“No thanks.
I’m already over-stimulated.”
On the Cover:

This April/May issue of the NCURA Magazine is exciting for several reasons. As the cover illustrates rather humorously, continued attention is paid to developments regarding the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), which some could argue is the singularly most important piece of legislation to come out of Washington, D.C., in the past 70 years. Additionally, this issue contains the first article written by a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Wisconsin Congressman Tom Petri. And lastly, the Magazine itself continues to evolve in content and breadth, and increase in size. The Magazine is the premiere publication of NCURA and with a domestic and international publication run of approximately 7300 copies (plus global readership of the on-line version), it truly is NCURA’s publication presence to the international research administration community.

On top of these reasons, you will find within this issue the normal breadth, quality, and content that you expect. The Corners provide topic-specific information and issues of timely and historical importance. The Neighborhoods provide information specific to the current stable of NCURA neighborhoods. The Neighborhoods are virtual communities that are important to the overall mission of the organization. Visit them.

This issue also contains a wonderful set of feature articles written by individuals associated with or outside of NCURA. While it is important that NCURA remain true to its profession, it is equally important to draw upon the larger universe of individuals who work in professions tangential to research administration. Increasing those linkages makes the profession and NCURA stronger.

So, enjoy this issue. And look forward to the July/August issue, which will focus on university-industry partnerships.

James Casey
Senior Co-editor
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Dr. Neil Turok to present 51st Annual Meeting Keynote Address

The 51st Annual Meeting Program Committee is pleased to announce that Dr. Neil Turok, Executive Director of the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, will serve as the 51st Annual Meeting Keynote speaker. Born in South Africa, Dr. Turok founded the African Institute for Mathematical Sciences (AIMS), which opened in 2003. Based in Cape Town, this postgraduate educational center supports the development of mathematics and science across the African continent by connecting talented students with world-class researchers (see www.aims.ac.za and www.nexteinstein.org). Dr. Turok has worked in a number of areas of theoretical physics and cosmology, focusing on developing fundamental theories and new observational tests. Along with Stephen Hawking, he developed the Hawking-Turok instanton solutions describing the birth of inflationary universes. Most recently, with Paul Steinhardt at Princeton, he has developed a cyclic model for cosmology, according to which the big bang is explained as a collision between two “brane-worlds” in M-theory. In 2006, Steinhardt and Turok showed how the model naturally allowed the cosmological constant to relax to very small values, consistent with current observations. Steinhardt and Turok co-authored the popular science book “Endless Universe: Beyond the Big Bang.” Among his many honors, he was awarded Sloan and Packard Fellowships and the 1992 James Clerk Maxwell medal of the UK Institute of Physics. He was recently awarded a prestigious TED Prize and a “Most Innovative People” award at the 2008 World Summit on Innovation and Entrepreneurship for his work with the African Institute for Mathematical Sciences and for his contributions to theoretical physics. Dr. Turok’s life work has demonstrated that we are truly “One World Connected Through Research”. Please join us on Thursday the 23rd of October to hear how one person can make a big difference in the lives of many. To find out more about Dr. Turok and the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, please visit www.perimeterinstitute.ca.

Dave Barry to Headline 51st Annual Meeting Banquet

During challenging times like these, people often state that laughter is the best medicine. Prepare to be medicated as the award winning humorist Dave Barry is set to entertain the NCUA membership at the 51st Annual Meeting opening banquet to be held Wednesday the 21st of October. For 25 years Dave was a syndicated columnist whose work appeared in more than 500 newspapers in the United States and abroad. In 1988 he won the Pulitzer Prize for Commentary. Many people are still trying to figure out how this happened. According to his website (www.davebarry.com), Dave has also written a total of 30 books, although virtually none of them contain useful information. Two of his books were used as the basis for the CBS TV sitcom Dave’s World, in which Harry Anderson played a much taller version of Dave. Dave has made many numerous TV appearances, including one on the David Letterman show where he proved that it is possible to set fire to a pair of men’s underpants with a Barbie® doll and recently participated in the Presidential Inaugural Parade as an embedded reporter marching with the world famous Lawn Rangers of Amazing Arcola. In his spare time, Dave is a candidate for president of the United States. If elected, his highest priority will be to seek the death penalty for whoever is responsible for making Americans install low-flow toilets. Dave lives in Miami.
Networking and Volunteering Opportunities

The 51st Annual Meeting will carry on the strong NCURA tradition of offering ample opportunities for members to network throughout the conference. The kick-off to the Annual Meeting will be the traditional Night of Networking held Tuesday, October 20th. The Night of Networking offers the perfect opportunity to check in with old friends and also meet colleagues from institutions across the country. The always popular and educational NCURA workshops will take place on Wednesday, October 21st and will be followed by the formal banquet opening the 51st Annual Meeting. If you are a new member, you will not want to miss the New Member Breakfast scheduled for the morning of Thursday, October 22nd. This breakfast will give you a unique opportunity to network with other new members and some “more seasoned” members to ask questions about the meeting and NCURA resources in a more “relaxed” atmosphere.

Still looking for more ways to network? Be sure to participate in the ever popular Dinner Groups scheduled for the evening of the 22nd, the NCURA National Office always has a great selection of restaurants to choose from! Of course, in addition to all the more “formal” networking opportunities that will be available during the conference, the Marriott has many public spaces and lounge areas available to meet and talk with your colleagues between sessions or after lunch. Details will follow regarding specific times for all events, so keep watching for more information!

Interested in taking on a more active role in NCURA? Then the 51st Annual Meeting can be the place to start! With a new venue, and larger than previous conference facilities, we will be seeking volunteers to assist our membership in finding their sessions and for highlighting opportunities that only the Annual Meeting provides. In addition, assistance is always needed for members willing to help with registration/check-in; information desk; and other opportunities that will assist in providing a “seamless” conference for the membership. Volunteering also provides a great reward – it gives you the opportunity to meet your fellow research administrators, while also providing a service! Details regarding volunteer opportunities will follow, so be sure to find the one that is right for you and take that leap!

The 51st Annual Meeting Will Offer Many Changes!

The recently remodeled Marriott Wardman Park will be home to the 51st Annual Meeting scheduled for October 21-24. Situated in a beautiful garden park just off of Connecticut Avenue and one Metro stop away from Dupont Circle, the Marriott Wardman Park offers a historic property with plenty of open space for our members to relax and soak in the atmosphere of the NCURA Annual Meeting. Multi levels and the flexibility of the Marriott’s meeting space will easily accommodate everything from the smallest to the largest of our planned sessions. The property has a variety of on-site dining areas and is within close walking distance to the National Zoo and the quaint and charming shops and restaurants along Connecticut Avenue. Besides the venue change, the length of the concurrent sessions and discussion groups have been designed to decrease as the day progresses. The longest sessions of 90 minutes will be offered in the morning while we are at our most attentive and the mid- to late-afternoon sessions will be limited to 75 minutes and 45 minutes respectively to maintain the freshness of the dialogue and to coincide with the challenges of learning throughout the day. With the change in venue and date, also note that the traditional full-day workshop offerings examining the operations of great “Sole Source and the No-cost Extensions” rock and roll.

Sole Source and the No-cost Extensions Celebrates 20 Years

The 51st Annual Meeting will mark a very important milestone in the history of NCURA. Besides this year being the 50th year anniversary of NCURA’s founding, it also marks the 20th anniversary celebration of NCURA’s own house band the “Sole Source and the No-cost Extensions”. While members have come and gone and venues have changed over the course of the last two decades, the one thing that has remained consistent is the great rock and roll entertainment provided by the “Sole Source and the No-cost Extensions” at the Annual Meeting party. Led by the talented past NCURA President Steve Smartt of Vanderbilt University, composed of various NCURA members from around the country, and featuring the “world’s greatest left-handed tambourine player” the band remains a perennial favorite among the NCURA membership and is always a highlight of the Annual Meeting. This year promises to be special as the “Sole Source and the No-cost Extensions” will take the stage for their annual concert on Friday the 23rd of October. That’s right, the Annual Meeting Party has moved to a Friday night and this year’s party theme of “TGIF: Return to the 70s” reflects this uniqueness by celebrating the end of the work week and a return to the age of long hair, bell bottom s, punk rock, and great guitar riffs! So dig into your closets and attics and find those good ol’ clothes from the 70s and plan to join us as we celebrate both the 50th anniversary of our founding and 20 years of great “Sole Source and the No-cost Extensions” rock and roll.
The signs are well-known – stiffening one’s back, turning away from people, avoiding eye contact, screaming and yelling. Sound familiar? The solutions are easy – time alone to re-establish feelings of self-esteem and self-confidence, getting respect from one’s colleagues, quiet time for relaxation. Every parent knows to look for the signs of over-stimulation in children; it may be time to look for those signs in our colleagues.

The Stimulus or American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) has provided an important, nay, an unprecedented opportunity to move research forward in significant and substantial ways. The opportunities are seemingly irresistible but, as we’ve learned, they come with a cost. The Recovery Act is intended to stimulate the economy, in part, by creating or retaining jobs. The funds are also “a down payment on addressing long-neglected challenges so our country can thrive in the 21st century” – that’s the research part. The funds for research, notably at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the National Science Foundation (NSF), Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science and NASA, are intended as a down payment toward solving long-neglected challenges and to create jobs. Thus, reflecting the Obama Administration’s commitment to transparency and accountability, we’re counting jobs created or retained in research programs as a measure of success. It takes some getting used to.

Agencies have taken varying roads to spending Recovery Act funds. NIH and NSF will look at recently peer reviewed or proposals currently in the peer review processes as candidates for Recovery Act funding. NIH will look for activities that can be accomplished in 2 years or less; NSF will issue grants for the standard 5 years. NIH will fund new research applications through the announced Challenge Grants and support supplements to current grants to accelerate research. Both NIH and NSF will build or rebuild the infrastructure and support major instrumentation. Most of Energy’s funds will go to their national labs with a portion for competitive awards for Energy Frontier Research. These centers will focus on alternative energy sources as well as energy-related fundamental research. NASA will accelerate the development of selected Earth Science climate research projects and research and development in a number of areas including aviation safety and the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen).

It is an understatem ent to note that the management of Recovery Act awards will be complex. Each award – whether a new Challenge or competitive award or as a supplement to an existing award – each award or supplement will need to be tracked separately through the life of the award. Audits will be conducted separately and the agency Inspectors General will be visiting campuses and organizations from the outset. Agencies will be announcing any special terms and conditions for the Recovery Act awards.

continued on page 21 ➤
by Rep. Tom Petri

Preface by Senior Co-editor James Casey

The U.S. higher education system, including its research enterprise, is dependent upon a strong and vibrant pool of students at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In fact, one can argue that the nation’s educational and economic success can only continue if increasing numbers of traditional and non-traditional students enroll in undergraduate and graduate education. As a result, student financial aid is a significant issue in higher education, and one that has special importance and linkage to the U.S. research enterprise.

With this background, we turn to an interview with Congressman Tom Petri, a Wisconsin Republican who has been in the House of Representatives since 1979. Congressman Petri’s specialty is student financial aid. This article is the result of a compiled draft article in advance of an in-person interview at his Washington office.

Q: Congressman Petri, how and why did you become interested in the issue of student financial aid?

