From office disasters to natural disasters, the only constant in today’s world is change...

Are YOU Prepared?

ALSO INSIDE: NCURA’s 50th Anniversary Meeting see page 3
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Working in research administration is an exercise in simultaneously juggling multiple responsibilities and time-sensitive projects. Internal and external pressures are constant. Getting and keeping our ducks in a row is a job responsibility we all share. Whether we keep our “ducks in a row” or “herd cats,” the cover design reflects one aspect of our profession.

The 50th Annual Meeting in Washington is rapidly coming. This issue contains articles geared towards newcomers to the profession (a “Just the Facts” track), and departmental administrators. Updates concerning the Annual Meeting will be in the Newsletter during the coming months.

Bob Beattie, in his ERA column, provides a thought-provoking look at the Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB) initiative. Bo Bogdanski poses a question that Plato first raised: Is your institution really different or is different just an excuse? If Plato were alive today, he would probably say that Bo is “spot on.”

Everyone knows how tragic Hurricane Katrina was, but out of that came greater recognition of the need for being prepared for the unexpected. To that end, Vivian Holmes and Tammy Raccio provide an article based upon interactions with Louisiana colleagues at FRA IX. Check it out!

Last but certainly not least, please give a warm welcome to Lynette Arias, Oregon Health & Science University, who has joined Bob Lowman and I as NCURA News Co-editor. She has an excellent background in research administration; read more about her inside this issue.

James Casey
Co-editor
At many institutions this time of the year is dedicated to budget planning for the new fiscal year. In FY09 be sure to plan the 50th Annual Meeting into your budget. This milestone year for NCURA marks a half century of support of the best science in the world. The Program Committee has chosen the theme of Celebrating the Science, Supporting the Scientist. We want Departmental Administrators to join in the celebration while taking advantage of one of the best programs in NCURA’s history. This year the format will be changed a bit and will feature two plenary sessions and lots of new opportunities to discuss issues relevant to your institution. We are bringing back “short takes”, one-hour sessions dedicated to a variety of topics, and this year we are adding a ‘Case Study’ session so that issues of the day can be discussed in detail in small intimate groups. It is the hope of the Committee that the various formats will give all of us the opportunity to learn from each other in sessions that best fit our individual learning styles.

The draft program is almost complete, and we have worked very hard at developing tracks for all levels of knowledge. For example, newcomers to the profession will find fundamental topics throughout the entire program. We anticipate that many newcomers will stick within the track and not only learn a great deal, but also move with many of the same people throughout the meeting. This networking opportunity may be one of the highlights of the meeting.

Those of you with years of experience will not be disappointed as we have jammed the sessions with intermediate and advanced level topics. Departmental Administrators will have the opportunity to attend sessions geared specifically to them on issues such as non-standard award terms, effective proposal development for hospitals and communicating compliance with faculty.

This year’s program has something for everyone. We hope you will consider sharpening your pencils and setting aside the funds you need to attend this meeting. Watch for the updates on the meeting in the coming months.

NCURA’s 50th Annual Meeting:

WHAT’S IN STORE FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATOR

“JUST THE FACTS”
Newcomers Track to be Offered at 50th Annual Meeting

By Antoinette Lawson and Danielle Woodman

This year the NCURA 50th Annual Meeting Program Committee will be introducing a newcomer’s track called “Just the Facts!” For those who have been working in research administration for less than a year, this track is designed to provide an introductory overview of topical areas for research administration as well as introduce new research administrators to one another. In addition, it will showcase the vast resources available through NCURA. We invite seasoned members of NCURA to encourage newcomer staff to participate in this welcoming, informative, introductory track.

Session titles for this track include: Acronyms, OMB Circular A-21-Allowability Criteria and Section J; Building a Budget; OMB Circular A-110; Effort Reporting; Cost Sharing and Cost Transfers; Financial Reporting; F&A and OMB Circular A-21-F.6.b; What is Research Administration and How Do We Provide Service to our PIs; Electronic Research Administration (eRA); and Non-Financial Compliance.

Sessions will be offered in the same room with the idea that newcomers will participate in most sessions as a cohort. The concept of the track is that each session will naturally flow into the next, offering a comprehensive overview of the primary topical areas as well as the range of resources available through NCURA. We invite seasoned members of NCURA to encourage newcomer staff to participate in this welcoming, informative, introductory track.

The NCURA 50th Annual Meeting Program Committee is excited about bringing this new track offering to this year’s conference.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS TRACK OR WOULD LIKE TO VOLUNTEER TO ASSIST WITH COMPLEMENTARY ACTIVITIES, PLEASE CONTACT ANTINOINETTE LAWSON, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION AND ADVANCEMENT, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, TLAWSON@UMRESEARCH.UMD.EDU OR DANIELLE WOODMAN, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF ACADEMIC GRANTS, DAEMEN COLLEGE AT DWOODMAN@DAEMEN.EDU.

APRIL/MAY 2008
**MILESTONES**

Have you or any of your colleagues made a career move? Please contact NCURA so our entire membership can help celebrate the change!

---

**NEW CO-EDITOR OF NCURA NEWSLETTER NAMED**

LYNETTE ARIAS, Director of the Sponsored Projects Administration office at Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) has been appointed co-editor of the NCURA Newsletter.

Lynette’s career in research administration began in 1988 at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and continued with positions at the University of Washington and Legacy Health Systems before joining OHSU in 1999. Although focused primarily on post-award over the last 9 years, Lynette’s background includes experience in both pre and post award grants management as well as involvement at the individual PI support level, and departmental as well as central leadership roles.

Lynette is excited to join the current editorial team of Bob Lowman and Jim Casey and looks forward to her upcoming work with the NCURA staff and membership.

---

**GEORGE SCIORTINO** recently joined MedStar Research Institute as Assistant Vice President, Research Administration.

**EDWARD F. PROCTOR III** has retired from Johns Hopkins University after 33 years of service.

On April 14, 2008 **BENJAMIN FIGUEROA** became Associate Vice President for Research at Childrens Hospital Los Angeles. Ben will be responsible for the development, implementation, and oversight of a centralized research administration for all research activities at Childrens Hospital with a focus on service, compliance, knowledge and efficiency in the concept of “One Stop Shop”.

**MICHAEL T. BLANDA** has been promoted to Assistant Vice President for Research and Federal Relations at the Texas State University-San Marcos.

---

**CONGRATULATIONS!**
Do not read this article if . . .

✓ You are always certain what regulations or policies are in effect
✓ You know which ones apply only to grants versus contracts and which ones apply to both
✓ You have complete confidence that you know exactly what your institution is expected to do in every situation.

S till reading? If you are like most of us, confusion about award policies has been particularly acute recently. Part of this has been due to extended—and sometimes confusing—discussions about the implementation of various Federal statutes. Further confusion has resulted from agencies establishing so-called interim rules. Added to this mix is the enduring optimism of research administrators that perhaps all these interim rules will simply go away. Meanwhile, research administrators find themselves in a difficult position. If an interim rule is going to be withdrawn or modified after the comment period is over, we don’t want to spend too much time and money implementing the interim rule. At the same time, we cannot afford to be out of compliance, even if the interim rule is going to be heavily modified or even withdrawn down the road.

Two current examples are useful and informative—one at the National Science Foundation; the other at the National Institutes of Health. The America COMPETES Act requires the National Science Foundation to implement a variety of changes to its application, reporting and oversight processes. Only one of all the measures outlined in the COMPETES Act has been implemented: a 30 percent cost share on the Major Research Instrumentation program. What has not been implemented is the requirements for Postdoctoral Fellow mentoring and training in the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR). NSF will notify the community either through Dear Colleague or Important Notices letters and/or requests for comment, etc., before full implementation. Proposals do not need to include discussions of postdoctoral mentoring or training in the responsible conduct of research as of April 2008, unless required by a specific program announcement.

The discussions of all the provisions of the COMPETES Act continue at NSF. With regard to the RCR requirement, NSF recognizes that any such education program needs to accommodate disciplinary differences and understands that the educational level of the trainee will make a difference in the topics and approaches used by an institution. NSF may not require a plan in each proposal. It could choose instead to have the institution certify that there is a plan in place and expect institutions to develop a process for monitoring and documenting that the RCR training has occurred as required. Acknowledging that the implementation of a broad-based training program will require significant time and resources on campus, NSF is considering requesting comment from the community on its planned implementation, particularly with regard to the Responsible Conduct of Research, through a Federal Register notice. If such a process occurs, the plan presented for comment will provide a general—but just a general—roadmap for institutions to use to begin their own planning. The final policy may change in response to the comments NSF receives from the community.

Unlike NSF’s pending implementation of the provisions of the America COMPETES Act, the National Institutes of Health’s requirement for Enhancing Public Access to Archived Publications Resulting from NIH-Funded Research—submitting final peer reviewed manuscripts accepted for publication to PubMed Central—is current and active.

In January 2008, NIH issued a revised policy that made the previously voluntary submission provision mandatory as required by PL 110-161, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008. The policy, itself, requires submission of manuscripts accepted for publication on or after April 7, 2008. However, investigators and institutions must read the Frequently Asked Questions posted to NIH’s Public Access website to understand that it applies to manuscripts resulting from current and active awards (grants issued since October 1, 2007; contracts issued on or after April 7, 2008). These are important limitations and reflect the fact that the requirement is tied to appropriation funding for the current fiscal year.

NIH requested further information on the implementation of the Public Access policy in a March 28 NIH Guide and March 31 Federal Register notice. This renewed call for comment, following a March 20 public meeting and request for comment, has led some in the research community to believe they don’t have to implement the policy because it remains under discussion. Others believe it will go away in the next appropriation bill and, as a consequence, can be ignored. As to the former perspective, the policy is in effect and the institution should focus its information and assistance on those investigators who have continuing funding. These scientists may have results to report and need to reserve their right in copyright agreements to deposit the final peer-reviewed manuscript in PubMed Central. As to the latter viewpoint, it is important to remember that FY 2009 funds may be appropriated through a continuing resolution which will keep the mandatory submission provision in effect for FY 2009 funds. In addition, there is widespread support for access to federally funded research results in Congress, by the public—especially patient advocate groups—and at NIH.

Keeping track of new agreement terms and conditions requires revisions in subawards as well. The NIH Public Access Policy flows to subrecipients, because it follows the research activity. Another example occurred early in March 2008, when NIH chose to implement the Trafficking in Persons award term under “interim final guidance” issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in November 2007. Other agencies will begin to implement this grant policy, and universities need to review their subagreements to pass this provision down to their subrecipients as appropriate. In a notice posted on March 7, 2008 and in effect on that date, NIH has continued on page 27
It was a beautiful morning with the sun shining over the Mississippi River as we prepared for the opening session of the FRA IX conference. As we met for breakfast with our distinguished leaders and administrators who graciously offered to help NCURA attendees gain an appreciation for how they survived the devastation of Hurricane Katrina in August 2005, we quickly realized this was not going to be a session solely about their commitment to rebuilding research administration. It would also be a lesson about inner strength and the human spirit which has brought New Orleans back so far in less than three years since the deadliest and costliest natural disaster in the US.

