pre-award and post-award research administration, think hands-on. Think small.

Contact Charlie Tardivo, founder of RACS llc, and begin to put his more than 35 years of hands-on experience to work assuring your institution is compliant in all areas of grant administration.

You can hire the BIG consulting firm with the most staff or the SMALL one with the best hands-on experience. Think it over. Then contact Charlie.

216-403-8176 grantsresearch@yahoo.com

TAKE A CLOSER LOOK.

If your institution is not one of the many universities that our federal research group currently serves, please take a closer look at what we have to offer. We are widely recognized as a leader in addressing and resolving legal problems relating to federal research grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements performed by universities and nonprofit research institutions. We count among our clients the majority of the nation’s top 40 research universities, as listed in the most recent NSF rankings, and many other research institutions of all sizes in all parts of the country. Whether our clients need advice in connection with government audits or investigations, or counseling on financial, administrative, or scientific research compliance issues, we are proud to combine the legal acumen, unparalleled experience, and committed client service that makes us the law firm of choice for research institutions across the country.

HOGAN & HARTSON IS PROUD TO SUPPORT NCURA.

Baltimore  Caracas  Los Angeles  Paris
Beijing    Colorado Springs  Miami    Shanghai
Berlin     Denver             Moscow    Tokyo
Boulder    Geneva            Munich    Warsaw
Brussels   Hong Kong         New York  Washington, DC
Budapest   London            Northern Virginia
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
MAXIMUS Higher Education Practice

Compliance Matters..............................Protect Your Institution

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

Contact us at:
1-800-709-2747
http://highereducation.maximus.com
2007 NCURA TV Broadcast Series
Sponsored Project Essentials..................................................January 23, 2007
Effort Reporting .....................................................................March 6, 2007
Conflict of Interest .................................................................June 12, 2007
Subcontracting .......................................................................September 11, 2007

Online Chat
Subaward Monitoring Issues....................................................January 2007

Financial Research Administration Workshop
New Orleans, LA .................................................................February 12 – 14, 2007

Online Education Audio/Web Seminar
Cost Sharing Issues.................................................February 16, 2007, 12:30-2:00pm EST

Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
New Orleans, LA .................................................................February 14 – 16, 2007
Atlanta, GA .................................................................March 26 – 28, 2007
Charleston, SC .................................................................April 16 – 18, 2007
Austin, TX .................................................................May 23 – 25, 2007
Portland, OR .................................................................June 25 – 27, 2007
Indianapolis, IN .................................................................July 23 – 25, 2007
Providence, RI .................................................................August 20 – 22, 2007

Sponsored Project Administration: Level II
Critical Issues in Research Administration
Atlanta, GA .................................................................March 26 – 28, 2007
Portland, OR .................................................................June 25 – 27, 2007
Providence, RI .................................................................August 20 – 22, 2007

Financial Research Administration (FRA) VIII
Gaylord Texan Resort, Grapevine, TX ....................................April 1 – 3, 2007

2007 Regional Meetings
Region I, Providence, RI ........................................................May 6 – 9, 2007
Region II, Rochester, NY ........................................................May 5 – 8, 2007
Region III & IV, Nashville, TN ...............................................May 13 – 16, 2007
Region V, Arlington, TX ........................................................April 29 – May 2, 2007
Region VI/VII, Park City, UT ..................................................April 22 – 24, 2007

NCURA Annual Meetings 2007 and 2008

Visit www.ncura.edu for updates and additional information.
For more than thirty years, the NCURA Annual Meeting has been one of the highlights of my professional life. I am especially pleased to be working with Chris Hansen as the Co-Chair of the Program Committee for the 49th Annual Meeting. Under the overall direction of David Mayo and with the collaboration of a very bright, talented, and experienced Program Committee, we are looking forward to making the 49th Annual Meeting the best one yet.

Dick Seligman

I feel very privileged to participate in the planning of the 49th Annual Meeting, and fortunate that Dick Seligman and Chris Hansen have agreed to co-chair this important endeavor. Together we have selected a very accomplished group of individuals to make up the Program Committee, and I believe the 49th Annual Meeting will be one to remember!

David Mayo

I am delighted that David Mayo asked me to co-chair the 49th Annual Meeting with my good friend, Dick Seligman. With an exceptional group of NCURA members to help with the planning, this year’s Annual Meeting promises to offer the best of high quality workshops, timely presentations and networking opportunities. The 49th Annual Meeting should be a great one!

Chris Hansen