A: When I was a new member of the Education Committee I was called upon to vote on federal programs to improve access to higher and vocational education. To prepare myself to do that, I talked to people from my state that had educational backgrounds. One was the head of a higher education aid program who suggested a variety of improvements in the way the federal government supplied financial aid.

One suggestion was for a direct loan program, which made sense to me. Then I started looking at income-contingent repayment loans with terms that would automatically be adjusted depending on the borrower’s post-school income, and would be paid along with one’s income taxes. I quickly realized that this could be an exciting innovation which could do some real good by guaranteeing students that their loans would be kept affordable no matter what the highs and lows of a person’s career might be.

I discovered the constellation of forces both for and against my proposal, and well, this has remained interesting and stimulating and, from time to time, quite gratifying.

In the late 1980s I managed to win approval for a limited direct lending program at Marquette University in Milwaukee and some other institutions to demonstrate its cost-effectiveness. In ’93 I worked with President Clinton’s Education Department to have the approach expanded nationwide.

Since then, I’ve had to defend direct lending from numerous attacks by financial institutions which receive subsidies under the older, competing guaranteed loan program. Now, President Obama has come out in favor of winding down guaranteed loans in favor of direct loans, and the Congressional Budget Office estimates that doing so would save us $94 billion over 10 years by eliminating subsidies to the private financial institutions while providing students with the exact same loans. The House seems likely to go along, but the private lenders are managing to keep this interesting.

Q: Everyone acknowledges that education is, for most people, the ticket to a better life in the American economy. Even with this near universal acknowledgment, why is it so hard to achieve consensus across the political spectrum?

A: Think of the story of blind men trying to describe an elephant based on the part that each individual touches. The challenges facing education can appear very different if you are a parent, teacher, administrator, politician, loan officer, whatever. Urban needs differ from rural needs. And it’s difficult for people to separate their own interests from that of education as a whole.

And there is the ideological component - is it most important to help the best reach their potential, or should we emphasize not leaving any child behind? Is education about learning things, or about learning how to think? Is it about individual achievement or about the need for a democratic society to have a literate and numerate citizenry?

Some measure one’s commitment to education largely on how much money we spend on it while others add a concern about making sure that money spent actually produces results for students and the community.

I am particularly concerned that our schools are failing to teach history in ways which will help students understand themselves, our country and the way the world has worked over time. That is why last year I managed to win passage of legislation designed to strengthen postsecondary academic programming in subject areas that are vital to American civic education but which are increasingly omitted from university and college requirements. These include the study of traditional American history, constitutional, political, intellectual, economic and diplomatic history. Without adequate knowledge of their own country, our citizens will be unprepared to make intelligent decisions about public policy.

I am also concerned about financial literacy, which is why I am co-chairman of the Congressional Savings and Ownership Caucus. The results are so much better for people who have been taught about finances compared to those who haven’t. The difference is amazing.
Q: What has been your greatest achievement in the field of education as a congressman?
A: I beat the drum for direct lending through most of the 1980s and helped lay the groundwork for the Clinton Administration to actually bring it into being. The same goes for income-contingent loans, which I’ve always considered a key potential advantage of direct lending. I consider as accomplishments both that I helped create the Direct Lending Program and that I have helped to defend it against bitter special interest attacks over the years.

I’m also quite proud of my work to create and support the Troops to Teachers Program, which helps retiring military personnel to qualify for teaching positions in public schools which serve large numbers of disadvantaged kids. Troops to Teachers participants fill several critical needs among educators: 82 percent are male, over one-third are ethnic minorities, and a majority brings expertise in science and math to the classroom.

Q: With the election of President Obama, what will be the biggest difference in the substance of educational issues in Congress?
A: The early signs are that the appointment of Arne Duncan as Education Secretary brings someone with real, substantial experience promoting educational innovation. I am hopeful that we will have an active Education Department willing to consider new approaches and ready to tackle problems, especially in inner-city schools.

Q: What are the potential pitfalls in the area of education for President Obama?
A: The President gets to propose, but Congress has a decisive role in designing federal programs while state and local governments do most of the actual administering. If the President proposes changes which threaten entrenched special interests, he is likely to be thwarted unless he is able to mobilize sustained public support.

Q: Is there anything else you want to add in your message to the National Council of University Research Administrators?
A: Research is a critical component of the nation’s educational enterprise. To that end, I appreciate the efforts of organizations such as yours in providing professional development programs to those involved in managing research.

Congressman Tom Petri, who represents Wisconsin’s 6th Congressional District, is serving his 15th term in the U.S. House of Representatives. First elected in April 1979, Petri has been returned to office every two years since. He is a former Vice Chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, now named the Committee on Education and Labor.
A Retrospective on Federal Agencies and Regulations

by Lauren A. Wilson

Throughout history, Congress has established, changed and transformed federal programs to meet the demands of the times. The passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 presents an unprecedented number of new rules and regulations that will flow down to universities through research and development grants and contracts. At this time it is more important than ever to understand federal agency motives and obligations. A historical approach presents these and the resulting changes in a unique perspective.

Historical Background – Agency Creation

Between 1774 and 1781 there was no “national government.” Individual states made decisions and sent their decisions to Congress through their congressional representatives. During this time the states funded the representatives, as well as all other needs of their respective states because there was no national treasury. Although the Articles of Confederation were proposed on June 11, 1776 (prior to the Declaration of Independence) our nation was not formed until March 1, 1781 when The Articles of Confederation were finally ratified by all the states. Under the Articles of Confederation, all major legislation required a unanimous vote of all the states, which obviously created many problems and eventually led to the convention to draw up the Constitution as we know it today (John Spencer Bassett, The Federalist System, 1789-1801 (Harper & Brothers, 1906), pp. 65-85).

To put this in perspective, the Constitution of the United States was not ratified until March 4, 1789, which brought the nation under a centralized federalist form of government. President George Washington and Vice President John Adams were inaugurated on April 30, 1789, under the rules of the new Constitution. Congress then rapidly began organizing the new government, creating a judicial system, executive offices and creating administrative structure to manage and oversee complex issues of governmental concern that are beyond the expertise of Congress or the President. (Id.)

Administrative agency rules and regulations have the same force and effect of law as laws passed by Congress or state legislatures. Administrative agencies are created by state or federal law that outlines the agency’s authority and ability to make rules and regulations. These are called enabling statutes. The intricacies of the rules and regulations are not dictated by Congress; Congress does not have the expertise or time to micromanage the jurisdiction given to them by writing statutes that cover every possible detail relating to the agency’s duties. Further, because agencies are made up of experts in the field in which the agency operates, they are best equipped to develop the detailed applications of statutes to a particular situation.

Agency rules and regulations are codified in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), which are published in the Federal Register by the executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The Federal Register was created by Congress on July 26, 1935 in response to Franklin D. Roosevelt’s creation of new agencies under the “New Deal.” Prior to the creation of the Federal Register, there was practically no public dissemination of agency rules and regulations being implemented, and companies and individuals were being charged with violating laws they had no idea even existed. The Federal Register Act provided that rules or regulations put in place by an agency would not be valid against any person until published in the Federal Register. The first Federal Register notice of compliance was sent to the existing agencies to gather their rules and regulations in 1935. On March 14, 1936, the first issue of the Federal Register was published and consisted of only sixteen (16) pages (http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/the-federal-register/history.pdf).

The Federal Register made it possible to inform the public regarding rules and procedures as they were promulgated, but it was only published chronologically. This made it impossible to quickly research a rule or regulation without knowing what date it was implemented. In 1937 Congress created the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), which organized the regulations by subject to make it possible to locate a regulation by topic, rather than by chronology (http://www.answers.com/topic/code-of-federal-regulations).

The Mission of Federal Agencies

There are six “key” federal agencies that provide the bulk of R&D funding for universities: National Institutes of Health (NIH); National Science Foundation (NSF); National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); Department of Energy (DOE); U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA); and Department of Defense (DOD). As times changed and public demand or needs evolved, so did the agencies and their missions.

The National Institutes of Health

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) roots date back to 1798 when President John Adams signed “An Act for the relief of sick and disabled Seamen.” This act was funded by a twenty-cent tax that was deducted from merchant seamen’s wages each month. In 1799 an amendment to the act extended benefits to officers and men in the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps. This tax continued until 1943. In 1878 Congress appropriated funds for investigating the origin and causes of epidemic diseases. This action was taken after the outbreak of yellow fever. In 1879 Congress passed a law to establish The National Board of Health, which was the first organized, comprehensive, national medical research effort of the Federal Government. Congress expanded their authority in 1890 to include the power to quarantine throughout the states.

Throughout the years as other medical and health concerns received public attention, more authority was given to the
agency ultimately resulting in today’s NIH mission: to advance knowledge and promote improvements in human health (http://www.nih.gov/about/almanac/historical/chronology_of_events.htm).

The National Science Foundation
The National Science Foundation (NSF) was created in 1950 as a post World War II effort to maintain United States dominance in scientific research and discovery. The bill introduced to Congress was actually passed in 1947, but President Harry S. Truman vetoed the bill because he wanted it placed in under the executive branch so the President could appoint and remove the directors. In 1952, NSF awarded their first 52 grants. NSF’s mission is fundamental research and education in all major scientific and engineering fields, which is unique among all the Federal agencies (http://www.nsf.gov/about/history).

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration
President Dwight D. Eisenhower established the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in 1958, which grew from the National Advisory Committee of Aeronautics (NACA). The NACA had been researching flight technology for over 40 years. In response to the Soviet Union’s launch of the first satellite in 1957, the United States created NASA and entered the “Space Race.” NASA’s mission is to undertake aeronautic and space research and activities for the benefit of all humankind (http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/pao/History/factsheet.htm).

The Department of Energy
The origins of the Department of Energy (DOE) trace back to 1942 and the Manhattan Project: the race to develop the atomic bomb during World War II. Following the war, Congress argued over who should have control of the atom, civilians or military personnel. In 1946 the Atomic Energy Act was passed which created the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC). The AEC was established to specifically maintain government civilian control over the field of atomic research and development. During the cold war years, the Commission focused on designing nuclear weapons and developing nuclear reactors for naval propulsion. In 1954 Congress passed the Atomic Energy Act beginning the regulation and growth of the commercial nuclear power industry. In response to the energy crisis in the early 1970s, Congress created two new agencies, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to regulate the nuclear power industry and the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) to manage the nuclear weapon, naval reactor, and energy development programs. However, by the late 70’s Congress concluded that all Federal programs addressing energy issues should be administered under a single Federal agency, and created the Department of Energy. Today, the Department of Energy has a much broader scope than just research and development of nuclear energy or conservation of energy. The DOE research and development programs have several components, including research in energy technology, support for fundamental physical science research, and research involving nuclear security in support of the nation’s defense (http://www.energy.gov/about/timeline.htm).

The Role of the Research Administrator
As we all know, federal agencies are ultimately responsible to the taxpayer, whether it be through the Executive, Legislative or Judicial branches of government. This awareness is now heightened to a new level with the implementation of the stimulus package and the transparent government that President Obama has promised. Although federal agencies seek to ensure integrity and accountability through the award and administration process and the individual system of checks and balances and separation of responsibilities within an agency, the responsibility actually remains with the grantee. Agencies are establishing new expectations for grantee organizations at a rapid pace. Institutions and faculty researchers are being required to accept more responsibility and accountability with the ever changing terms and conditions associated with awards. The bottom line is this: we must be diligent in our constant review and dissemination to our peers of the changes in the rules, regulations, terms and conditions associated with each agency. We must also pay attention to the promulgated changes in rules and regulations as published in the Federal Register in order to take advantage of the time allowed for public comment to make known the concerns of our institutions and colleagues.