Our guests represented Louisiana State University Health Science Center, Tulane University and the University of New Orleans. Each of them shared their disaster preparations pre-Katrina and changes they’ve made post-Katrina. Whether you live in an area subject to hurricanes, tornados, wildfires or ice storms, there was something for everyone to take back to their institution from our experienced panel. For those of you who were not able to attend FRA IX we’d like to share with you some suggestions from our panel regarding preparedness for the unexpected.

As we listened to each one of our panelists share their experiences we could see how Katrina has impacted research administration at all of our institutions in some capacity.

Many of our institutions are enhancing disaster plans on campus and their off-site locations after leveraging from lessons learned through Katrina. We were extremely fortunate to have Peter Tiskus, Dr. Kenneth Kratz and Shanna Labranche from Louisiana State University; Dr. Laura Levy, Tulane University; and Dr. Joseph King, University of New Orleans share their professional and personal experiences with us. It was clear that the rebuilding is underway and huge progress at every institution is being made. We extend our deepest gratitude to these individuals and their institutions to help us understand how Katrina affected every aspect of their lives and how they are forging ahead to make New Orleans and their institutions stronger that ever.

Vivian Holmes is Director, Finance & Administration, Harvard Medical School and Tammy Raccio is Audit Manager, Yale University. Both served as Co-chairs of FRA IX.
This year’s FRA Conference was a great success, bringing in just over 715 attendees. The conference offered attendees several opportunities to gain knowledge in different areas pertaining to federal regulations and issues regarding compliance, clinical trials, pre-award, effort reporting, and much more. FRAIX also offered an extended program from previous years. This year the conference offered a full day of workshops, giving attendees 20 different workshops to choose from.

In addition to the educational offerings and networking opportunities, FRA attendees also had the chance to help the city of New Orleans by reaching out to its local merchants. A couple of walking tours were organized with the local, family-run stores. Groups of attendees enjoyed visiting the different stores and purchasing an array of merchandise.

This year’s attendees were happy to come back to New Orleans and enjoyed everything the beautiful city has to offer.
Is Your Institution Really Different or is Different Just an Excuse?

By Vincent A. “Bo” Bogdanski

For as long as I have been attending NCURA training, now thirteen years, I have heard research administrators describe their institutions or some part of their institution as “different” or “unique” or some similar description. Often the word “different” is used in relation to instances of non- or minimal compliance to federal requirements. Since federal compliance policy dictates most institutional internal compliance systems, I have been disturbed at how often I heard the description “different.” Then I began thinking about what is really “different” in research administration from one institution to another in relation to compliance. This article includes my thoughts on the subject. Compliance in this article refers to any compliance from IRBs to export controls to financial activities. I hope these thoughts will cause you to think about your organization and maybe initiate some changes that will call for compliance that is well thought out when implemented or changed.

Federal compliance has not changed much over the years. Sure, there have been updates to IRBs, IACUCs, nuclear safety etc., but these updates usually occurred after there had been abuses or where guidance wasn’t sufficient and clarification was needed. OMB Circulars A-133, A-110 and A-21 have been re-written only a few times, and the changes have not been numerous or far reaching. Even changes to the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) take a relatively long time to implement.

I agree that compliance has become more complicated and in-depth, but it has not changed decidedly or quickly, and the changes have been gradual. I submit that many organizations have not adjusted until there was an absolute need to change at that institution. In the time between knowledge of the requirement and the institutions’ action, many have just declared themselves “different.”

I have been a bureaucrat for some thirty-five years, and from the very beginning I heard “more with less,” “limited or dwindling resources,” “additional oversight requirements with no additional budget,” and similar statements. So I surmise things haven’t changed that much since the clichés are the same. As for compliance, none of us are really that “different,” although those who realistically and thoroughly address any one issue, using sound management principles, will institute solutions which are not “cookie cutter,” but reflect the true needs of the institution.

For purposes of this discussion, labeling as “different” is an attempt to legitimate an excuse for circumstances or situations which result from choices, either informed or uninformed, that do not address or do not adequately address risks. These choices may be based simply on lack of resources available, popularity or unpopularity with the topic, unfamiliarity of the topic, the potential of having to make a change or modify the organization’s thought processes because of the topic, or simple lack of time. Surely I have not addressed all the negative reasons for declaring an institution “different,” but by looking at the listing above, the reader can readily and easily add to the excuses for declaring themselves “different” while thinking about this article.

A decision is a well thought out action developed through in-depth analysis and assessment based on good management principles. Decisions are not made quickly, and when ready to implement are well publicized to the constituency. They are often in the form of a policy, but at a minimum, they are written and available for common access. They would be used to justify your institution’s position in the event of audit. Constituents may not agree with the decision, but are aware of the final result, and if possible, the reasoning for that decision. The result does not make your institution “different,” but provides a direction for compliance that will meet the societal need for the compliance requirement, address the scrutiny of audit, and hopefully be readily available for adaptation by similar institutions in similar situations.

...A decision is a well thought out action developed through in-depth analysis and assessment based on good management principles.

Here are some of the approaches which I’ve seen used to declare an institution “different.” The approaches provided sometimes give examples which are specific to U.S. institutions, but these examples are for illustration purposes only and those outside the U.S. can more than likely think of examples which fit your particular circumstances.

Avoid or delay addressing the issue.

No action is a decision. By avoiding and delaying, you are telling your community that the particular compliance issue is of little or no importance, and you don’t think it has any potential negative consequences for your institution. You are declaring your institution as “different” from those who recognize the issue as necessary for compliance.

Nominally address an issue.

Create a procedure, but don’t document or formally develop the procedure for all to use. Put the procedure in some obscure or little-used document, or only use verbal guidelines given to a minimum number of people. This allows for multiple deviations of the procedure because each individual will move toward their own implementation or interpretation and soon many situations become “different.”
Gamble on audit.
Have your words and actions lead to a conclusion that the auditors either won't catch or if they do catch, it won't matter at your institution. The compliance issue is of so little importance that your “different” situation will be obvious to any auditor that would bother to address the issue.

Label your institution as different.
Declare yourself as “different,” that is a medical school, a predominantly undergraduate institution, an agricultural school, an East coast school, a predominantly NSF school etc. I am only aware of very few situations where your institution characteristics make any “difference” in the compliance issues. I looked but can’t find anything in A-21 that says, “except for medical schools,” and nothing in the FAR says “academic institutions of higher education except agricultural schools.” The federal government will write exceptions in their regulations if they determine those exceptions are appropriate for a particular class of institutions.

Allow your situation to dictate your action.
Are your salaries perceived as too low? Encourage additional compensation. Are you not funded for administrative salaries? Put more administration expenses in your budget justifications. Are IRB activities too slow? Skip the process because you know that the project is exempt. All of these actions allow you to declare yourself as “different” but in most cases it is just cutting corners or rationalizing based on the situation. Rationalization doesn’t fix these issues; good management and leadership principles do.

Let the sponsor’s inaction define your action.
Put it in the proposal and if the sponsor doesn’t object, they must have approved your position as “different.” However, sponsors expect the institution to be following their own internal processes and procedures. A-21 has four criteria for any purchase: allowable, reasonable, allocable, and consistent. By deferring to the agency in the proposal, we often default the consistency criteria to the sponsor—thus being able to declare ourselves “different.” Sponsors expect well thought out decisions made by each institution and consistent adherence to those institutional policies.

Use an unauthorized or uniformed opinion as the basis for your action.
Program managers are not always knowledgeable of sponsor or federal laws, rules, or regulations or are not capable of waiving them. However, many will either intentionally or unknowingly declare your situation as “different” even if that authority is not within their purview. Even worse, institutions use the program manager’s “permission” as an excuse to declare themselves as “different.”

Use a liberal interpretation.
Allow non-experts to interpret the federal regulations without input or background. The result based on a “gut feel” or a comment like “they really can’t mean it this way” allows for a “different” interpretation. Looking at just the words of the rule without intent, without researching another institution’s implementation, and without considering a strategic implementation for the whole institution makes any situation look “different.” Rationalization is easy, takes no real analysis, and allows for multiple interpretations.

Write a weak or very general policy.
Weak or general policies allow for multiple deviations because there is plenty of room for “different” interpretations. Weak policies make compliance difficult to achieve.

It has always been done this way.
Institutional culture can be an excuse for lack of leadership and is an excuse for being “different.” Cultures change and your goal should be to have a culture of compliance. You need to give everyone at the institution the training to comply and the tools to enforce if necessary.

You don’t have the systems, expertise, or experience.
This doesn’t mean you are “different.” Your institution either by circumstance or decision has a problem. Either change the circumstances or change the decision. Admittedly this will take time and maybe some things cannot be done in the short term. A strategic plan with realistic milestones would be helpful, provided there is a real commitment to the long range goals from the multiple levels of the institution.

You are an Institute, Center or Division.
Institutes, Centers, and Divisions are part of a whole. Awards are given to the institution, not to the Institute, Center or Division. By declaring yourself “different,” you are indicating that your part of the institution doesn’t need to adhere to any institutional policies and procedures or you can “cherry pick” those policies or procedures that fit your needs and declare yourself “different” for others. If you are truly different, the institution should consider “spinning you off” and allow you to develop your own policies and procedures with a separate F&A agreement and your own administrative structure. Either you belong or don’t belong. There is no in-between.

Now, you may think this is just semantics and you may be right for your situation. But considering the number of times I heard “different” and the resulting details, I don’t have the impression that semantics is the rule. If we are going to be leaders in our professional activities, we ought to use language that shows professionalism and action. I’d like to hear research administrators say “my institution decided” or “we chose” or “the option we selected” as more appropriate for our vernacular. Further, those decisions and the resulting decision process should be shared with other institutions for assessment of similarity of issue and to assist those other institutions in making a decision for their situation.

I believe that declaring your institution as “different” has the potential to be a disservice to those that are served by compliance regulations: the taxpayer, the human subject, the people who work within our laboratories, and the people that live in the surrounding community. If there is any sort of adverse event, being “different” is not going to be an easy sell to the auditor, the newspaper, the regulators or others within the academic community. There cannot be a better process than a well thought out decision to make the research administration community and profession respected by those we serve.

Vincent A. “Bo” Bogdanski is the Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs at Colorado State University. These are his own thoughts at do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Colorado State University.

Vincent A. “Bo” Bogdanski is the Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs at Colorado State University. These are his own thoughts at do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Colorado State University.
GRANTS MANAGEMENT ACROSS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS EXTREMELY DECENTRALIZED. MORE THAN 900 PROGRAMS IN OVER 26 GRANT-MAKING AGENCIES PROVIDE OVER $500 BILLION ANNUALLY IN FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE. THE [GRANTS MANAGEMENT LINE OF BUSINESS] IS CREATE A GOVERNMENT-WIDE SOLUTION ... THAT WILL SUPPORT END-TO-END GRANTS MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS [AND] A STANDARDIZED AND STREAMLINED APPROACH ... ACROSS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ... [IN ORDER] TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF ... SYSTEMS DEPLOYED ACROSS THE 26 GRANT-MAKING AGENCIES.

President's E-gov Grants Management website

The Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB) initiative faces a daunting task. It has been given the job of simplifying and standardizing the business processes and information technology (IT) systems of every grant-making agency across the federal government. If successful, the impact on colleges and universities will be immense. While we may receive only 10-15 percent of the $500 billion in federal grants each year, we submit about a third of the applications. Further, our organizations collectively deal with all 26 grant-making agencies. As a result, we interact with dozens of different business processes and IT systems—a legacy developed over many years of decentralized federal grants management. This article is a report on how GMLoB is progressing and what we might expect to see in the next year or two. It draws heavily on information contained in agency websites and provided to the author by agency personnel involved in the effort.

Public Law 106-107 gave impetus to standard forms and a single portal for the submission of grant applications that evolved into Grants.gov. This same law also had provisions for post-submission management. A couple of years after the law was passed, in 2001, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) had identified 24 different e-government initiatives, one of which was devoted to grants management. In 2004, the Office of Government-Wide Policy (in the General Services Administration) and OMB were working to establish “common solution and target architecture approaches that identify systems, best practices, migration strategies and key interfaces to develop common business process and system solutions in each of three business areas: financial management, human resources, and grants management.” This was the beginning of the Line of Business Opportunity Development Initiative.

GMLoB is an initiative to streamline the entire grants management process, support more common ways of doing business, and reduce grants IT infrastructure across all agencies and the entire lifecycle. Goals identified for the initiative included: (1) improved decision making; (2) integration with financial management processes; (3) greater efficiency of reporting procedures and enhanced quality of information collected; and (4) optimized post-award and closeout action.

In September 2005, Charles Havekost, the original manager of the Grants.gov project, reported progress on GMLoB to the Federal Demonstration Project (FDP). He explained that there was to be a specific operating model in which the grants management community processed grants in a decentralized way using common business processes and supported by shared technical support services. That model called for:

- Aligning agency work teams around shared business interests (consortia)
- Allowing each consortium to provide planning, leadership, business, and program direction with the goal of standing up a service center to meet their members’ needs
- Designing service centers to provide technical solutions and support to a consortium of agencies
- Encouraging competition among agencies and/or private industry to provide the technology components

The grants flow was divided into 14 processes (g=grantee function, others are agency functions):

1. program announcement
2. find(g)
3. apply(g)
4. authenticate
5. intake
6. status & update(g)
7. conduct review & decision
8. in process status review(g)
9. award fulfillment
10. receive notification(g)
11. award management & oversight
12. reports(g)
13. grantor close-out
14. grantee close-out(g)

Grants.gov is the government-wide solution for Find and Apply. These two aspects of the flow should not be part of GMLoB which, would instead focus on the other twelve.

OMB has recognized three GMLoB Consortia and selected three agencies to lead them, as shown in the table below, taken from the 2009 E-Gov IT Budget report.
Consortia partners that have signed Memoranda of Understanding with a Managing Agency.

The first agency in each column is the Consortium manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GrantSolutions</th>
<th>G5</th>
<th>Research.gov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager: HHS/Agency for Children and Families (ACF) Institute of Museum and Library Services</td>
<td>Manager: Department of Education Department of Justice - Community Oriented Policing Services</td>
<td>Manager: National Science Foundation (NSF) *Dept. of Agriculture - Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service National Aeronautics and Space Administration Department of Defense: ONR, AFOSR, ARO, DARPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury - Community Dev. Financial Institutions Dept of Transportation Corporation of National and Community Service Environmental Protection Agency Department of State USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service 6 HHS agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>*No MOU signed, but a long standing partner and user of services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(GrantSolutions) GrantSolutions.gov calls itself “The Grants Center of Excellence.” The website for the Consortium is GrantSolutions.gov. The introduction on the site states:

The GrantSolutions.gov mission is to provide a comprehensive and cost effective grants management solution for grantors, grantees and applicants. We service all types of grants (service, training, demonstration, social research, and cooperative agreements) across all grant categories (discretionary, formula, block, and entitlement).

GrantSolutions.gov incorporates all 14 Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB) grant award processes both for awarding agencies and recipients as well as extensive and flexible post-award reporting mechanisms.

- Full life-cycle processing (pre-award through post-award) for all types of grants
- Funds control integration with financial systems, financial reports, audit tracking
- Flexible mechanisms for program-specific needs and performance reports
- Standard system interfaces to Grants.gov and other external systems.

Additionally, there is a Review Management Module, Online Data Collection for submitting grant forms to DHHS, and an Enterprise Reporting System that allows grantees to view and print reports. I could not find what types of users had access to various parts. This is especially troubling when there is no central Grants Office control. In response to a question to the national Research Administrator’s Listserv about use of GrantSolutions.gov, I had the following response from a Grants Office manager: "I’ve used the GrantSolutions program/website to submit a progress report. . . . It’s set up so that only the PIs can use it, and when I asked how I can view/submit/approve, I was told to fill out and submit a paper form to get a waiver from their regular policy of only allowing one user/contact (the PI) in the system."

Besides dealing with post-submission grants management, there seems to be a submission program, but according to the project manager, Michael Curtis, the Consortium incorporates Grants.gov as its "find and apply function." The Consortium has developed automated links to “download and upload information from Grants.gov.” I reviewed a recent grant solicitation from ACF, “Child Welfare Training: National Child Welfare Workforce Initiatives.”

There was no reference to GrantSolutions.gov in the application; only instructions for Grants.gov or paper submissions.

The GrantSolutions.gov system offers many functions for grants management by Agency staff. More features for grantees will be forthcoming, and, with, I hope, better University Grants Office control over interactions.

G5

The Department of Education Consortium, typically called G5, has as its motto “Empowering the Grant Community.” The website states “It is with great pride that the U.S. Department of Education (ED) announces the G5 application, G5 is a state-of-the-art electronic system for grants management and payments. It will replace the current Grant Administration and Payment System (GAPS).

Also on the website is the comment, “G5 is the Department of Education’s new grants management system designed to achieve the following objectives” (G5 refers to the 5 items):

1. Enhance and increase program performance monitoring
2. Improve communications with system users
3. Fast-track grant award processing
4. Link dollars to results
5. Promote technical and financial stewardship

The time line for the systems is as follows:

- Phase 1 (2007) Payment Functions: Drawdown capabilities and base system architecture
- Phase 2 (2008) Pre-Award Functions: Planning and scheduling, application (notice & receipt), and peer review process
- Phase 3 (2009) Post-Award Functions: Grant performance and financial monitoring grant close-out, and electronic signatures

Before users can do anything on the system, they must go through a registration involving submission of detailed information including date of birth. Moreover, the application for use must then be signed by the applicant’s supervisor; and faxed to the Department of Education. Only when the application to use the system is approved does the requested role get activated. Given that the current function is grant payment, this seems appropriate, but I have to wonder what the procedures will be when PIs and Grants Office staff are involved in future phases. The University of Michigan, Assistant Financial Manager of Sponsored Programs commented on using the system: ▶
Research.gov

The third GMLoB Consortium, Research.gov, is managed by the National Science Foundation. Its motto is “Powering Knowledge and Innovation.” The site’s home page lists the following services:

- Research Spending and Results: NSF award information available to be searched by the public in compliance with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006.
- Policy Library: An electronic library that consolidates federal and agency-specific policies, guidelines and procedures for use by federal agencies and the awardee community. Agency-specific documents are included only for Research.gov partner agencies.
- Grants Application Status (Coming soon): Single site where principal investigators and sponsored research offices check the up-to-date status of grant applications submitted to participating agencies.
- Institution and User Management (Coming soon): Online tool for administrators to grant user rights and privileges.

Other services to come are: Principal Investigator/Reviewer Profile Update, Federal Financial Reporting, Research Performance Progress Reporting, Research Spending and Results Sub-award, and Payments and Cash Requests.

The Research Spending and Results search function is in operation now and works quite well, with one caveat. Users need to use precise search terms to ensure accurate results. For example, I searched on “University of Michigan” and found many hits that are not awards to UM, but to other universities in Michigan. A search with the more formal title, “Regents of the University of Michigan” gave a list of 739. My local search found 740. The results included all awards active in FY2007 and beyond. Indeed, the most recent entry for UM was an award for March 27, 2008, the week I wrote this article. Quite up-to-date! A user can drill down into more detail to a page showing much grant, financial and demographic detail, including an abstract. Moreover, all of the awards can be exported to Excel. Currently the system only contains NSF awards, but Consortium partner award data will be added.

The other active feature noted at the home page is the Policy Library, which contains federal and agency-specific policies, guidelines and procedures. The library appears to be quite comprehensive. I would recommend the Research.gov Library as the first place to look for policy related documents.

The next functions developed by the Consortium will be the Grants Application Status. This will allow sponsored projects officers and principal investigators to check the status of their proposals as they are received and reviewed by NSF and partner agencies and view a history of the submissions, panel summaries and reviews (available only to PIs), and award and/or authorization notices. Other useful features will include a consolidated list of grant applications submitted to all Consortium agencies.

While Research.gov does not have an explicit “find and apply” function, it seems that NSF is retaining FastLane as an alternative to Grants.gov. FastLane will be available only to NSF, not to other partners in the consortium.

Exemptions

An agency can obtain an exemption from joining a Consortium. The Department of Energy did so, and has begun its own system to replace the Industry Interactive Procurement System (IIPS), based on a commercial system—FedConnect. There is a special notice on the IIPS website that states:

The Department of Energy, including the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), will implement the Strategic Integrated Procurement Enterprise System (STRIPE) during fiscal years 2008 and 2009. As a result, the Department will begin using FedConnect, which is hosted by Compusearch, as the communications portal for its potential and actual contractor and financial assistance recipient communities beginning in March 2008 instead of the current system (IIPS). Therefore, in order to do business with the Department, all current and potential acquisition and financial assistance awardees must be registered with Compusearch’s FedConnect portal.

Information on the site explains that FedConnect will be used not only for post-submission grants management but also for contract submission and management. There is no indication of any “find and apply” function.