Lauren A. Wilson is Senior Associate Director in the Office for Sponsored Programs at The University of Alabama.
The difficulty that most working academic researchers face in obtaining adequate research funding cannot be overestimated. Statistics show that in recent years it has become increasingly more difficult to secure research funding. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) went through a period in which its extramural budget doubled (FY 1997-2003). Since 2004, however, the NIH budget has remained flat in real-dollar terms, which translates to a loss in purchasing power of over 25% by FY 2008. At the same time, NIH received 73,500 applications in 2007 versus 46,000 in 2001 (NIH website, Improving Peer Review CSR Initiatives August 2007, CSR Media Kit). Pay lines have decreased across the board to the extent that even veteran study section members complain it is almost impossible to determine which of two or three outstanding projects will get funded. Similarly, state funding has been flat to sharply declining due to the severe economic climate over the past year; these cuts most heavily affect public research universities such as the University of Michigan and the University of California systems.

While President Obama has expressed his intent to double federal investments in research over the next decade, apart from the immediate and one-time effects of the stimulus package, the current economic crisis will likely still take a sharp toll on funding in the short and medium term. Competition for research dollars will only increase, making ‘grant hunting’ all the more important. Directors of sponsored program offices (SPOs), whose primary goal is to assist researchers in successfully obtaining and maintaining critical research funding, have seen the substantial additional stress that lack of funding puts on researchers and their staff alike.

In addition to the difficulty in obtaining funding, the ground underneath researchers’ feet has been shifting in many other ways, posing new challenges to researchers and central administrators alike. The move to electronic grants submission, first with Fastlane and now Grants.gov, has changed administrative processes substantially and exacerbated existing labor shortages in SPOs. The existing transition to fully online systems continues to put significant strain on SPO ability to submit grants in a timely and successful way. This in turn has limited the amount of one-on-one assistance that SPOs can offer individual researchers and helped to fracture relationships and trust between investigators and SPOs that took years to build.

The research university itself is also evolving rapidly. Universities are opening multiple campuses overseas, and continuing a process of academic decentralization that occurs even in the context of attempts by senior university leadership to centralize and streamline university operations — in order to achieve financial goals and ensure compliance with ever-shifting regulatory burdens. Negotiating these centrifugal and centripetal forces simultaneously is a highly difficult task. Traditional departmental structures in many leading research universities still hold sway, but they are giving way to a more complex organization that includes the old departments. Even institutes, centers and floating research teams, some of which may operate on a financially independent basis from the university, continue to use SPO services. A single researcher may play three different roles and carry three different titles within the university, and conduct separate research as part of each of these roles.

Finally, there has been a marked shift away from small research teams working in a very specific area in favor of larger interdisciplinary teams working in conjunction with each other on broader grants. Some researchers applaud this trend, some decry it, but the funding emphasis from Federal agencies within the last decade has clearly accelerated this trend. The interdisciplinary nature of these collaborations not only spans departments and schools within one university, but frequently links multiple institutions into a single research framework. International collaborations, while common for a number of years in some fields like high-energy physics, have also increased sharply, posing additional compliance and administrative challenges to the institutions that lead such efforts.

The current state of research funding is especially daunting for junior investigators. Having invested very heavily in both time and money to obtain a doctoral degree in the sciences, post-doctoral researchers find themselves in the precarious position of making the transition to becoming an independently funded researcher. This journey is a long and difficult one. The extreme stress on junior researchers in the current environment is a well-recognized problem, and NSF and NIH have specific programs to assist junior investigators in making this transition, but even these programs do not adequately meet the needs of this group.
Are Creating a new playing field

The managers and staff of the SPOs are perhaps the best-situated to help with this transition. Within the university structure they are closest to the many complex issues surrounding grants funding. Given the large volume of submissions they handle, the many researchers whom they interact with, and the intense policy monitoring and communication they maintain with the major funding agencies, SPO personnel often have a clearer picture than most of the evolution of grants funding and the role junior researchers can play to benefit the organization today and in the future.

Given the undeniable stress on SPO resources, taking on the responsibility of junior research mentoring may seem daunting. However, there are new tools being developed to simplify the difficult task of seeking research funding. These tools can not only help jumpstart the younger scientists and benefit senior researchers but also support the increasingly tech-oriented administrative tools can not only help jumpstart the younger scientists and benefit senior researchers but also support the increasingly tech-oriented administrative needs of the SPO.

Mentoring can also be as simple as offering tips and insight based on the wealth of grant hunting knowledge the SPO office contains. Some thought starters that can be shared include:

- **Target the opportunities that you apply for carefully:** Younger researchers in particular often take a scattershot approach to funding, applying for grants far and wide in the hopes of getting one application accepted. The application process is difficult and time-consuming. Anything that can be done to narrow the search and find the most relevant funding opportunities can be very beneficial in terms of success rates and saving time.

- **Look backward to look ahead:** Junior researchers need to gain perspective by spending some time reviewing past grant entry winners to get a sense of what may have made them successful. They should also speak with their peers and senior colleagues who may have applied for and won awards for similar programs in the past. This group can also offer advice and assistance in determining how relevant the application is by offering feedback on how closely the researcher’s work matches the opportunity profile.

- **Think multidisciplinary:** Today’s research world is increasingly multi-disciplinary, and collaboration across fields can help give proposals the competitive edge needed to win funding. Junior researchers can leverage their fluency with interactive technologies to facilitate this collaboration which is increasingly important as even grants that do not specify the need for a multidisciplinary approach will likely see it as a positive element.

Often at the forefront of the grant hunting process, investing time in helping junior researchers grow will help improve and accelerate current submissions. It will also serve to train them to be highly productive senior researchers who understand the grant process thoroughly down the line.

Getting junior faculty active early in the grant hunting process allows them to help support labs by identifying smaller or lesser-known grants for additional resources. Additionally, it offers an opportunity for them to create a track record for themselves and build relationships with grant program managers, both of which are instrumental for future success not only of the individual but of the SPO and institution.

The need for mentoring is only heightened by the recent Federal stimulus package which has made large amounts of research funding available on a one-time basis, further stretching the capacity of both researchers and research administrators to respond. Different agencies have chosen different ways to disburse the funding. NIH, for example, has said that its share of the stimulus package will go largely to fund previously reviewed grants that were near the payline and considered to be promising projects while other agencies have decided to use the money to start new programs.

While the stimulus package has created widespread opportunity to get new projects funded, the resulting scramble has caused significant confusion. Research administrators will need to quickly synthesize relevant information on new programs, advise faculty appropriately and continue to successfully submit what is likely to be a tidal wave of new and revised proposals. They also need to ensure that less experienced faculty do not drown in the flood. The good news is that the stimulus funds have specific allocation for additional training grants on the state and local levels, providing new avenues for enhancing mentorship. These are avenues that SPOs must not neglect to explore as they struggle with the immediate needs created by the stimulus package.

If done right, the mentoring process can offer a significant return on the time invested as well as valuable insight. It will not only grow junior faculty into future leaders but allow the SPO team to gain the perspective of this new generation who are on the front lines of the rapidly evolving research process.

Daniel Calito is the Director for Product Management in the Academic and Government group at Elsevier, New York. Josine Stallinga is a Product Manager in the Academic and Government group at Elsevier, Amsterdam.
RETOOLING EMERGING RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

by Earnestine Psalmonds

STRENGTHENING
the science and engineering enterprise is critical to ensuring that the United States remains globally competitive. Engaging entrepreneurial faculty and providing more opportunities for student participation in research at the university level can help achieve this goal, since research is known to spawn innovation and extremely effective in preparing students for graduate school and science and engineering careers. It seems reasonable, then, to expect that all higher education institutions will be able to optimize their productivity given the slippage of the nation’s competitive edge in science and technology. However, that is not the case with a large segment of institutions that are the topic of a recently released National Academies report entitled Partnerships for Emerging Research Institutions: Report of a Workshop.

Emerging research institutions (defined in the report as master’s colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, and tribal colleges) constitute one-third (1,463) of 4,392 institutions of higher education that are listed in the 2005 Carnegie Classification System, and they enroll over 30 percent of the total student population. In addition, excluding the associate colleges, they enroll the largest population. In addition, excluding the associate colleges, they enroll the largest number of undergraduates and the largest proportion of the minority student population. While the primary emphasis at these institutions is teaching, emerging research institutions (ERIs) can potentially contribute more significantly to research and must play a more prominent role in re-positioning the nation for global competitiveness.

Why can’t emerging research institutions simply be transformed into robust research enterprises? For that matter, why can’t their faculty successfully compete for research funding directly, thereby garnering the resources to encourage and sustain this significant activity? How does one initiate research in an environment that is not necessarily research friendly?

The report responds to these questions by profiling emerging research institutions, examining the impact of research experiences on students at ERIs, and then exploring reasons why it is so difficult to cultivate a research climate in these institutions. The major barriers discussed in the report are that teaching loads at ERIs are usually double or triple that of research universities, and many ERIs are limited in the administrative support they can offer their faculty. In addition, the faculty reward system does not compensate adequately for the burdens that ERI researchers must bear or for the full scope of their efforts. The term “partnerships” was chosen to encourage ERIs to align with research universities and other organizations to remedy infrastructure shortfalls and to leverage existing resources.

The report presents a number of approaches to overcome resource and infrastructure barriers facing ERIs:

FACULTY TIME. ERI teaching loads are high, typically three to four courses per semester. Moreover, because these institutions try to maximize student access to courses, classes often are distributed across day and evenings and include both Monday-Wednesday-Friday and Tuesday-Thursday slots. This means that there are no blocks of uninterrupted time to perform research. The combination of high teaching load, high advising load, extra administrative duties, and limited institutional capacity for release time creates an unmanageable situation for many ERI faculty who would otherwise take an active interest in research. This phenomenon is supported by a 2002 Research Corporation study on the role of research in the natural sciences at undergraduate institutions where faculty concur that the major barrier to research participation is workload. The problem is that the percentage allocation of faculty time for teaching and research at ERIs has not changed over time, although both are more time intensive today than in the past. Research must be continual in order for it to be sustained; it can no longer just be a summer activity.

Proposed solutions to the faculty time issue include: (1) consolidating many small classes into fewer large ones; (2) formulating a research project as an undergraduate class to leverage the resources allocated for teaching; (3) consolidating teaching schedules to provide time blocks for research; (4) providing “reassigned time” for faculty, especially new faculty, with institutional funds or through aggregated teaching replacements among multiple institutions; (5) collaborating to implement faculty sabbaticals at research universities; and (6) capitalizing on internal faculty development activities, such as proposal development groups and peer mentoring.

TARGETED INVESTMENTS. Developing a research enterprise is difficult and expensive, but good strategic planning and investment can optimize the results and minimize the liabilities. Internal funding should support activities such as research initiation grants, summer salaries for young investigators, laboratory space, and travel. Also, establishing research niches and cultivating research experts can enhance competitiveness and attract quality faculty and students. Realistic estimates of expenditures needed for research support personnel, materials, and equipment will help guide decisions about research investments.