Another agency missing from the current Consortia is the National Institutes of Health (NIH). That agency already had the eRA Commons, an excellent example of what a GMLoB system should be: post-submission grant application management, revision options, capability to add just-in-time information, award notice, close out functions, and more, but no “find and apply” NIH also had to submit an appeal to the OMB asking for an exemption from partnering with the existing Consortia. Megan Columbus, NIH Manager for Electronic Receipt of Grant Applications and Agency Integration, reports that “NIH’s appeal was granted, probably in part because NIH has been servicing other organizations in the spirit of the GMLoB since before the initiative began. The appeal decision means we can continue using eRA systems to support NIH and our HHS operating divisions and Agency partners, which include AHRQ, CDC, FDA, SAMHSA, and the VA.”

Conclusion

The e-gov site that I quoted at the top of the article presents the following benefits of GMLoB for grantees.

Through GMLoB, citizens will experience improved service and reduced administrative burden due to the standardization and streamlining of government-wide grants business processes. Fewer and more consistent grant system interfaces, as well as the availability of online forms and filing will lead to time, cost, and resource savings for the grantee community.

These are certainly outcomes we in research administration would like. Better to deal with fewer than 26 different entities for grants management. But, there are still issues to be addressed.
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
“What you do speaks so loud I cannot hear what you say.”

– Ralph Waldo Emerson

Let’s face it, we can all be difficult. We would constantly be on the move if we tried to run away from every difficult person. The first “difficult person” we have to deal with is ourselves, one of the first exercises taught in the NCURA Leadership Development Institute, and certainly one of the most beneficial, is that leaders must learn their own personality types before they can gain an understanding of others. In doing so, leaders learn that good communication requires working through fears and becoming aware of “blind spots” in their own behavioral patterns. Effective management of difficult interpersonal relationships requires the ability to communicate honestly within ourselves, as well as with others. When a leader begins to understand her or his own psychological drives and desires, she/he is able to avoid behavioral stumbling blocks and unknowingly encouraging difficult behavior within themselves or others. Whether you are a leader in a formally defined leadership position, or simply someone whom others seek out, you can benefit from an understanding of how your behavior influences others.

The behavioral and communication habits of leaders greatly influence the environment in which they lead. Their actions communicate their personal values and their vision for the organization. As Kouzner and Posner discuss in “The Leadership Challenge Workbook,” good leaders understand that their “voice” as a leader is closely related to their own personal values. Leaders’ actions set the tone and the expectations of the people that they lead. Because leaders are looked up to as role models, it is important for them to consider the impact of their behavior. Leaders who model negative behaviors are setting an unhealthy example and may cultivate bad behavior in others, thus creating an environment in which difficult people thrive and congenial people become difficult. If a leader is unclear about his or her personal values she or he may appear chameleon-like. Chameleon-like behavior erodes a leader’s credibility and gives the impression of inconsistency and indecision, thereby undermining effective communication and the image of strong leadership. Whether or not the person is conscious of his or her negative behaviors, the result is the same. It is most important for leaders to explore their behavior and underlying psychological motivation when dealing with difficult people.

There is an old saying: “People treat you the way you allow them to treat you.” Becoming a strong leader means overcoming common blind spots such as fear of rejection and confrontation. If a leader’s behavior is centered on the avoidance of fear it will be hard for him or her to project a strong and confident voice. Good communication skills are essential for leaders who must deal with a variety of difficult people. When leaders “model the way,” as Kouzner and Posner describe, by communicating consistently with team members and colleagues, they are able to connect with people in a way that demonstrates competence, credibility, and a genuine respect for others. Additionally, leaders who demonstrate competence and respect for others are able to build a culture based on mutual trust.

It is important that leaders not only explore their inner world, but also consider a variety of techniques to deal with difficult people. Leaders will be well served if they choose to build their knowledge of different personality types and learn techniques for diffusing and dealing with difficult behavior. There is no silver bullet for dealing with difficult people, but a number of helpful books are available and worth consulting.

There is an old saying: “People treat you the way you allow them to treat you.”

It is not necessary to be a psychologist to implement the suggestions in “Coping with Difficult People” by Robert Bramson, but readers will need a willingness to develop better communication skills. Bramson suggests using a coping approach that does not seek to control or demand change from a difficult person – of which Bramson identifies seven different types and outlines techniques to diffuse their behavior. Just be careful that you’re not “typecasting” a difficult person and thereby closing off communication. A key concept of the book is that difficult people use their behavior to get a desired result because they have learned it works – picture a child throwing a temper tantrum in a
store and getting a cookie to calm them down. An adult’s behavior may be less dramatic, but no less damaging. The book outlines communication techniques that can be used to consistently convey the message that the difficult behavior is unacceptable.

Bell and Smith, in their book “Winning with Difficult People,” describe difficult people as Sources of Pain, which they humorously describe as “SOP’s.” The techniques and scenarios outlined in the book are based on 500 interviews with difficult people and the people their behaviors have affected. The book discusses twelve different types of difficult people and describes their behavior in detail. The book is a great source of real-world examples and specific techniques that can be used with performance appraisals, disciplinary conferences, terminations, and exit interviews.

Bell and Smith suggest that exploring our own judgmental voices will better enable us to understand our reactions to the difficult person. Effectively dealing with a difficult person requires anger management — since anger destroys communication. The book discusses techniques that can be utilized to remain objective and keep the lines of communication open. The authors argue that exploring our own inner world is the way to build our knowledge and listening skills to achieve better communication.

Reading Sam Horn’s “Tongue Fu” reminds us of a sign posted on an IRB administrator’s desk that reads, “It is nice to be important but it is important to be nice.” We are so often centered on our own feelings and accomplishments that we feel entitled to get our way. The lesson to be learned is that, despite our title, degrees, family name, or affiliations, the world does not revolve around any one individual. It is only by working cooperatively that we achieve great things. This book explores a variety of techniques that will help even the most self-centered person step outside themselves. The reader is encouraged to communicate better with a difficult person rather than wallowing in hurt feelings or bruised egos. In Horn’s view, our own impatience is often the by-product of ignorance. Horn outlines techniques that help the reader explore situations and gather objective facts required to communicate with difficult people.

The bottom line is that good communication is critical when dealing with the behaviors of difficult people. Leaders need to understand themselves as well as the various types of situations and personalities that trigger bad behaviors. Leaders who explore their inner worlds and understand themselves first will be empowered to deal confidently with difficult people.

We hope that readers are inspired to explore their inner world as well as build their knowledge of ways to deal successfully with their own and others’ difficult behavior. Unexpectedly, difficult people can teach us things about ourselves that we would not have otherwise considered. We hope that when faced with difficult people you will confidently approach them with a willingness to grow and expand your knowledge about human behavior. No leader is an island and we hope that everyone consults the resources discussed in this article to build better communication skills so that you are able to work better with others. Ultimately, a person cannot force another to change. But by altering our own behavior, we can change the dynamic and possibly the outcome of any situation.

We would like to thank the LDI class of 2007, NCURA, and other colleagues for their support, inspiration, and willingness to provide honest feedback. Without contributions from others this article would not have been possible.

Leerin K. Shields is the Subawards Associate for The Johns Hopkins University, School of Medicine. Anita Mills is the Associate Director, Sponsored Projects Compliance Training at the University of Pennsylvania

SELF-EXAMINATION

Here’s a brief exercise to get you started on examining your own attitudes and behaviors.

Scenario:
Professor Frazzle is one of the top researchers at your institution. He is used to getting his way and having everyone cater to his every need. You have never warmed up to Professor Frazzle and find yourself boiling with frustration just at the sight of him. You know if you do not help Professor Frazzle you will spend your entire vacation filled with anxiety and frustration.

Mental Practice:
Do you have a Professor Frazzle in your life? Think about this person and jot down everything (we mean everything!) that comes to mind when you think of this person.

- What do your notes reveal about your thoughts and judgments about your difficult person?
- How are these judgments affecting your communication with the difficult person?
- Are the judgments valid?
Greetings, Region I:

Our 2008 Regional Spring Meeting in beautiful Cape Cod, having just ended, provided a terrific program of more than 50 workshops, concurrent sessions, and discussion groups woven around each attendee’s self-defined level of expertise. As a result, each of us left the meeting with information to help us in “Steering Clear of the Jaws of Non-Compliance”, our meeting theme. Please stay tuned for more meeting highlights, including the recipients of our Region I Distinguished Service Award, Outstanding New Professional Award, Outstanding Volunteer Award and Merit Award in the next NCURA Newsletter!

I am pleased to announce here the three recipients of the $750 Travel Awards for the Regional Spring Meeting:

- Colleen M. Campbell, Proposal Development Coordinator, Bridgewater State College
- Megan Ballard, Grants Development Specialist, Springfield Technical Community College
- Karen Andresen, Academic Grant Writer/Manager, Norwich University

The travel award allows at least two recipients to attend the NCURA Region I Spring Meeting and the amount of $750 helps defray some of the costs associated with attending the meeting. Thanks go to the members of the Awards Committee and Susan Cassidy Zipkin Director, Chair of the Awards Committee for their work in facilitating and coordinating the selection process.

The February 14 Research Administrators Discussion Group (RADG) meeting “Hot Compliance Topics for a Cold February Day” was a huge success! We had more than 170 people in attendance. A special Region I thank you go out to our panelists: Patrick Fitzgerald, Associate Dean for Research Administration, Harvard University and Gretchen Brodnicki, Director of Research Compliance, Partners Healthcare.

The RADG meetings continue to be a great way to stay on top of current issues in research administration in addition to serving as a networking opportunity within our region. Please visit the Region I Home page under “Meetings” for information about future RADG meetings.

I look forward to seeing you again soon!

Tom Egan is Chair of Region I and serves as the Assistant Director, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dear NCURA Region II Members,

It certainly has been a busy time for NCURA Region II. We’ve returned from a most successful Region II Spring Meeting in Pittsburgh, and I’ll have more on the meeting in the next issue of the Newsletter. I am very pleased to let you know that Region II presented two Distinguished Service Awards during the Spring Meeting. This year’s awardees are Ken Forstmeier and Erica Kropp. Ken is Director of the Office of Research Information Systems at The Pennsylvania State University. Region II members, though, may know him better as “a ‘techie’ with a national profile who fluently speaks the language of research administration,” to quote Betty Fabman’s eloquence in describing Ken’s talents and unparalleled contributions to the Region and its members. In addition to serving on the National Board of Directors, on the Region II Steering Committee, and as a frequent moderator and presenter; he has always made himself available to our members for consultation and support and shared freely of his expertise in electronic research administration. Erica is Director of Research Administration and Advancement at the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science. She is currently serving as our regionally-elected National Board Member and has served as regional meeting chair, on the Steering Committee, and as a moderator and presenter on many topics. Her nomination materials for this award stressed the fact that she is ready to take on any task to serve NCURA and the Region, never saying “no” to a colleague in need. Anyone who knows Erica knows that this is 100% true. She is truly generous with her time and with her vast knowledge of the field of research administration. Congratulations to Ken and Erica, and our thanks for their extreme and continuing commitment to the Region, and its members.

I’d like to take this opportunity to remind you that NCURA is now accepting applications for the Leadership Development Institute (LDI) for 2009. The application deadline is June 6, 2008. This is a good time to think about submitting an application for the LDI, or about encouraging a colleague to apply. The LDI offers a unique opportunity for NCURA members to further develop their leadership skills and prepare for leadership roles in NCURA and in their careers. More information and application materials are available at http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/online/ldi/ldi2009.pdf.
Still searching for an Award Management and Accounting Solution?

Your search has ended with GRANT ADMINISTRATOR® 6.0.
The latest release of the powerful GRANT ADMINISTRATOR®
Software offers more features and tools for unmatched
control over your proposals, grants, contracts, and programs.

Award Management and Accounting For Both Pre-
and Post-Award Administrators Has Never Been Easier!
• Easy to implement
• Intuitive and user-friendly interface
• Comprehensive reporting capability

• Automatic calculations for F&A and fringe
• NEW! One-time entry for recurring transactions
  such as salaries
• NEW! Tracks monthly salary distributions by
  employee and by account

Single, Network, and Site Licenses available.

VISIT WWW.DYNA-QUEST.COM FOR DETAILS,
CUSTOMER TESTIMONIALS, AND A FREE DEMO.
Do consider volunteering for the Region, too. There are many ways in which volunteers can contribute, not all of which require a huge time commitment (but all of which are very rewarding). Alex McKeown, Chair-Elect, is our Volunteer Coordinator and can give you details on the types of volunteer opportunities available and about how to become involved. The more you’re involved in the activities in the Region (and nationally, of course), the more you’ll get out of your NCURA membership. You can contact Alex by email at amckeown@jhsp.edu.

Mary Louise Healy is Chair of Region II and serves as Director, Office of University Research Services at Towson University.

A special thanks goes out to Chair - Michelle Powell, Georgia Institute of Technology; Regina Allen, Western Kentucky University; Carolyn Elliott-Farino, Kennesaw State University; Lauren Goralski, University of Louisville; Alexia Lewis, University of North Florida; Velera Pate, Georgia Institute of Technology; Rick Smiley, East Carolina University; Cathy Snyder (Region III Treasurer), Vanderbilt University; Jill Tincher, University of Miami; and Immediate Past Chair - Michelle Vazin, Vanderbilt University for your dedication and commitment to NCURA Region III over the past year.

Thank you!

If your work schedule is a busy one and you know that you don’t have time to participate in a standing committee, there are always opportunities for you to volunteer during the NCURA National and Region III Spring meetings. Here are some of the areas where you can contribute your expertise: Presenting/Co-Presenting Concurrent Sessions; Facilitating/Moderating Discussion Groups; Greeting arriving attendees at the Registration Desk; Keeping things running smoothly at the Hospitality Suite; Ensuring AV/Technical Equipment/Handouts are ready prior to program sessions. If you are interested in volunteering, please contact our Region III Volunteer Coordinator, Alexia Lewis at alexia.lewis@unf.edu.

Remember to visit our Region III website for all upcoming regional information.

Lori Brown and Rebecca Puig are Region III’s Newsletter Team. Lori serves as Proposal Specialist, University of Central Florida and Rebecca serves as Director of Research Resources, Office of Research, University of South Florida.

I’m pleased to report that the Region IV spring meeting in Kansas City provided us with new information, renewed energy and a smile on our faces from all the networking! Thanks to the Program Chairs and Program Committee for planning an educational meeting with something for everyone. Look for the next Region IV newsletter, where we will be reviewing the meeting’s highlights, sharing the winners of the Service Awards, and announcing the newly-elected members of the Regional Board of Directors!

I want to take this opportunity to thank everyone for your support during my term as Region IV Chair. It has truly been a wonderful experience. The one recurring message that I cannot be emphatic enough in stressing is the importance of “getting involved,” whether it be running for a place on next year’s Board, becoming a member of a committee or as a volunteer at one of our meetings. Please check out Region IV’s website for more details or contact Gigi Beaird, volunteer coordinator at gbeaird@niu.edu.

Sara Streich is Chair of Region IV and serves as the Associate Director of the Lurie Comprehensive Cancer Center of Northwestern University.

Having recently returned from our Region V Spring 2008 meeting in Oklahoma City, I’m pleased to report that the meeting was a tremendous success! Kay Ellis, along with her program committee, assembled a terrific program around the theme “Weathering the Storm: Strategies for Research Administrators.” Please watch for meeting highlights in the next NCURA Newsletter.

National Meeting Travel Award
Region V is offering its members the opportunity to nominate deserving colleagues for the coveted $1,000 National Meeting Travel Award! It is an incentive for newcomers and veterans alike who would like to attend the NCURA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. The full award description and nomination form will be posted on our Region V website soon!

Hellos and Goodbyes
Congrats to:
› Melinda Cotten has joined MD Anderson as the Executive Director, Office of Sponsored Programs.
Welcome new (or renewed) members:

- Leah Benard-Boggs, Senior Department Administrator, Rice University
- John B States, Director, Sponsored Programs, Univ. of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas
- Kathleen A Alwell, Operations Manager, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center
- Crystal Chovanec, Project Administrator I, Texas A & M University
- Phyllis R Doughty, Project Coordinator, Baylor University
- Scott Dudek, Grant & Contract Specialist III, Univ. of North Texas Health Science Center, Fort Worth
- Julie Duiker, Contracts & Grants Manager, University of Texas at Austin
- Matthew S Ennis, Accounting Supervisor, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas
- Ersulan D Hampton, Grant Program Manager, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center
- Sonia Hernandez, Senior Administrative Associate, University of Texas at San Antonio
- Gloria L Holder, Administrative Associate, University of Texas at Austin
- Barbara Hryc, Research Administrator, University of Houston
- Jae Hughes, Research Director, University of Houston
- Erin Kinne, Contract Negotiator I, Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Texas A&M Univ. System
- Ariasari Lair, Analyst II/Post Award, Texas Tech University
- Bonnie E Melhart, Associate Provost, Texas Christian University
- Berva D Pool, Sponsored Programs Specialist, Southwestern Oklahoma State University
- David Riddle, Director, IP & Licensing, Texas A & M University
- Sharon K Shumpert, Grants and Contracts, University of Texas at San Antonio
- Vanessa Stepney, Senior Research Administrator, University of Houston
- Paul Tyler, Director, Auditing And Consulting Services, University of Texas at San Antonio
- Anja Wells, Research Administrator, University of Houston

Please let me know of other personnel changes at we10@txstate.edu.

Volunteers

There are many volunteer opportunities available for Region V annually and not just during the national or regional meetings. Some opportunities during the Spring Meeting and also the NCURA Annual Meeting are: presenting or moderating sessions, helping with the registration desk and/or hospitality suites, and an annual opportunity is serving on committees. If you are interested, please contact Joanne Palmer at jp57@txstate.edu.

Chair’s note

It has been an honor and privilege to serve as your Chair this past year. I want to thank each one of you for the opportunity and express my gratitude to you. I have learned so much and have built many great friendships both in and out of Region V. Best wishes to each of you and if I can be of service, please do not hesitate to send an e-mail or give me a call. Thanks again.

W Scott Erwin, Sr is the Chair of Region V and serves as Director of Sponsored Programs at Texas State University – San Marcos.
REGION VI continued

This year, Region VI was able to award four travel awards for the Spring Meeting. Please join me in thanking the Awards Committee (Ann Pollack, UC Los Angeles; Dan Nordquist and Lynn Fister both from Washington State University; Vincent Oraqwam, California State University, Bakersfield; and Csilla Csaplár, Stanford University) for their efforts, as well as congratulating the travel award recipients: Linda Torgersen, San Diego State University Research Foundation; Robin Toles, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Deborah Motton, UC Merced; and Catalina Verdu-Cano, Stanford University.

As you can imagine, it takes nothing short of an army of volunteers to make a Spring Meeting successful, and 2008 was no exception. It was my honor to work with a great group of volunteers, including the Region VI Program Committee members (Sherylle Mills Englander, UC Santa Barbara; Ted Mordhorst, University of Washington; Jeri Muniz, University of Southern California; Christina Hansen, UC Irvine; Dick Seligman, California Institute of Technology; and Georgette Sakumoto, University of Hawaii), the Site Coordination team (Cora Diaz, UC Santa Barbara; Samantha Westcott, California Institute of Technology; and Joseph McNicholas, Loyola Marymount University), and our volunteers on the ground in Oregon (Jesse Null, Oregon Health & Sciences University; and Kim Calvery and Pat Hawk, both from Oregon State University). Our sponsors and vendors, including Huron Consulting Group, Cayuse, Inc., InfoEd, and ClickCommerce, were also an important part of the meeting’s success, and I greatly appreciate the support that we received from them.

The Regions VI/VII Spring Meetings are intended to benefit the membership of the regions, and it is the Region VI leadership’s goal to make each Spring Meeting better than the previous year. However, this can only happen with your feedback. Shortly after the 2008 Spring Meeting, you will be receiving an e-mail asking you to complete a short, overall evaluation of the meeting. Please take a few minutes to complete and submit the survey so that the 2009 Spring Meeting may be equally or more successful than this year’s meeting.

Speaking of the 2009 Spring Meeting, it will be held at the historic La Fonda on the Plaza Hotel in Santa Fe, New Mexico April 5-8, 2009. Region VI will be responsible for the program and Julie Guggino, Central Washington University, will chair the Program Committee. If you are interested in serving on the Program Committee, please contact Julie at gugginoj@cwu.edu or (509) 963-2640.

Looking forward to the 2010 Spring Meeting, the Site Selection Committee is hard at work soliciting proposals from a number of hotels throughout the Hawaiian Islands. The committee is chaired by Georgette Sakumoto. Joining her are Region VI members Julie Guggino and Steven Eisner (Stanford University), as well as Judy Fredenberg (University of Montana) from Region VII.

As we look forward toward the rest of this year, elections are just around the corner. The Nominating Committee (Pat Hawk, Ted Mordhorst and Katherine Ho from Stanford University) are working to put a slate of candidates together for the following positions: Chair-elect, Secretary-elect, Treasurer-elect, Regional Advisory Committee member, and regionally elected member to the Board of Directors. If you are interested in any of these positions, or if you would like to nominate anyone, please contact Pat, Ted or Katherine. Their contact information can be found on the Region VI website at http://www.ogrds.wsu.edu/r6ncura/officers.asp (please see the Nominating Committee section).