The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) is exemplary in this respect, having grown from a research funding base of about $4 million per year in 1989 to more than $45 million in 2006, largely through the activities of the Colleges of Education, Science, and Engineering where investments were targeted to a few faculty within a subset of departments. Those researchers’ ability to generate research revenue paved the way for the next generation of researchers to enter a more research-intensive environment with more robust resources. This approach allows emerging research institutions to focus on areas in which they are uniquely suited by virtue of geography, access to special populations,
prominent alumni, or unusual faculty expertise, thus making success more likely.

INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES. The infrastructure requirements that enable ERIs to participate more fully in research are an office of sponsored research, office of technology transfer, efficient business support services, and centrally supported information resources such as information technology and journal subscriptions. Many ERIs have very limited research support units with professional staff who can provide comprehensive pre- and post-award services to faculty and too few persons with delegated signatory authority.

Institutions with more research revenue can possibly support at least one grants officer, whose full time responsibility is managing the institutional administrative responsibilities related to federally funded research programs, an allowable cost under OMB Circular A-21. The report stresses that having even one trained person to support the faculty can make an incredible difference.

Some ERIs consider technology transfer beyond their purview, although they concede that establishing an office of technology transfer is a core element of a viable research infrastructure. However, they are challenged by a culture that is risk averse and not entrepreneurial, with limited research expenditures, hiring and promotion policies that do not reward technology transfer activities, and a lack of administrative support.

An NSF study entitled “Technology Transfer and Commercialization Partnerships” prepared by Innovation Associates, Inc. argues that ERIs indeed can be successful in this area. The study presents case studies of smaller colleges and universities, including one community college, with modest research expenditures that have been successful in licensing their innovations and starting new companies. Their success was attributed to a commitment to research, concentrated on specific research niches, hired faculty with expertise in those areas, and cultivated partnerships with local industries. Some participated in state-funded collaborative research centers and leveraged those funds to attract federal funds. The study cites the need for technology transfer and commercialization mentoring for emerging research institutions.

Partnerships with other institutions and organizations for economies of scale can enable ERIs to provide services such as sponsored research administration, technology transfer, and grants management. The report mentions the GrantsPlus program at the Research Foundation of the City University of New York as an alternative to establishing a post-award administrative office. The web-based systems facilitate fiscal management and reporting, sponsor liaison and compliance management, payroll, fringe benefit administration, vendor payments, time and leave tracking, and more. The fee for the service is a small percentage of grant expenditures and can be written into a grant as a valid direct or indirect cost.

There also are initiatives for journal subscriptions and faculty sabbaticals funded by state systems of higher education. Examples include the Georgia Library Learning Online (GALILEO) project and Faculty Development Program. GALILEO is a statewide virtual library and an initiative of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia that provides access to its 8,000 journal subscriptions to practically every library in the state. The Faculty Development Program, no longer operational, enabled ERI researchers to spend a semester or year at the Georgia Institute of Technology to position themselves to compete for grant awards. Both institutions reported reciprocity in the knowledge exchange and anecdotes about extended research collaborations and continuing publication streams. The ERI researcher received start-up funding to launch a research program upon return to his or her institution.

The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), a membership organization dedicated to streamlining the administrative burden related to research, also is a valuable resource for ERIs. Because the FDP counts federal agency representatives among its members, its meeting agendas offer very timely insights into upcoming changes in federal grant requirements and procedures. The FDP has an emerging research institutions membership category, which is an excellent environment for ERI research administrators to network with federal program officers and peer administrators from research intensive as well as emerging research institutions.

FACULTY REWARD SYSTEM. The faculty reward system at ERIs reflects the values they assign to scholarly activity consistent with their mission. In Scholarship Reconsidered, Boyer challenged universities to adopt a broader paradigm for defining scholarly activity, replacing the traditional definitions of research. Thus, as ERIs shift to a greater emphasis on research, they must institute faculty reward structures that affirm that commitment while recognizing the synergy of teaching and research. ERIs are urged to place greater emphasis on “scholarly activity” in faculty evaluations and provide rewards for faculty-directed (nonsponsored) and undergraduate research. The rewards and incentives should include laboratory space; more flexible teaching loads; consistent faculty evaluation, tenure and promotion policies and practices; start-up packages for new faculty; returned overhead to principal investigators, and strong advocacy for the researchers themselves.

ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP. Leadership at all levels is pivotal to transforming the institution by publicly embracing a research culture, stimulating internal collaboration to leverage resources, and providing research access and opportunities for more students. In addition, administrators should encourage researchers to share their findings and promote more interdisciplinary activities. ERIs can develop “learning communities” especially for junior faculty where there is not a critical mass of disciplinary expertise in one department, thus helping young faculty members find the synergy needed to incubate and nurture innovative ideas.

In conclusion, partnerships among ERIs, research institutions, and other organizations can offer solutions to the impediments to research. The National Academies report reinforces the notion that research and education are not mutually exclusive, particularly in the context of academic quality, and that ERIs should exploit the resources that can propel them into more competitive enterprises. In closing, and as one National Academies workshop participant stated:

"The rest of the world is shifting bases. And I think that faculty, both in research universities and small institutions, will have to undergo what amounts to a paradigm shift in the way they work and think. And we have to start with research behavior."

Earnestine Psalmonds, a Senior Program Officer at the National Academies, is a visiting scholar from the National Science Foundation. This work was supported by the National Academies and NSF, but the opinions expressed are solely those of the author and the workshop participants and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Academies or NSF.
COMPLIANCE

The Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) has issued several announcements over the past couple months, including a request for comments on proposed IRB accountability for meeting certain regulatory requirements. New frequently asked questions (FAQs) regarding quality improvement as well as a revised compilation of recent OHRP determinations of noncompliance also have been posted. Links to these and other recent OHRP announcements are available on the overview page of the Compliance Neighborhood.

Compliance Neighborhood Committee members have recently reviewed the library section of the neighborhood website. As a result, many existing links have been updated and some new ones added. We hope that the library serves as a valuable resource for members and we encourage you to take a look. If you have any suggestions for new links for existing sections or would like to see a new topic added, please contact one of the compliance committee members.

Carol Pech is Chair of the Compliance Neighborhood Committee and serves as Assistant Director, Health Sciences Institutional Review Boards Office, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

DEPARTMENTAL

We’ve always had lean budgets in our academic world, but trying to balance the books in these economic times can be tough. The environment of an academic institution is based on growth in research and education and, as department administrators, it’s our job to find and manage the funding that supports this growth. In past years, this wasn’t so hard – in fact, most of us department administrators would call it fun! But lately things have changed. The neighborhoods have put together some helpful information to guide us through this new world. Here are a few not-to-miss highlights on the neighborhood site:

GUIDANCE FOR THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT: Everyone has heard – the recently passed stimulus package offers many opportunities for research funding at academic institutions. The neighborhood news section on the NCURA web site is a great resource for keeping track of the latest news and guidance related to ARRA.

Finally, find out how you can help your faculty in the latest On Campus Profile on the department administrators neighborhood page: What PIs Look for from Departmental Administrators.

Kirsten Yehl is a member of the Departmental Administration Neighborhood Committee and serves as Administrator, Institute for Healthcare Studies, and Division of General Internal Medicine Academic Programs, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine.

eRA

No eRA discussion these days could begin anywhere other than with Grants.gov, the federal government’s primary portal for electronic submission of grant applications. This system has experienced much-publicized “challenges” over the past several months, accompanied by increasing frustration among users. The concerns regarding Grants.gov’s ability to handle the expected surge in ARRA applications (the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, or “the stimulus bill”) prompted the federal Office of Management and Budget to release a memorandum (http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/assets/memoranda_fy2009/m09-14.pdf) requiring agencies to identify alternate means of accepting grant applications in the event Grants.gov fails. No word on those alternate means as of press time, but be sure to tune in to the next Grants.gov stakeholder webcast on April 15 from 1-2 pm EST (http://www.grants.gov/help/stakeholder_communications.jsp). You should also visit the Grants.gov blog (http://grants.gov.blogspot.com) for system status updates and other items of importance. The most current news (as of late March) from DHHS, the agency charged with overall management of Grants.gov, can be found in this interview (http://federalnewsradio.com/?nid=35&pid=&sid=1625260), for those of you who cannot get enough of Grants.gov!

Speaking of ARRA funding, be sure to monitor each agency’s website for announcements regarding available applications and e-submission news; just add “recovery” to the agency’s URL (web address). For example, NSF’s is http://www.nsf.gov/recovery while NIH’s page is at http://grants.nih.gov/recovery.

In case you missed it, check out the excellent eRA Corner article on page 23 of the last issue (http://www.ncura.us/docs/magfebmar09.pdf) on using an e-Portfolio as a training tool for research administrators.

And finally, a few web resources worthy of mention. The FDP sponsors a wiki, hosted by Colorado State University, with some very informative matrices on specific agency e-submission and system-to-system requirements (http://wiki.research.colostate.edu). While still a bit NSF-centric, more federal agencies are signing on to Research.gov (http://www.research.gov), which is already incredibly handy if for nothing other than its pan-federal Policy Library section.

Nathan Martinez-Wayman is a member of the ERA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Effort Manager, Office of Research Administration, Duke University.

FRA

The tenth annual FRA conference was held at the LaQuinta Resort in Palm Springs, CA in February 2009. Sessions were informative and lively. For those who couldn’t attend, session handouts will be available online with a link from the FRA Neighborhood website.
Economic stimulus is the hot topic, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) may be the most exciting thing to happen in research administration ever! It also heralds serious reporting challenges for us. Complying with ARRA reporting requirements will mean tracking information that many of us have never tracked before, such as job creation, and submitting it with greater frequency and a short turnaround. Institutions will not only have to collect new data elements, but will have to be quick to report them.

The Jobs Accountability Act provisions (section 1512) describe reporting requirements that may strain current reporting resources. Detailed quarterly reports are due to funding agencies within 10 days of the quarter end, and the reported information will be posted on a public web site within 30 days of the quarter end. Visit the FRA Neighborhood for more information about the required reporting data elements and to keep apprised of ARRA reporting changes and announcements as they unfold.

Linda Ward is Chair of the FRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Grant Accounting Manager, Children’s Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota.

**INTERNATIONAL**

There are a couple items of interest from the world of international research administration for this issue of the NCURA Magazine.

The International Neighborhood is creating a repository of international contracts and agreements that members will be able to access. Hopefully these will include both financial (sponsored research agreements, subawards, etc.) and non-financial agreements (team agreements, memorandum of understanding, material transfer agreements, confidential disclosure agreements, etc.). If you have any international contract templates that you would like to see added to the International Neighborhood website, send them to me at James Casey@utsa.edu.

The GUIRR International Research Collaborations working group (“I-Group”) recently met in Washington, D.C. to discuss a potential workshop to be held in early 2010. The I-Group web site is at http://www7.nationalacademies.org/guirr/International_Research_Web_Update.html if you want to read more about this exciting project.

And finally, the September/October issue of the NCURA Magazine will have a special theme of international research administration. If you want to contribute an article for that issue, with an article submission deadline of August 24, 2009, email me at James.Casey@utsa.edu.