Last, but not least, the NCURA 50th Annual Meeting is also just around the corner. With this being NCURA’s golden anniversary, you’ll want to keep an eye out for the e-mail announcing the opening of registration and hotel reservations. Region VI will be offering travel awards for the Annual Meeting, and we will be announcing the opportunity shortly.

Bruce Morgan is Chair of Region VI and serves as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research, University of California, Riverside.

REGION VII Rocky Mountain
ncuraendregion.vii.unm.edu

This Portland Research Trailblazer is back in her office, reenergized by the workshops and sessions, friendships and connections made and renewed at the 2008 Region VI/VII meeting in Portland, Oregon. What a great meeting! Truly the depth and breadth of presentations and discussions in the workshops and sessions were outstanding, and the downtown Portland site was a wonderful attraction in and of itself. (As you share what you’ve learned with colleagues who weren’t able to attend the meeting, don’t forget that session handouts will be posted on our website).

The Program Committee begins work each year almost as soon as the last meeting ends, and moves into high gear in the summer and early fall when committee members begin to firm up commitments for workshops and sessions. As Program Chair, I owe special thanks to committee members and co-track leaders from both Region VI and VII. Special thanks to Region VII members Randy Draper (UC-Boulder) – Compliance/legal, Judy Fredenberg (U. Montana) – Government, Leslie Schmidt (Montana State) – Financial, Vicki Krell (ASU) – Pre-award, Denise Wallen (UNM) – Senior Track, and Josie Jimenez (New Mexico State) – Evaluations for your thoughtful selection of workshops and sessions, perseverance in seeking moderators and panelists and session descriptions, and commitment to excellence: it was a pleasure and privilege to work with all of you.

Many thanks go out to all the volunteers who helped make our meeting a great success. Jackie Hinton (Utah) did an outstanding job helping volunteers connect with opportunities, developing a survey of member interests, and also, with Joseph McNicholas from Region VI, developing and presenting the new member orientation.
We were very fortunate to have NCURA President David Mayo join us for the meeting and speak at the Monday luncheon. Special thanks to our keynote speaker Dr. Robert Collier, Professor of Chemical Oceanography at Oregon State University. Thanks also to the Huron Consulting Group, a Platinum sponsor of our meeting, and Cayuse, Inc., a Silver Sponsor. Thanks also to meeting exhibitors Click Commerce, and InfoEd International. Thanks also to Marc Schiffman, Assistant Executive Director, NCURA National Office, who spoke about NCURA as a guide to navigating your professional development.

Region VII is responsible for site arrangements for our 2009 meeting in Santa Fe, New Mexico April 5-8, 2009 at the historic La Fonda on the Plaza Hotel. As you evaluate the 2008 meeting, we would very much like to hear your thoughts and ideas for programs, workshops, and session topics that you would like to see included next year, as well as your interest in presenting or moderating a workshop or session at the 2009 meeting. Please use our regional meeting planning website http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r7ncura/regional_meetings.asp to indicate your interests. If you would like to take a leadership role in Region VII, remember that this fall we will elect a Chair Elect, Member at Large, and Regional Representative to the Board. Do not hesitate to contact Chair Elect Dianne Horrocks (horrdian@isu.edu), Treasurer Kate Green (kmgreen@unm.edu), Members at Large Karen Henry (khenry@boisestate.edu) and Deb Murphy (Debra.Barnes@asu.edu), Volunteer Coordinator Jackie Hinton (Jackie.Hinton@hsc.utah.edu) or me (Winnie.Ennenga@nau.edu) to share your interest.

Finally, keep a close watch on the NCURA website to be ready to submit your paperwork as soon as registration opens for our 50th National Meeting, so that you can lock in your hotel reservation for the Hilton. We also will request Region VII travel award nominations in early summer, and notify the awardees shortly thereafter so they can make their travel arrangements to attend the meeting.

Winnie Ennenga is the Chair of Region VII and serves as Director of Grant and Contract Services, Northern Arizona University.

---

### NCURA MINI GUIDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Member Price</th>
<th>Non-member Price</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OMB Circular A-21</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB Circular A-110</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Payment Information:**

Name __________________________________________

Title __________________________________________

Institution _____________________________________

Address _________________________________________

City ____________________________ State__________ Zip _____________

Phone ____________________________ Fax ______________

E-Mail ____________________________ Web Site ______________

**Credit Card Information:**

Credit Card Type: [ ] Mastercard [ ] Visa [ ] American Express

Cardholder Name: ____________________________ Cardholder Signature: ____________________________

Card Number ____________________________ Expiration Date: ____________________________

**Two Convenient Ways to Order:**

Visit: [http://www.ncura.edu/bookstore/default.asp](http://www.ncura.edu/bookstore/default.asp)

Complete this form and mail:

NCURA, 1225 19th Street, NW, Suite 850, Washington, DC 20036
The program committee has been working diligently toward finalizing the sessions. We have a keynote speaker identified, the workshops and the social events have been planned, and the hotel wants to make this a great conference for all.

We want to reach beyond just a great conference, and make this a great experience. So we decided that the way this becomes a great experience for you is YOU. Sounds a little funny? Well not really. These experiences become great when people are excited and ready to participate. So here are some ways you can help your fellow NCURA members have a great experience and even have one yourself.

We titled your conference “Embrace the Change! Creating the Environment for Tomorrow.” Research Administration is all about change, constant change and constant learning. One aspect of a great conference experience is learning, and the committee has some very strong workshops scheduled for Monday morning. The workshops are specifically designed for all knowledge levels and interests. Add to your experience by participating, for example, in “Grants.gov Boot Camp” or “Human Subjects Research for Pre-Award Administrators.” Participate, you say? Yes, be prepared to participate because the faculty would like to hear from you during the workshop. No matter what the level of the workshop, you play an important role in the success of that workshop.

In connection with our theme of “Creating the Environment for Tomorrow,” we are pleased to welcome Dr. Charles Liotta as our keynote speaker. Dr. Liotta has been a vice president for research at Georgia Institute of Technology and remained an active researcher during his tenure. He still has an active portfolio that focuses on developing new processes and materials without harming the environment or depleting the resources.

He will mix green chemistry with research administration, while providing some humor, and maybe even a few ballroom dance steps into a keynote address that will help prepare you for the rest of the experience.

You have a great experience when you interact with others having a common interest. The committee has helped by providing six tracks; Contracts and Compliance, Departmental, eRA, Federal, Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions, and Senior. You can decide if you want to follow one track throughout the conference or mix and match to your interests. Either method will provide you an opportunity to hear and interact with knowledgeable speakers and more importantly, to network with those who have common interest and also common problems. Be ready to ask questions and give opinions to add to your experience. We are excited to announce the program committee’s decision to promote the federal track at this meeting. Our federal counterparts will be at Hilton Head to make presentations and speak directly with you.

The program committee is excited to offer a robust program, expanding the offerings to 6 workshops, 50 concurrent sessions, and 14 discussion groups. The sessions will be a unique mix of traditional 90 minute slots, mixed with 60 minute “short takes.” Almost every track is represented in the scheduled times so you should be able to experience a great variety of topics during the conference. If you are unable to attend the national meeting, this is a great opportunity to capitalize on a broad offering of topics and experts.

Of course, networking is truly a great by-product of any conference, and we have created many opportunities for you. The welcome wine and cheese reception is scheduled for Monday evening, and you can meet many of the participants and speakers. There will be lunches with no speakers so you can discuss topics of common interest around the table at your leisure, and the breaks between the session always provide opportunities for specific questions.

Let’s be honest. You are going to be at Hilton Head, full of beaches, golf, shopping, seafood, biking or just sitting around the pool. Summer has daylight savings and sunlight lasts until about 9:00. Our last session ends early enough to give you plenty of time to take advantage of all there is to do in this beautiful locale. You even have the option to stay a few days later. Now, that is the final piece to your experience.

The NCURA pre-award conference offers the opportunity for learning, networking, sharing and relaxing. What better way for you to experience research administration!

See you in August.

Vincent “Bo” A. Bogdanski serves as Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs at Colorado State University and Jan L. Madole is Director of Research and Sponsored Programs at University of Montana. Both are serving as PRA III Co-chairs.
Virginia Commonwealth University has an opening for a Senior Research Assistant/Associate-Scientific Administrator in the Department of Biostatistics. The Department of Biostatistics is housed in the VCU School of Medicine and is committed to excellence in conducting multidisciplinary collaborative biomedical research, developing new statistical methods, and providing a graduate training program. Our department includes 15 full-time faculty members who are engaged in mentoring 21 PhD and 14 Master’s level students. The department offers both MS and PhD programs in Biostatistics, including a concentration in Genomic Biostatistics, and an MS in Clinical Research in Biostatistics. Our faculty, students, and staff have established strong collaborative research with departments and centers within the Schools of Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health and with local health departments.

We are seeking individuals with excellent interpersonal and organizational skills, as well as verbal and written communications skills, who have a MPH or a MS in a health-related area. Experience with both pre-award and post-award procedures of federal and foundation grant applications including budget is highly desirable. In particular, interested candidates should be knowledgeable about funding opportunities and skilled in eRA Commons and other forms of electronic grant application and progress report submission. Candidates should also be able to organize portions of grant applications such as biographical sketches, resources and environment, funding opportunities and be able to track protocol submissions to the IRB and annual IRB renewals and be able to prepare ‘just-in-time’ materials for funding agencies in the proper format. Candidates should also be able to maintain a database of grant applications in the department.

Interested candidates should submit a cover letter describing their research experience along with a CV to Shumei S. Sun, Ph.D., Professor and Chair, Department of Biostatistics, School of Medicine, Virginia Commonwealth University, PO Box 980032, 730 E Broad Street, Richmond, VA 23298, telephone: 804-827-2042, email: ssun@vcu.edu.

VCU is an urban, research intensive institution with a richly diverse university community and commitment to multicultural opportunities. Virginia Commonwealth University is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities are encouraged to apply.
COMPLIANCE

RCR: What is the Institution’s Responsibility?

Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) covers an array of research activities and involves anyone engaged in those research activities.

Simply stated, RCR is good citizenship exhibited by students, post docs and faculty. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Research Integrity identifies nine core areas of RCR. These nine areas include: Data Acquisition, Management, Sharing and Ownership; Conflict of Interest and Commitment; Human Subjects; Animal Welfare; Research Misconduct; Publication Practices and Responsible Authorship; Mentor/Trainee Responsibilities; Peer Review; and, Collaborative Science.

The institution’s responsibility is to promote integrity in research and responsible conduct through establishing and monitoring policies and procedures, including these components:

- Provide leadership in support of responsible conduct of research;
- Encourage respect for everyone involved in the research enterprise;
- Promote productive interactions between trainees and mentors;
- Advocate adherence to the rules regarding all aspects of the conduct of research, especially research involving human participants and animals;
- Anticipate, reveal & manage individual and institutional conflicts of interest;
- Arrange timely and thorough inquiries and investigators of allegations of scientific misconduct and apply appropriate administrative sanctions;
- Offer educational opportunities pertaining to integrity in the conduct of research;
- Monitor and evaluate the institutional environment supporting integrity in the conduct of research and use this knowledge for continuous quality improvement.

For more information on RCR, please visit the DHHS ORI website: http://ori.hhs.gov/education/index.shtml

Source: IOM Report on Integrity in Scientific Research: Creating an Environment That Promotes Responsible Conduct

Maggie Pyle is a member of the Compliance Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director of Sponsored Programs, University of South Alabama.

DEPARTMENTAL

Have you heard about Research.gov?

Led by the National Science Foundation (NSF), Research.gov is a partnership of federal research-oriented grant making agencies with a shared vision of increasing customer service for the research community, while streamlining and standardizing business processes amongst partner agencies.

Services currently offered:

- Research Spending and Results
  NSF award information available to be searched by the public in compliance with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006.
- Policy Library
  An electronic library that consolidates Federal and agency-specific policies, guidelines and procedures for use by Federal agencies and the awardee community. Agency-specific documents are included only for Research.gov partner agencies.

Coming soon:

- Grants Application Status
  Single site where Principal Investigators and Sponsored Research Offices check the up-to-date status of grant applications submitted to participating agencies. Account Required.
- Institution and User Management
  Online tool for Administrators to grants user rights and privileges. Account Required.

The Departmental Administration Neighborhood recently sponsored the April 16 online chat, Show Me the Money: Finding Funding, with Sondra Anderson, Assistant Chair, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Rochester; Sarah Starr, Director, Office of Funding & Research Development, The Ohio State University Research Foundation. Check out the transcript of the chat in the neighborhood. There you will also find interviews, upcoming events, and various presentations and links that have proven helpful to other DAs. Please visit the site and give us feedback so we can make the Neighborhood welcoming and informative for all departmental administrators.

LaJauna Ellis is a member of the Departmental Administration Neighborhood Committee and serves as Program Manager and Assistant to the Chair School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology.

eRA

Did you miss our recent online chat with Bob Beattie, Grants.gov Liaison at the University of Michigan and Tammy Custer, eRA Specialist at Cornell University on Grants.gov: Adobe Forms Update? The transcript from this online chat can be found on our ERA Neighborhood website. It’s a quick and easy way to catch-up on what you missed.

Rebecca Puig is Chair of the eRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Research Resources, University of South Florida.
FRA

Has the administration of training grants been an issue for your organization? Not sure how to file that financial report? Then make plans to attend our online chat, Training Grants, July 9th from 2-3 pm Eastern. The chat features guest experts Vivian Holmes, Director of Finance & Administration, Division of Medical Sciences, Harvard Medical School; Valerie Sherman, Assistant Director of Finance, Division of Medical Sciences, Harvard Medical School; and Alex Shimada-Brand, Training Grants Coordinator, Harvard Medical School. Sign up is available now at the neighborhood website.

FRA IX Conference was a great success with over 700 people attending. The location for next year's FRA X Conference will be: La Quinta Resort & Club, near Palm Springs, CA. Hope to see you there February 9-11, 2009!

Have you had an opportunity to check out www.research.gov? Future plans for Research.gov include offering more related content and news such as research spending and results as well as payment and cash request services. Spend a few minutes and check it out!

Patricia Groshon is a member of the FRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Associate Director of Accounting, Drexel University; Linda Ward is a member of the FRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Grant Accounting Manager, Children’s Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota.

INTERNATIONAL

The international resources section of the International Neighborhood is being updated presently due to the exemplary efforts of former chair John Carfora, Amherst College. Check the section out to see what we have to offer!

Another on-campus profile is currently being finalized and will be on the main international page soon. Dr. Tony Eastham, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, is the subject of the profile.

I very recently arrived back in the U.S. from university teaching in Hong Kong, China; it was a professionally rewarding experience. Aside from teaching friendly and energetic Chinese students, I met with our colleagues at several prominent Hong Kong universities and met with a Milwaukee educational/cultural delegation that also conferenced with Chinese officials in Beijing. I’ll write more on the research administration aspects of the trip in the next issue.

Jim Casey is the Chair of the International Research Administration Neighborhood Committee and serves as Visiting Professor of Leadership at Upper Iowa University and co-editor of the NCURA Newsletter.

PRE-AWARD

NIH has received its FY 2008 appropriations and has issued an announcement regarding the Fiscal Policy for Grant Awards for FY2008. This announcement provides guidance on the fiscal operations for FY2008 and how the FY2008 funds will be implemented. The following are key issues instituted for FY2008:

For Non-Competing Research Awards, FY2008 appropriations have provided NIH a 1 percent inflation allowance. To implement, first, there must be a reduction to previously established commitments, based on a 3 percent inflation allowance.

Non-Competing Research Awards issued in FY2008 at reduced levels will be revised to restore funds to the level indicated above.

Competing Research Awards – Funds used to award competing Research Awards will come from funds that were not committed for non-competing research awards. The average cost of FY2008 competing grants are allowed to increase by 1 percent over FY2007 grants.

Each NIH Institute and Center will use its own discretion to allocate adjustments among its non-competing research grants while keeping compliant with the 1 percent inflation allowance provided in its FY2008 committed level.

Funds for the NRSA program are held at FY 2007 levels and policies for tuition and training-related expenses established for FY2007 remain in effect for FY 2008.

Please visit NCURA’s Pre-Award Neighborhood website for the full details of this announcement.

Deborah L. Price is a member of the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee and serves as Manager, Office of Sponsored Research, Baylor Research Institute

PUI

Great minds think alike! After re-reading the Pre-Award article in the last newsletter, PUI’ers offered suggestions to improve the PUI Neighborhood web pages. Like Pre-Awarders, the PUI members value their time and want a resource that is easy to navigate and has all the information they need (or links to the information), all on one easy to use page. Member suggestions included posting examples of:

- Policies and Procedures, a Grants Handbook (inspired by Loyola Marymount’s beautiful work), Internal review and benchmarking information, IRB information geared specifically to PUIs, a risk assessment matrix modified for PUIs, effective grant management strategies for challenged PIs, F&A rates and distribution methods, Successful training incentives, Leveraging resources effectively at a PUI, Excellent website information for the PUI, Best Practices, Organizing a conference with Program Officers, Collaborating with larger institutions for beneficial results

Those are a few of the suggestions I’ve received. I’ll undoubtedly receive a few more. The idea is to put the information on the NCURA PUI site, or to provide links to the information (such the Pre-Award site or others that contain information PUI members use frequently).

The email listserv has proven to be a great place to get information or to ask questions and receive a dozen or more great insights. We encourage those who have not yet used the PUI email listserv to come aboard!

Ken Clark is Chair of the Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Grants & Contracts, Lewis-Clark State College
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The other day, when I was daydreaming and bored, my mind drifted to negotiating contracts in higher education and the practice of law. I remembered reading an article in the Wisconsin Lawy er a few years back; I decided to re-read the article and tailor my own 5 golden rules for negotiating university contracts. These rules may or may not work in your situation, but taking them to heart and using them as circumstances dictate will lead to win-win relationships over the long term. So here they are:

- Get as much information from your counterpart as early as possible. Knowledge is power, and listening is equally important—more important—as talking. If you want to succeed with and for your faculty, truly listen. Consider the substantive and time dimensions of this suggestion. Seal the deal with the least amount of time and headache as possible.

- Maximize your leverage in dealing with your counterpart. What are your institutional strengths? The faculty involved? Geographic location? Research facilities? Central administration support? A strong graduate student pool? Remind your faculty and your counterpart that your institution has strengths that make it the preferable institution to conduct research. I never sold my institutions short, and negotiators should always be aggressive in outlining their institution’s strengths. You also need to have an honest discussion with your faculty about what the goals are, whether they are research funding, graduate students, intellectual property, or publishing. Your leverage comes from listening and then coalescing facts and thoughts into action.

- Seek fairness and the perception of fairness in negotiating with your counterpart. There are two dimensions here—actual fairness and the perception of fairness. You want to build long term relationships, right? Then be fair. People have long memories.

- Design a win-win “offer-concession” strategy. Everybody knows what a “win-win” is all about. In a general sense, that is what the University-Industry Demonstration Partnership (UIDP) is all about...creating mutually satisfying long term relationships. An “offer-concession” strategy is your internal process to decide how you want to push the other party, and how much you want to concede to them. Negotiation is part art, part science, and part psychology, best developed through academic knowledge and daily experience. Like win-win situations, offer-concession strategies are numerous.

- Control the agenda and pace of negotiation. Lawyers like their control, mostly because they know what they want as the end game. That doesn’t mean you need to be a control freak; just that you need discipline and a plan in order to get what your faculty, institution, and you want.

These brief thoughts are meant to stimulate your additional thought about what negotiation is and how you can continue to develop your negotiation skills. As long as you promptly and fairly “seal the deal” and build long term relationships, there is a method to your madness.

James Casey is an attorney in Milwaukee, a visiting professor of leadership at Upper Iowa University, and a co-editor of the NCURA Newsletter. This article is based upon “The Five Golden Rules of Negotiation for Lawyers” by Marty Latz, as published in Wisconsin Lawyer, pp. 27-29 (November 2004).

---

**Eshelf corner**

I am not sure about the consistency of the system interfaces. All of the three Consortia interfaces and the two exempt ones are quite different. The GrantSolution.gov site seems to be mostly directed to potential partners, while the other two are more for grant seekers. Each is offering different services at different times in their development. G5 started with a payment system, presumably to come later for Research.gov and GrantSolutions (although I found no reference to this). I think it is safe to say that all will have similar functions in the end. They lack a systematic reference to the functions that will be allowed for users with different roles: PIs, central grants office pre-award or post-award staff, and departmental staff. Most troublesome is the lack of systematic input from the grantee community. All three consortia are moving ahead rapidly with features and procedures they think their customers will want. While there have been some opportunities for user input, and selected institutions are taking part in some beta testing, there has been no systematic user validation. There are no organized user groups to provide ideas and validation. None of the consortia has web casts to inform users of developments. Research.gov does have a feedback form on the site. The NIH system staff does meet with users on a regular basis to seek input. I would recommend that NCURA consider setting up “shadow” committees to follow the developments of each consortium to provide them with feedback. Also, representatives of the Consortia should be invited to present at NCURA meetings.

Research.gov is coming to the November meeting, independent of the usual NSF update.

I hope that the various agencies involved with GMLoB will not maintain grant submission systems. Multiple submission programs do not seem to fit the principles of GMLoB, and the existence of alternative e-submission systems makes it all the more confusing for applicant institutions that are increasingly coming to rely on Grants.gov.