Jim Casey is Director of Contracts and Industrial Agreements at The University of Texas at San Antonio, Chair of the International Neighborhood, and Senior Co-editor of the NCURA Magazine.

**PRE-AWARD**

**COULD CIPSEA IMPACT YOUR OPERATIONS?** The Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act (PL107-347), signed in December 2002, can impact certain kinds of university research. Unlike other confidentiality laws, CIPSEA imposes penalties on the individual rather than the institution and can be severe.

Under the act, data that would allow an individual or group to be identified by or identity be inferred from data gathered under a confidentiality oath is protected. The act applies only to statistical agencies as determined by the OMB.

University researchers can be determined to be agents of these statistical agencies under the contracts and grants they receive. Sponsored programs involving the collection of statistical data should be reviewed for incorporation of the CIPSEA legislation. The act calls for the following minimum standards:

- Inform respondents about confidentiality and use of information
- Training for all individuals collecting or having access to protected information
- Used for statistical purposes only
- Identity must be protected from direct release & inference from information
- Supervision & control of agencies accessing information
- Procedures for monitoring release of information
- Logs must be maintained
- Control access to information
- Physical security & information (IT) security required

Violation of the act, including accidental release of information, carry potentially stiff penalties including a class E felony with up to 5 years prison and up to a $250,000 fine.

**IMPROVEMENTS ON THE WAY:** Plans are under way by the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee to offer NCURA members more information on their website. During a time, when many are experiencing limited travel budgets, we want to be a resource for you. Watch for updated information to be offered in our neighborhood library under Education & Training Development where you will find sample presentations, various online training resources, or materials pre-award administrators could use to develop their own programs. If you have suggestions about what you like to see offered on our website, please contact Robyn@spa.msstate.edu. We want to be a life line for you in the area of pre-award research administration.

Teresa Carey is a member of the Pre-award Neighborhood Committee and serves as Contract and IP Specialist, Texas State University-San Marcos. Robyn Remotigue is the Chair of the Pre-award Neighborhood Committee and serves as Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, Mississippi State University.

continued on page 33 ➤
Spring has sprung in Region I! And, of course, many of us are looking forward to our upcoming Region I Spring Meeting. This year’s meeting will take place at the beautiful Grand Summit Hotel at Mount Snow, Vermont from May 3-6, 2009. Our theme is “Scaling to the Summit - Reaching the Peak of Research Administration in Challenging Climates” and the meeting will include a plethora of workshops, sessions, discussion groups, and networking opportunities for all who attend. We hope you are registered and preparing to head to the mountains with us!

Speaking of the Spring Meeting, the winners of this year’s Bernard McLane Travel Awards to attend the Region I Spring Meeting are Susan Ericson-West from Keene State College and Emily Martyn from the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute. Congratulations to you both! And kudos to the Region I Awards Committee for all of their hard work in identifying this year’s recipients. The 2009 Awards Committee consists of Landy Johnson, Chair, Assumption College, Kevin Brodrick, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Eva Faling, Brown University, Tammy Houle, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and Randi Wasik (Chair, Volunteer & Membership Committee), University of Massachusetts Medical School.

On February 26, 2009, Region I held its first Research Administrators Discussion Group (RADG) meeting of the year. Nearly 130 attendees were provided with a birds-eye view of the expected impact on federal and foundation funding caused by the economic downturn as well as the prospect for stimulus funding. Our sincere thanks go out to Pat Fitzgerald at Harvard University FAS for taking the lead on this meeting and to the illustrious panel of experts who presented - Kevin Casey, Associate Vice President for Government, Community and Public Affairs, Harvard University, John Groeboer, Assistant Director of Federal Relations, Harvard University, and Tara Murphy, Director of Research Development, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University. Thank You!

Region I’s efforts to redesign its web site to make it more functional and add new features for our members are continuing on schedule. In addition to thanking our wonderful volunteer ad hoc committee announced in the February/March Regional Corner, I want to thank and formally acknowledge the many contributions of Steve Dowdy at MIT. Who better to engage in a web site redesign effort than Steve! As busy as he is, Steve has been meeting with us and providing advice, as needed, and he has already created the shell of our new web site. Thanks to Steve and everyone involved in this initiative. Please visit the current Region I web site and stay tuned for continuing updates!

The Region I Advisory Committee recently approved creation of a Treasurer-Elect position for the region. The individual holding this position will have the advantage of working with the current Region I Treasurer for one year before taking over as Treasurer in the second year. Once the initial transition to the Treasurer-Elect/Treasurer “team” has been completed, it will become more of a shared responsibility, thus making it easier to handle the Region I Treasury functions.

I look forward to seeing many of you at the Region I Spring Meeting in Vermont!

Franc Lemire is the Chair of Region I and serves as the Director of Sponsored Programs, Worcester Polytechnic Institution.

Do you know people who seem to live by Emerson’s words? Within NCURA, I am willing to bet that your answer would be a resounding “Yes!” In our current NCURA President’s own words “…it is the dedication of our members and their willingness to volunteer to share their knowledge that keeps us the vibrant organization that we are…” Year after year, many of our members make valuable contributions to the organization without asking for anything in return. Rather, they take pride in knowing that others are learning from them, acquiring new skills from them, and sharing the expertise with others.

For the past two years, we have awarded Distinguished Service Awards to members of our Region as a way to recognize those who have gone above and beyond in their contributions to the Region. I am pleased to announce that there are two Region II Distinguished Service Award recipients this year: Cheryl K. Williams, University of Rochester and Marjorie Forster, University of Maryland Baltimore.

Ralph Waldo Emerson
Perseverance. Emerson’s words are profound - the first step, any small contribution from volunteers is a gift. But it is especially astounding when you find someone who perseveres over the long term. They participate, contribute, and work so hard year after year for our Region. Marjorie and Cheryl have taken that second, third, fourth step (and beyond) which has made them so invaluable to the Region. Both Marjorie and Cheryl have been active members of NCURA for many years and have contributed by serving as officers, speakers and program committee members. For Region II, Marjorie served as Chair, has organized and chaired regional meetings and has served as faculty member and presenter at numerous regional meetings. She has also served as national Treasurer of NCURA. Cheryl has been both the Chair and Secretary of the Region and has served countless terms on regional committees, including Program, Communications and Steering. She has conducted workshops and presentations at both the regional and national level.

When he took time to help the man up the mountain, lo, he scaled it himself.

Tibetan Proverb

Teamwork. In addition to sticking with it and serving in all of these regional capacities, both of our award recipients have contributed to the profession by working with others. Our members who participate and help others by providing the leadership and mentorship that we are so dependent upon will also learn and experience success. In helping others and assuring the continued professional development of NCURA members, both of our Distinguished Service Award recipients have experienced great success themselves: Cheryl Williams is the Assistant Director of the Office of Research and Project Administration at the University of Rochester. Marjorie Forster is the Assistant Vice President for Research at the University of Maryland, Baltimore.

While we enjoy our spring and see it turn into summer, remember our growing list of distinguished colleagues. Let’s use Marjorie and Cheryl as an example of what wonders can happen when we take that first step and think about how you, too, can take that first, second or third step!

If you are interested in volunteering, visit our regional website and complete the on-line enrollment form.

Alexandra (Alex) McKown is Chair of Region II and serves as Associate Dean for Research Administration at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.

Greetings Region III!

There is a lot going on in Region III right now, including preparations for the upcoming spring meeting and some final business from last year.

2009 Spring Meeting Update: Our spring meeting will take place May 3-6 at the beautiful Bay Point Marriott Resort in Panama City Beach overlooking St. Andrew’s Bay on the Gulf Coast of Florida. The conference theme is “Innovative Strategies: The Necessary Tools to Win the Battle.” The agenda includes six pre-conference workshops and 28 concurrent sessions and discussion groups on a wide range of topics, including regulatory compliance, professional development, departmental research administration, intellectual property, and contracting.

The registration form and a preliminary program are available for download from the Region III website. The preliminary program shows session titles, presenters, program level, target audience, session descriptions, and learning outcomes. The programming promises to be excellent, and we encourage all Region III members to review the agenda and send in their registration as soon as possible.

While we are aware of budget cuts and travel freezes across the country, we would like to encourage everyone to attend this wonderful meeting. Members can drive and save airfare costs or minimize travel expenses by choosing to room with colleagues.

2009 Spring Meeting Fundraiser: We still plan to conduct a fundraiser to benefit Shelterbox USA, a non-profit disaster relief organization that provides shelter and tools to families to sustain them immediately following a natural disaster. A representative from Shelterbox USA will make a presentation during the Region III meeting, and members can learn more about the organization at the relief organization’s website (www.shelterboxusa.org). We will have donation cans at the meeting, as well as other fundraising activities. Like many non-profits, Shelterbox is currently experiencing a downturn in donations due to the state of the economy. Now is a great time for us to be of service.

2009 Spring Meeting Keynote Speaker: Region III will be pleased to welcome our keynote speaker, Dr. Felicia Chisolm Coleman of Florida State University. Her research interests lie in the area of marine ecology, particularly as it relates to reef fishes and their use of habitat. She is particularly interested in how scientific findings are incorporated into laws and regulations that affect the management and conservation of the organisms that live in the ocean. We look forward to hearing Dr. Coleman share her research experiences, her ideas about how scientific findings may benefit habitat management and conservation, and her suggestions about how investigators and research administrators may better work together. The Keynote session is scheduled for Monday, May 4, 9:00 a.m. ➤
Regional Corner continued

2009 Spring Meeting Travel Award Recipients: There were so many excellent candidates for this year’s spring meeting travel award that the committee couldn’t just pick one! This year’s recipients are Sandy Barber, an Accounting Manager III at the Georgia Institute of Technology, and Elizabeth Rarick, a Research Administrator II from University of Florida’s College of Engineering. Congratulations to both of you, and thanks to the Region III Executive Committee for allowing two recipients to be chosen!

2009 Spring Meeting Hospitality Suite: Look for some Cinco de Mayo excitement in the hospitality suite at this year’s spring meeting! LaJuania and her team of volunteers are putting together a load of fun activities for everyone.

2009 Spring Meeting Volunteers Needed: Help is needed at the upcoming spring meeting! If you’d like to volunteer to work the registration desk, evaluate a session or help host the hospitality suite, contact Rick Smiley at smileyr@ecu.edu.

Committee Volunteers Needed: All members of Region III are encouraged to step up and volunteer for committee participation this coming year. With travel budgets tight or completely frozen, we all need to pull together and show our support for Region III through our work on the committees, which include the Executive Committee, Program Committee, Nominating and Elections Committee, Membership and Awards Committee, Hospitality Committee, Site Selection Committee. You can find a lot of information about the committees, their activities and the members at www.ncuraregioniii.com/committees.htm. Feel free to contact current committee chairs if you have questions about the time commitment or expectations involved in committee service.

Changes to Region III Bylaws: The previously proposed changes to the Region III Bylaws (see January/February Regional Corner) were approved via the online vote and are now available under the “Bylaws” link on the Region III website. Thanks to everyone who took the time to review the changes, share their comments, and cast their vote.