GMLoB is having an important impact on NCURA members. I urge you visit the various sites and, in other ways too, learn about the services and how you can use them.

**For further information**

E-gov Grants Management
http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/c-6-3-grants.html

Details about the Grants Policy Committee
http://www.grants.gov/aboutgrants/streamlining_initiatives.jsp

Robert Beattie serves as the Managing Senior Project Representative at the University of Michigan Ann Arbor.

Special thanks to Erika Russi, Staff Associate, BFA/DIAS, National Science Foundation for providing me with many of the links to GMLoB activities, and for answering many questions on the process.
incorporated the interim final rule into its grant award conditions. (NOT-OD-08-055). This NIH implementation references the section in the Code of Federal Regulations (2 CFR Part 175) that contains the interim final guidance and, as a consequence, should carry forward any changes that are incorporated into the final rule. This prohibition against engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons, procuring a commercial sex act, or using forced labor in the performance of the agreement is similar, but not the same, as the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) of the same name.

The FAR interim rule on Combating Trafficking in Persons was substantially revised and presented as an interim rule with a request for comments in August 2007. Unlike the OMB guidance for grants, the contract provisions require the institution to notify all employees working on a project of the US Government’s zero tolerance policy regarding trafficking in persons and the actions the institution will take if an employee violates the government’s policy. As an interim rule, it is in effect as of April 2008.

The FAR Councils (the Civil and the Defense Acquisition Regulations Councils that discuss and propose revisions to the FAR) issued a final rule requiring a Contractor Code of Business Ethics and Conduct on November 23, 2007. The current rule requires a written contractor code of business ethics and conduct for contracts and subcontracts exceeding $5 million and a performance period of more than 120 days.

Most institutions will have policies and procedures that address issues of business ethics and conduct and can link those policies and procedures together and present them as a code for the institution. Creating a web site that provides links to the related policies and describes, in general, disciplinary actions that may be pursued for improper conduct (another requirement of the FAR) is an efficient way to meet the requirement for a written code. To meet the FAR requirement, an institution should develop a process for notification of the employees engaged in affected contracts that could direct them to the web site for additional information. In addition to the required business ethics and conduct awareness program, the contracting institution is required to have an internal control system that facilitates discovery of improper conduct and ensures corrective measures are instituted and carried out. If your institution is in compliance with OMB Circular A-110 and A-21 you are likely to have those systems already in place. Finally, the rule requires posting of the sponsoring Federal agencies fraud hotline poster in the common work areas and work sites for the specific contract. This requirement can be waived if the institution has implemented a business ethics and conduct awareness program that includes a reporting mechanism, “such as a hotline poster.”

In an unusual development, the FAR Councils actually proposed amendments to the November 23 final rule before it was published in its final version! The amendments were proposed in the Federal Register on November 14, 2007 and add significantly greater detail to the description of the nature of the code of business ethics and conduct training, the assignment of responsibility for compliance with the code and the elements of the internal control systems. This proposed amendment is not in effect, and it is difficult to know when or if further modifications will be made to the final rule.

In yet another action, on March 26, 2008, the FAR Councils issued an advance notice of proposed rule making in the area of organizational and individual financial conflicts of interest. In this notice, the FAR Councils indicated their interest in determining if, when and how contractor employees’ personal financial interests need to be addressed or whether greater disclosure of contractors’ policies and practices would be an effective and efficient way to promote ethical behavior. In a related announcement, the FAR Councils ask if there is a need to revise the current guidance on organizational financial conflicts of interest including the development of standard provisions and clauses. The notice reviews current agency-specific regulations and asks the public to comment by May 27, 2008. These advance notices indicate that the Councils and their participating agency representatives have interest in an area. A proposed rule may or may not be drafted for comment. It does suggest, however, that institutions will want to review the current agency-specific rule and policies to determine whether they meet the current requirements.

And as if the new rules (interim or final) aren’t confusing enough, the time-worn troublesome contract clauses continue and have expanded throughout the agencies. In response to the continuing problems with some agency acquisition (and grant) terms and conditions, the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) are updating the Troublesome Clauses Report first issued in 2004. To date, institutions report receiving a similar number of troublesome clauses in federal contracts as reported 4 years ago. Once again restrictions on publications appear to be the most significant problem arising, mostly with DOD agencies. Help in the form of the final report should be available in late April.

As spring finally begins to arrive along with “the boys of spring,” and in light of the confusion with the development of recent Federal regulations, it seems fair to ask “Who’s on first?”

Carol Blum is Director, Research Compliance and Administration, Council on Governmental Relations.
Broadcast Workshop Series
Live Via Satellite or on DVD

**June 10, 2008**

**COMPLEX AGREEMENTS**

We are hearing more and more the term translational research – how research results are translated into products or public use. Getting research results from the bench to the public can take several paths and involve several types of agreements outside of the initial supporting research award. These may include non-disclosure agreements, teaming agreements, material transfer agreements, clinical trial agreements, and license agreements with start-up companies. The negotiation and management of these agreements usually involves some unique challenges for research administrators. This program will focus on these agreements and areas of risk, accounting issues, institutional and individual conflict of interest, protection of human subjects, effort certification for investigators, publications, and the special challenges you face in administering all these issues in collaborations with multiple parties and a multi-site clinical trial program. Whether you are involved as the prime institution or as the subawardee we all need to understand and work through the wide range of issues.

The faculty for this program are seasoned pros who will share their experiences in successfully managing these unique and often challenging agreements.

**MODERATOR:** Geoff Grant, Vice President, Research Administration, Partners Healthcare

**FACULTY:** Barbara Cole, Associate Vice President, Research Administration, Boston University; Michele Codd, Assistant Director, Institute for Software Integration, Vanderbilt University; Todd Gutman, Associate Vice President for Research, Office of Research Compliance, The Ohio State University; Erica Kropp, Director, Research Administration & Advancement, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science

---

**September 9, 2008**

**GOOD CUSTOMER SERVICE FOR RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS: HOW TO SUPPORT THE RESEARCH ENDEAVOR AT YOUR INSTITUTION**

With new demands emerging from sponsors, faculty and institutional management on a daily basis, how do Research Administrators define Good Customer Service? Our panel of experts will examine who is the Customer and what constitutes Good Customer Service. They will look at the roles of the Central Sponsored Programs office and the role of the Departmental Administrator. The faculty will explore the elements of customer service that works both ways between central and departmental research administrators, and how this relationship is critical to good service to the ultimate customer: the PI. They will discuss approaches as to how to communicate to your customers in a way that lets them know that you are both working toward a common goal.

Some of the elements of customer service that will be covered are:
- Speed
- Accuracy
- Transparency
- Politeness
- Compliance

The Sponsor as the Customer will also be examined as good communication is critical to insuring that this customer is best served - while keeping your researchers content.

**MODERATOR:** Kim Moreland, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, University of Wisconsin - Madison

**FACULTY:** David Richardson, Assistant Vice President for Research and Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Pennsylvania State University; Cynthia White, Director, Sponsored Programs, Belmont University; Stephen Hansen, Associate Provost for Research and Dean, Graduate School, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Broadcast Workshop Series
Live Via Satellite or on DVD

Registration Form

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!

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 that select the DVD option will receive a link to the broadcast schedule and reference material guide when they receive their DVD copy of the program.

CONTACT NAME ________________________________
TITLE _______________________________________

INSTITUTION ______________________________________
ADDRESS _______________________________________

CITY ________________________ STATE ___________ ZIP ___________

PHONE ___________________ FAX ___________________

E-MAIL ___________________ WEB SITE ___________________

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, 1225 19th Street, NW, Suite 850, 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/content/educational_programs/ncura_tv/

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.
Do you wish you had more time to concentrate on managing your grants... instead of your technology?

Galaxy Hosting
Northern Lights Software

Introducing Northern Lights Software's Galaxy Hosting service. Now your Internet browser is all you need to manage your grants from any location, around the clock.

Sign up today for a whole new era of ease, timeliness, accuracy, protection and support:

- Available 24/7 with more than 99.99% up-time
- Accessible immediately from any from any Windows, Mac or Linux computer with Internet access
- Wide range of file-output options
- Incredibly fast
- Highest-level security
- Automatic data backups every night
- Customizable, smart system for maximum flexibility
- Automatic software updates
- Automatic, immediate bug fixes
- No retraining necessary
- Incredible ROI with higher productivity and lower costs!

Free yourself from the tasks that take you away from managing your grants. Sign up and worry no more...

- NO installation
- NO configuration
- NO downloads
- NO idle time
- NO management
- NO maintenance
- NO troubleshooting
- NO extra update or backup procedures – it's all automated!

See for yourself and save!

- FREE sign-up for existing Grant Manager users.
- Sign up by May 15, get 10% off the first user's annual fee, already thousands of dollars less than the competition's stand-alone service.

Call (415) 453-0481 or log in for a test run at www.NorthernLightsSoftware.com
NCURA Calendar of Events

MULTI-WEEK ONLINE TUTORIALS
A Primer on Federal Contracting (8 weeks) March–August 29, 2008
A Primer on Clinical Trials (7 weeks) March–August 29, 2008

ONLINE CHATS
America COMPETES ACT May 21, 2008, 2:00-3:00 pm EDT
Training Grants July 9, 2008, 2:00-3:00 pm EDT
International Subcontracting Issues September 17, 2008 (Time TBA)

FUNDAMENTALS OF SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION
Charleston, FULL May 19-21, 2008
New York, FULL NYC, NY June 18–20, 2008
Portland, OR July 21–23, 2008
Boston, MA August 25–27, 2008
Madison, WI September 3–5, 2008

SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION II WORKSHOP
Seattle, WA June 23–25, 2008
Boston, MA August 25–27, 2008
Madison, WI September 3–5, 2008

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
Charleston, FULL May 19-21, 2008
Seattle, WA June 23–25, 2008
Portland, OR July 21–23, 2008

2008 NCURA TV SATELLITE BROADCAST SERIES
Managing Cost Issues (DVD Available) aired January 22, 2008
Effective Proposal Development (DVD Available) aired March 11, 2008
Complex Agreements June 10, 2008

PRE-AWARD RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION III CONFERENCE
Embrace the Change! Creating the Environment for Tomorrow, Hilton Head Island, South Carolina August 11–13, 2008

NCURA SENIOR SUMMIT
Aligning Services, Resources and Institutional Mission to Enhance Faculty Research Productivity and Competitiveness, Washington, DC November 1, 2008

NCURA ANNUAL MEETING 2008
50th Annual Meeting Washington, DC November 2–5, 2008

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION X CONFERENCE
La Quinta Resort & Club, La Quinta, CA February 9–11, 2009

For further details and updates visit our events calendar at www.ncura.edu
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