2010 Spring Meeting: We are pleased to announce that the 2010 NCURA Region III spring meeting will be at the Peabody Hotel, located in downtown Memphis, Tennessee, just blocks from Memphis attractions like Beale Street, the Memphis Rock N Soul Museum, Gibson Guitar Factory, Fed-Ex Forum, National Civil Rights Museum, Sun Studio, and the Memphis Cook Convention Center. The Peabody Hotel (http://www.peabodymemphis.com/) is famous for ducks that parade to and from the fountain in the hotel’s lobby. The meeting will officially begin on April 27th with breakfast to be immediately followed by our keynote speaker, Dr. Roberto Ballarini. Dr. Ballarini’s multidisciplinary research focuses on the development and application of theoretical and experimental techniques to characterize the response of materials to mechanical, thermal, and environmental loads. His current research includes the collapse of the I35W Bridge in Minneapolis.

During the remainder of the meeting, the Program Committee offers 46 concurrent/discussion sessions around eight themes: departmental research administration, professional development, Federal issues of interest, predominantly undergraduate institutions, pre and post award research administration, biomedical, and legal/compliance.

Please check the Region IV website for updates on the spring meeting.

Looking forward to seeing you in Minneapolis!

Sue Keehn is Chair of Region IV and serves as the Director of the Institutional Review Board at the University of Illinois at Champaign.

Laura Lebetter and Sam Gannon serve as Region III’s Magazine team. Laura is the Director of Proposal Development for the Office of Sponsored Programs at Kennesaw State University. Sam Gannon is the Education and Training Manager for the Office of Grants and Contracts Management at Vanderbilt University Medical Center.
**Region V Elections and Spring Meeting**

At the time of this writing, we are just weeks away from the Region V election results and the Region V Spring meeting in San Antonio. I would like to thank Vice-Chair Gail Davis, Lamar University, and her program committee members Marttie Crawford, University of Texas at San Antonio; Jaime Farias, Lamar University; Ty Lane, The University of Texas at Austin; Tracey Lindsay, Texas Women’s University; Joanne Palmer, Texas State University-San Marcos; Hollie Schreiber, Oklahoma State University; and Joy Whitney, University of Texas Systems for putting together a wonderful program. Gail Davis will provide election results, meeting highlights, and the names of the regional meeting travel award recipients in the next issue.

**National Meeting Travel Award**

We know how tight travel budgets are for most institutions, so we are happy to announce that Region V will be offering a $1000 travel award to attend the 51st Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., October 21-24. An Eblast will be sent out soon announcing the details. In the meantime, you can view “The Travel Award Nomination Form” on the Region V website at http://www.ncuraregionv.com/administration.htm under the Forms heading.

**Call for 2009 Officer/Board Nominations - Deadline May 22**

It is not too late to nominate (or self-nominate) candidates to serve as Vice-President/President Elect, Secretary, Treasurer-Elect, and two At-Large Board Members. Nominations can be emailed to nominations@ncura.edu. More information and a description of the responsibilities of each position can be found at http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/opportunities/. Consider nominating an individual from Region V to serve as a leader for our organization!

**Leadership Development Institute (LDI) Applications Due May 26**

If you are considering applying to the LDI program but really aren’t quite sure, what’s holding you back? Go for it! Talk to someone in Region V who has been through the program – Toni Shaklee, Oklahoma State University; Sue Rivera, UT Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas; Ty Lane, University of Texas at Austin; or Cheryl Anderson, in the current class, UT Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas. For more information please see http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/leadership_development.php.

**Call for 2009 National Officer/Board Nominations – Deadline May 22**

Nominations are still being accepted for the following awards: Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration, Distinguished Service Award, Joseph Carrabino Award, and Catherine Core Minority Travel Award. For more information on these awards, please visit http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/awards/index.php. Don’t hesitate to nominate someone from Region V (or any region) if you feel that person is deserving of special recognition.

**Final Note from the Chair**

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of you for your support during this past year. I have made so many friends (and learned so much) during the years I have served Region V as Secretary, Vice-Chair, and now Chair. It has been such a rewarding experience! I encourage you to get involved, whether it is moderating or presenting a session, helping out at the registration desk or hospitality suite, making copies, or serving the region as an officer. If you are interested in volunteering, please contact Joanne Palmer, Region V Volunteer Coordinator, at jp57@txstate.edu, or feel free to contact me any time.

Remember to visit the Region V website for past Region V meeting presentations and pictures as well as upcoming activities.

---

Kay Ellis is the Chair of Region V and serves as Associate Director, Export Control Officer, in the Office of Sponsored Projects, University of Texas at Austin.

---

**Region VI - Western**

The only thing that could possibly rival early spring in Santa Fe are the invigorating networking and learning opportunities Region VI and VII members enjoyed at the 2009 Regions VI/VII Spring Meeting in Santa Fe, New Mexico. For four days nearly 170 participants attended workshops, concurrent sessions, and lively discussion groups where they learned how to approach new compliance challenges facing research administrators and delved into longer-standing challenges, like effort reporting and FAR clauses. Not surprisingly, the impact of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act on research and research administration was the primary focus of many conversations, in and outside of sessions.

Meeting highlights included the keynote address by Dr. Robert Waide, Executive Director of the Long Term Ecological Research (LTER) Network at the University of New Mexico. He talked about the results from the first 30 years and the important role research administrators play in successful research programs. The National Science Foundation established the LTER program in 1980 to support research on long-term ecological phenomena in the United States. It is a collaborative effort involving more than 1800 scientists and students investigating ecological processes over long temporal and broad spatial scales at 26 sites. The Network promotes synthesis and comparative research across sites and ecosystems and among other related national and international research programs. Members also enjoyed NCURA President Denise Clark’s comments during the Monday luncheon and were glad her schedule permitted her to participate in the whole meeting. The Sunday evening reception and Monday dinner groups gave members time to network, reconnect, and make new friends. The Tuesday evening performance by the National Flamenco Institute of Santa Fe was a culturally rich experience for all as the dancers displayed their technical skills on the dance floor and educated the group about the rich history of this Spanish Gypsy art form. ➤
Thank you to the great group of volunteers who made the Santa Fe Spring Meeting so successful. Region VI program committee members included Susan Abeles, University of California, Los Angeles; Csilla Csaplár, Stanford University; John Ebenal, Central Washington University; Anne Hannigan, Stanford University; Rosemary Madnick, Charles Drew University; Patty McCabe, Stanford University; Joseph McNicholas, Loyola Marymount University; Ted Mordhorst, University of Washington; Bruce Morgan, University of California, Riverside; Deborah Motton, University of California, Merced; Michiko Pane, Stanford University; Aedra Reynolds, University of Oregon; Leisa Rodriguez, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii; Sinh Simmons, University of Washington; Kim Small, Washington State University; and Gale Yamada, University of Hawaii. Many others volunteered time to assemble packets, staff the registration desk, help administer evaluations, and assist with the numerous other tasks that are essential to a successful program. It was a privilege to work with each of you.

Region VI awarded four travel awards for the 2009 Spring Meeting. Congratulations to Jill Klein, University of Washington; Suzanne Sutton, University of California, San Francisco; and Kelly Hayton and Cara Egan-Williams, both from University of California, Santa Barbara. Thank you to Awards Committee members Ann Pollack, University of California, Los Angeles; Dan Nordquist, Washington State University; Kevin Stewart, University of California, Santa Barbara; Vincent Oragwam, California State University, Bakersfield; and Csilla Csaplár, Stanford University for your efforts.

Given the current economic situation, Region VI and VII leaders decided to change the 2010 Spring Meeting from Hawaii to California. Next year’s meeting will be April 17-22 in Newport Beach, California, at the Marriott Newport Beach Hotel. Thank you to Region VI members Sinh Simmons, University of Washington; Maggie Griscavage, University of Alaska, Fairbanks; Csilla Csaplár, Stanford University; Bruce Morgan, University of California, Riverside and Samantha Westcott, California Institute of Technology who have been very busy vetting proposals and making site visits.

In the months ahead Region VI will be gearing up for its 2009 election for Chair-elect, Treasurer-elect, Secretary-elect, and Regional Advisory Committee member positions for terms to begin 1/1/2010. The Nominating Committee (Ted Mordhorst, University of Washington; Katherine Ho, Stanford University; and Richard Seligman, California Institute of Technology) will soon begin soliciting nominations for these positions. If you are interested in any of these positions, or if you would like to nominate anyone, please contact Ted, Katherine or Dick. Their contact information is on the Region VI website at http://www.ogrds.wsu.edu/r6ncura/officers.asp in the Nominating Committee section.

Julie Guggino is Chair of Region VI and serves as Research and Sponsored Programs Administrator for Central Washington University.

REGION VII

Rocky Mountain

Although current economic conditions across the country may have prevented many of our Region VI and VII members from participating in our Spring Meeting in Santa Fe this year, the economy didn’t dampen the spirits of those in attendance! Approximately 170 individuals enjoyed an excellent program coordinated by my Co-Chair, Julie Guggino from Region VI. I would like to thank all Program Committee members who spent many hours locating engaging and knowledgeable speakers who informed and energized everyone present. Program committee members from Region VII included: Ralph Brown, Colorado School of Mines; Brian Christian, University of New Mexico; Randy Draper, University of Colorado at Boulder; Tim Edwards, University of Montana; Winnie Ennenga, Northern Arizona University; Kate Green, University of New Mexico; Jackie Hinton, University of Utah; Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State University; Christine Pacheco, University of New Mexico; Ellen Thompson, Lewis-Clark State College; and Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico. We not only learned a great deal, but enjoyed terrific networking opportunities and the artistic creativity of the dancers from the National Institute of the Flamenco.

I’d like to say a special “thank you” to Denise Wallen for securing our keynote speaker, Dr. Robert Waide. Dr. Waide’s presentation, “In It for the Long Haul: Results from the First 30 Years of the Long Term Ecological Research (LTER) Network,” was a perfect kickoff for an exceptional meeting. Session presentations will be posted to the Regional web site soon. Please check them out at: http://www.ogrds.wsu.edu/r6ncura/.

Plans are underway for our April 2010 joint meeting to be held in the Los Angeles area. A big “thank you” to Csilla Csaplar who is finalizing contract negotiations. Co-Chairs, Deb Murphy, Region VII and Sinh Simmons, Region VI, will be calling on our membership once again to volunteer their time, energy, and talent. Please consider sharing your expertise! Watch for additional information coming soon!

In the next few months you will have an opportunity to nominate colleagues for regional and national offices and for national awards. Consider getting involved in an organization that has given so much to each of us – and – thank those, through awards, who have served us over the years.

My sincere thanks to all of you who are working hard on behalf of our Region. If you have any questions about regional issues, please feel free to contact me, (208)282-2592 or horrdian@isu.edu.

Dianne Horrocks is the Chair of Region VII and serves as the Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at Idaho State University.
The National Institutes of Health issued its NIH Award Terms and Additional Information for Recipients Receiving Recovery Act Grant Funding (NOT-OD-09-080) in early April. With the addition of special award number identifiers – an additional last character, a “Z” – and the creation of special separate “P” accounts for grantees receiving ARRA funds for individual draw-downs of funds and tracking, these awards will require significant changes in institution’s business practices.

NIH’s reporting requirements are not unique. The data elements are outlined in the Recovery Act itself. Quarterly reports on each separate Recovery Act award and sub-award using the new elements will require the design of new tracking and monitoring systems. In addition to predictable data – amount of the award, expenditures and obligations – the expenditures must be linked to project activities and an evaluation of the completion status. As expected, the report will require an estimate of the jobs created and/or retained and detailed information on subrecipients. The information on subrecipients includes the data required for compliance with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-282).

Through the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) council, the government announced the reporting guidelines (for contracts under the FARs, an interim rule effective March 31, 2009; for grants and other financial assistance, as data elements issued by OMB to be implemented by granting agencies). And on April 3, 2009, OMB issued Updated Implementing Guidance for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for the agencies. This Guidance will likely continue to be refined and clarified as funds are awarded and expended.

As institutions organized to take advantage of the Recovery Act opportunities, research administrators became faint-hearted when confronted with the need to use Grants.gov for these new FOAs. Grants.gov faced significant performance challenges as the weight of NIH submissions clogged the system in February and March. Washington-based associations including the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) began contacting OMB, Washington-based associations including the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) began contacting OMB, Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) as the Grants.gov program manager, members of the Grants Executive Board and the Grants Policy Committee to raise concerns about Grants.gov. As the breadth of the problem became known to OMB, on March 9, 2009, Peter Orszag, OMB Director, directed HHS and the General Services Administration to initiate immediate improvements designed to accommodate the anticipated increased volume of Recovery Act-related applications. In addition, Orszag instructed all Federal grant-making agencies to immediately identify alternative methods for accepting grant applications to reduce demand on Grants.gov. By April 3, 2009, OMB announced that OMB and HHS “are working to ensure that the necessary funds are in place to increase storage and processing capacity and purchase new hardware and software to support Grants.gov.” And HHS committed itself to lead a government-wide effort to develop a longer-term plan for the next generation of Grants.gov. Within days of this announcement, those agencies with stand-alone grants submission systems, e.g., NASA, began announcing that submissions should be made exclusively through the agency systems.

In the midst of the euphoria and angst over the Recovery Act, President Obama signed an Executive Order removing the limitations on stem cell research and directing NIH to issue new guidance for stem cell research within 120 days of the order (approximately July 9, 2009). On the same day, March 9, 2009, President Obama signed a Memorandum on Scientific Integrity. He assigned John Holdren, Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), the responsibility of ensuring the highest level of integrity in all aspects of the executive branch’s involvement with scientific and technological issues. Within 120 days, Holdren must develop a strategy for ensuring that the selection of scientists and technology professionals for science and technology positions in the executive branch is based on those individuals’ scientific and technological knowledge, credentials, and experience. In addition to getting the best people for the jobs, agencies must use peer-reviewed science and technology as the basis for policies. Finally, agencies must have appropriate rules and procedures to ensure the integrity of the scientific process within the agency, including whistleblower protection. This memorandum on Scientific Integrity is an important statement from the President committing him and the Federal government to decision-making based on science not speculation.

It’s been said before and bears repeating – be careful what you ask for.

Carol Blum is Director, Research Compliance and Administration, Council on Governmental Relations.

Call for Traveling Workshop Faculty

Are you a veteran research administrator who likes to teach? Do you enjoy sharing your knowledge and expertise with colleagues? Are you looking to give something back? The Professional Development Committee invites members to consider applying or nominating colleagues to serve as faculty for our traveling workshops. NCURA currently offers four traveling workshops.

✔ Departmental Research Administration
✔ Financial Research Administration
✔ Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration
✔ Sponsored Project Administration Level II

Faculty appointments are three year terms beginning January 2010. These prestigious positions include a required workshop observation and adult learning styles training this fall. An honorarium is provided for each workshop you teach. NCURA reimburses all travel costs. More details including the application/nomination and recommendation forms will be available in the upcoming call for faculty e-mail blast.
Reflections on a Career in Research Administration: It was Never Boring

by Mary Ellen Sheridan

We’re almost a decade into the 21st century and as I’m all too frequently reminded: This isn’t your parent’s era of research administration. Have the people and tools changed so dramatically that the lessons of the past have little relevance today? As all experienced research administrators know, the likely answer is “It all depends.”

In the Fall of 1974, I began in research administration with a temporary position in what was called Sponsored Programs Development; the emphasis was on locating funding opportunities and communicating that information to the faculty through a monthly hardcopy newsletter. Talk about inefficient! Everyday I perused the Commerce Business Daily and the Federal Register for R&D opportunities and new regulations that might impact universities and the conduct of research. Some of the opportunities were quite enlightening – from the esoteric (NIH looking for a contractor to maintain a colony of armadillos infected with leprosy) to the mundane (a contractor to paint the Federal prisons or supply huge amounts of mustard and ketchup to military bases). I scanned reams of paper announcements from NGOs and leafed through newsletters and sponsor publications that promised to find funding opportunities and provide “insider” tips on writing proposals and getting funded. No on-line searches, no Research.gov Find, and no Google to uncover that new foundation or company a PI wants to apply to. Today, the way we search for new information, stay current with sponsors and funding opportunities and check out FAR language is at our fingertips, not on a bookshelf or a binder.

Digital technology - we can’t live without it but do we live with it?

Do you remember when there wasn’t a single PC or Mac in research administration? For practical purposes, that computer on your desk is your IN and OUT boxes. Fewer and fewer proposals get submitted through hard copy; negotiations are taking place through email and award notices arrive electronically. How much of the time you spend on the phone is spent listening to voice messages left by people who want to know if you’ve received the fax or the email they just sent? Digital tools, including cell phones and Blackberries, have accelerated expectations as fast as they have streamlined administrative processes. Communication through digital devices does speed things up, providing avenues for quick problem solving, and sharing of critical information. Call me old school, but I’m not ready to abandon face to face meetings and the “pick up the phone and talk it over” technique.

While digital technology is undoubtedly the ubiquitous tool for research administration today, there are enormous differences today in what research administrators do and where research administration is conducted compared to those by-gone days. Now that “expanded authorities” are incorporated within A-110, the older generation of research administrators can look back, with no regret, on huge amounts of time and trees writing requests to federal agencies asking for permission to do reasonable things, pre-award costs, roll-over of funds from one year of a grant to the next and a no-cost extension. These requests were approved virtually 100% of the time by the agency. Modest changes in the budget line items of research grants took another letter - PI through campus channels to central office – to administrative point of contact at sponsor to program officer – and then all the steps in reverse on the return trip with the inevitable approval. Delegating reasonable budget flexibility and routine administrative management to Federal grantee institutions was a huge step in facilitating research administration and making researchers more productive. For most of our decentralized institutional structures this made local administrative staff the “deputized posse.” In the old days the NCURA national meeting was generally a gathering of directors and senior staff of pre-award and post-award central
The regulations governing the use of human subjects in research were just being issued. Although some institutions had voluntarily formed Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) earlier, a regulatory framework, expressed in the form of an “Assurance” of compliance with Federal regulations, for the review and approval of the conduct of research was established. Within a few years, the use of animals in research was also regulated through a review and approval process and another “Assurance” document. Next, recombinant DNA techniques were discovered and another institutional oversight committee was required. In the last twenty years plus, regulations that govern technology transfer, scientific misconduct and financial conflict of interest have been promulgated. In each regulated activity, the Federal government is requiring institutions to allocate resources to assure that research investigators conduct their research programs and apply the results of their research in compliance with Federal expectations. The new economic stimulus package includes welcomed R&D funds but also comes burdened with increased accounting and reporting requirements. It will cost institutions more to manage these new funds. The regulatory environment shows no sign of diminishing or even decelerating in the 21st century.

The best memories of a career in research administration are the people. Sure, there were occasionally problems and disappointments but there was incredible good humor, respect, accomplishment and (yes!) fun.

Mary Ellen Sheridan has been an NCURA member since 1976. She served as NCURA President in 1980 and was the recipient of the 2006 NCURA Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration.
The Impact of Medicare on Clinical Trials – Points to Ponder

by Lisa R. Pitler

I t has been nine years since the implementation of Medicare’s National Coverage Determination for Routine Costs in Clinical trials, known as the Clinical Trial Policy (CTP). On June 7, 2000 President Clinton issued an executive memorandum directing the Secretary of the Health and Human Services to “explicitly authorize [Medicare] payment for routine patient care costs and costs due to complications associated with clinical trials” (Medicare Clinical Trial Policy (CTP), Pub. 100-3, Transmittal: 74, September 7, 2007). The statute allows Medicare funds to cover routine costs associated with a clinical trial. However, Medicare will not pay for the investigational items or services (unless it is covered outside a clinical trial), activities associated with research and data collection, and items or services provided by the Sponsor.

In response to this directive, on September 19, 2000 the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) implemented the initial Clinical Trial Policy through the National Coverage Determination (NCD) process. The intent of this statute was to encourage Medicare beneficiaries to access and participate in clinical trials. While the intent was admirable, the actual implementation of this statute, along with billing for items or services provided in the context of a clinical trial provided many challenges to the research community. In an effort to clarify the NCD, CMS re-reviewed the NCD and in July 2007 issued a final decision memorandum leaving the initial NCD intact with a minor clarification, which did not ameliorate the challenges. For additional information on the history of this NCD, please see to http://www.cms.hhs.gov/. Some of these challenges could easily place an institution at compliance risk.

Billing errors such as “double dipping,” billing Medicare or other third party payors for items and services provided by the Sponsor could happen easily if systems of internal control are not in place. Additionally, billing for an item or service that is not covered by Medicare has the potential of triggering the False Claim Act and insurance fraud. If not addressed, these errors or flaws in the billing processes for clinical trials can create financial burdens and also significantly impact an institution’s reputation and ability to conduct research.

Therefore, understanding billing processes are an essential component of research administration. Understanding your institution’s strengths and weaknesses pertaining to current billing processes for clinical trials (both drug and device trials) is a good place to start. Points to consider when developing and/or reviewing your billing process include the ability to identify research subjects at the point of entry into your organization’s database, distinguishing the provision of research care from non-research care, determining billing for inpatient care and outpatient care, and the methods used by ancillary departments to capture a bill for care rendered and revenue flows. Essential factors to consider when building a compliant and effective billing program include open communication with stake holders, fostering a relationship with one’s fiscal intermediary (for hospital services the fiscal intermediary administers Medicare Part A) and the local Medicare carrier administers Medicare Part B (professional component) and education of stakeholders and end users. Ideally, a compliant and effective billing process should be instituted before errors occur; in reality, however, many sites are not aware of issues until there is a billing error. Finally, there is no turn key program that can be used by each institution, as institutions are unique in their needs and culture.

A Methodology to work the CTP: Coverage Analysis

So exactly what is coverage analysis and what does coverage analysis have to do with Medicare and Clinical Trials? What are the benefits of a coverage analysis? A coverage analysis is an in-depth review of the protocol, informed consent, sponsor’s proposed budget and contract. The coverage analysis outlines all items and services required to conduct a research project. It is also an analysis of the Medicare rules in the context of a specific clinical trial whether it is a drug or device study (each has different Medicare rules). For further information pertaining to Medicare rules, please see http://www.cms.hhs.gov/.

The CTP and the “coverage analysis” process are hot topics of discussion at many research administration meetings. Frequently, the take home message from these discussions imply that the conduct of a coverage analysis will automatically ensure proper billing for clinical trials and cure any issues associated with billing systems and processes. However, if such a document exists and is not followed you might put your institution at further risk. Unfortunately, a coverage analysis is only one step in the process.

The coverage analysis is a consistent methodology that is auditable, can be used as a billing template to prevent billing errors, a template to develop and negotiate a study budget, determine internal costs to conduct a particular study, prevent financial surprises during a study, and can be used as a guide to write the financial section in the informed consent. The coverage analysis process can also be used to map out an institution’s billing program to identify challenges and opportunities.
There are three components of a coverage analysis: Regulatory Analysis, Development of a billing grid with a review of Medicare rules including National Coverage Determinations (NCDs) and Local Coverage Determinations (LCDs), and the Synchronization process. To begin a coverage analysis, you need the protocol, informed consent, contract, draft budget and documentation to support routine care. This review is the first step to ensure continuity in all the documents associated with the research project.

**Regulatory Analysis**

In order for a clinical trial to be considered for Medicare reimbursement under the CTP, the study must be a qualifying clinical trial (QCT). The QCT analysis is a two prong analysis in which the following three requirements must occur:

1. The trial must be an evaluation of an item or service that falls within a Medicare benefit category and is not statutorily excluded from coverage.
2. The trial must also have the intent to cure or treat a medical condition, known as therapeutic intent.
3. The trial must enroll subjects with a diagnosis of disease. Additionally, a trial funded by certain governmental agencies, has an investigational new drug application (IND) or is exempt from having an IND and meets the other three requirements, is considered a QCT to receive Medicare coverage.

**Application**

If one looks at the phases of clinical trial design and the intent or goal, a Phase I clinical trial is designed to look at the toxicity of a new agent. It is not solely designed to determine if the agent works in a particular disease. Therefore, under the QCT analysis, a Phase I trial would not meet the requirements to bill Medicare. (For a review of phase of clinical trials, please see http://www.fda.gov/cder/handbook/.)

**Coverage Analysis or Synthesis of the Medicare Rules**

Recreating the schedule of events in a grid format is a nice visualization of the study related activities and is a tool to assist with delineating the party responsible for funding the items and services related to the clinical trial. Questions to ask in determining who will pay for the item and services related to a research project include:

- What has the Sponsor proposed to fund?
- What is the investigational item or service?
- What is your actual cost to conduct a clinical trial?
- What items and services are routine (conventional care) and what are research?
- What items and services can or cannot be billed to Medicare?

Application

Use the coverage analysis to bill for items and services related to the project and to follow the bills and payments to ascertain the appropriate funds are being used. You also need to understand the various milestone payments from Sponsors and determine that funds are captured.

Billing for clinical trials under the CTP is complex and provides challenges. However, once the systems are put into place they can assist with audits and identify any errors. While this article is a review of the CTP and a methodology that can be used to build a compliant and effective billing process for clinical trials, it is important to understand this is just one component. The key is to integrate this or any new process into existing organizational systems.

Lisa R. Pitler is Senior Director, Research & Clinical Trials Administration Office, Rush University Medical Center, and a partner with Aberdeen Consultants in Healthcare, Ltd., Oak Park, IL.
NSF To Implement New Responsible Conduct of Research Requirement  
by Naomi Schrag

...the proposing institution “must certify that it has a plan to provide appropriate training and oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research to undergraduates, graduate students and postdoctoral researchers who will be supported by NSF to conduct research.”

NSF will not require institutions to include training plans in proposals submitted. However, such plans are subject to review upon request. Finally, NSF stated that it would modify its standard award conditions to “clearly stipulate that institutions are responsible for verifying that undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers supported by NSF to conduct research have received RCR training.”

NSF’s approach is very different from NIH’s. As many of us are well aware, in the 1990s, NIH implemented an RCR training requirement for individuals funded by National Research and Service Awards. In its regulations, NIH stated that although it would not establish specific curriculum or format requirements, programs were “strongly encouraged to consider instruction in the following areas: conflict of interest, responsible authorship, policies for handling misconduct, policies regarding the use of human and animal subjects, and data management.” (Reminder and Update: Requirement For Instruction In The Responsible Conduct Of Research In National Research Service Award Institutional Training Grants NIH Guide, Volume 21, Number 43, November 27, 1992) The Office of Research Integrity later specified nine recommended topics of instruction:

- 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
- Collaborative Science

NSF is taking a different tack. It is requiring institutions to establish an RCR training plan and to verify that those required to complete the training have done so. But NSF is giving institutions tremendous flexibility to develop training programs individually and to customize them as appropriate. This makes sense. NSF recognizes that different institutions may choose different approaches, which may vary depending on the audience, discipline, resources available, and of course the institutional culture.

So what to consider as we think about how we would implement such a program? The answers depend on who you ask. A common faculty response is to grumble about the ever-increasing regulatory burden on research and observe that “if students didn’t learn to do the right thing at home, it’s too late now.” Others welcome the opportunity to provide the guidance they wished they’d had as young researchers.

Of course a major concern of faculty and students is, how much time will this take? And will the training be worth the time?

From a compliance perspective, the hallmark goals for any training requirement are: have the right content, make it easy to complete and easy to verify completion. The obvious choice is an online course. What better mechanism to deliver training to night-owl students, who can take the course at any time, work through the material at their own pace, and provide an electronic verification that the requirement has been completed?

The benefits of online programs are easy to list:

- They require few resources.
  - No need to worry about reserving classrooms
  - No need to hire (or persuade) instructors
  - “Off the shelf” courses come with ready-made content
- The instruction is consistent for all trainees
- Students can take the course when it is convenient for them
- Compliance is easy to verify and document
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Of course, the downsides are just as easy to enumerate:

• There is no opportunity for discussion or questions
• Students do not have the opportunity to read an on-line course
• An “off the shelf” course lacks information about institution-specific policies and resources.

Robert Klitzman, a bioethicist and Associate Professor of Clinical Psychiatry at the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Mailman School of Public Health, teaches a course on RCR to basic science, engineering, and social science students at Columbia. He summarized the pedagogical advantages of a classroom course by commenting, “I think that didactically, in-person classroom courses offer many advantages. As a teacher, I can immediately see, from students’ verbal and non-verbal responses, what points they readily grasp vs. have trouble understanding or appreciating.”

On the other hand, Daniel Vasgird, a founding member of the Association of Practical and Professional Ethics RCR Education Committee (RCREC) and a member of the Executive Advisory Committee of the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative, pointed out that “web-based RCR training can be a crucial element in a comprehensive research integrity initiative. It is an excellent way to review historical evolution and introduce vital conceptual elements so that valuable in-person training time is not wasted. The important thing to keep in mind however is that the development of cultural research integrity is complex and needs face to face sessions to allow personal perceptions and potential implications to satisfactorily play themselves out.”

Last summer, NSF sponsored a conference at the National Academy of Engineering entitled “Workshop on Ethics Education and Scientific and Engineering Research” that looked at some of these issues. The workshop included presentations of a variety of RCR training models, ranging from a Clemson College for-credit “professional development” course for all graduate students; one-time half-day workshops; a Dartmouth classroom program for all engineering students that starts at orientation and continuing throughout the year; a variety of on-line training programs; and PI-led discussions.

In addition to discussions of specific programs, the conference also covered research on what makes RCR programs work. One presentation, by Michael D. Mumford and Alison L. Antes of the University of Oklahoma, summarized characteristics of effective RCR programs as courses that:

• Provide cases
• Provide strategies for working through problems
• Use multiple activities throughout training
• Encourage participant interaction
• Conduct ethics training outside normal coursework

Ineffective programs were described as programs that:

• Provide low interaction (e.g., online training)
• Cover guidelines only
• Use lecture style predominantly
• Provide ethics training within normal coursework

Finally, a presentation by Wendy Reed Williams, regarding RCR training for post docs, highlighted the importance of including faculty and institutional RCR champions in the delivery of training. This is, of course, an important point. For in-person training, whom you select to teach may even communicate your institution’s commitment (or lack thereof) to the program. As Jonathan Kimmelman, a bioethicist at McGill University, told me, “In my experience, these programs tend to be led by junior faculty who “can’t say no” and emeritus faculty who have no active grants. That doesn’t send the clearest message that RCR training is a priority.”

Ultimately, the ideal program may be some combination of formats, with a mandatory on-line compliance program supplemented by structured discussions in the lab, department, school, or campus-wide. The good news is, there are resources available (see the side bar). And this is an opportunity to start a conversation within our institutions about how to educate young scientists so that they will be able to answer the challenges that will only get more complex as the research enterprise continues to expand.

Naomi Schrag is the Associate Vice President for Research Compliance in the Office of the Executive Vice President for Research at Columbia University.
President Obama’s economic stimulus plan has created a surge of federal grant funding opportunities for universities across the nation. These dollars do not arrive without strings attached, however; the federal government has mandated that strict requirements be observed following any outlay of stimulus funds. While the requirements are extensive, research and educational institutions should not allow this to become a barrier to entry. Universities should brush up on these new procedures now in order to prevent being caught off-guard later on.

A Few First Steps
• Visit Recovery.gov. This website acts as a portal for all activities related to Recovery Act funding. By entering an email address and zip code into the fields on the top-right corner of the website, one can sign up for updates related to Recovery Act funding, activities, allocations and requirements.

Web Site Requirements for Agencies Receiving Funding
Every agency receiving funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act must dedicate a page of its primary website to its activities related to this funding. No need for a new website; simply include a link, prominently displayed, titled “[Your Agency Name Here] Information Related to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.”
• This link should navigate to a new page dedicated solely to the agency’s Recovery Act funding and activities. For the sake of consistency, agencies are asked to use the following four main headings:
  - First, quoted verbatim: “Overview of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act).” The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) was signed into law by President Obama on February 17th, 2009. It is an unprecedented effort to jumpstart our economy, create or save millions of jobs, and put a down payment on addressing long-neglected challenges so our country can thrive in the 21st century. The Act is an extraordinary response to a crisis unlike any since the Great Depression, and includes measures to modernize our nation’s infrastructure, enhance energy independence, expand educational opportunities, preserve and improve affordable health care, provide tax relief, and protect those in greatest need.”
  - Third, “Agency Plans and Reports.” Here, the agency must include all plans for federal dollars and reports on their usage, as required by the federal government. The requirements for these reports will be outlined in the next section of this article.
  - Fourth, “Learn More About our Programs.” While this is a required section, there are no particular formatting requirements. The agency may include information on its strategic plan, upcoming projects, successes, etc.
• Additionally, this page must include: a link to Recovery.gov, a graphic for the Recovery Act, links to Grants.gov and FBO.gov, and a link to the agency IG (Inspector General) website.
• Web sites should be clear and user-friendly. Wording should be simple, links easy to find, and downloads in working order.

What Reporting is Required Under the Recovery Act?
There are eight different levels of reporting necessary to meet accountability and transparency objectives of the Recovery Act and this Guidance. The reporting requirements in this Guidance apply at the department or agency level, except those reporting requirements in Program-specific Recovery Act plans (refer to chart).

AS AN NCURA MEMBER BENEFIT, we are pleased to present a Podcast on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. “Preparing your Institution for Stimulus Funding: Part I” is presented to members, only, at no charge and can be found in the Neighborhood section of the NCURA website. We hope you will tune in to this inaugural podcast and learn more about the president’s stimulus package.

Moderator: David Richardson, Assistant Vice President for Research, The Pennsylvania State University; Panel: Denise J. Clark, Assistant Vice President for Research Administration and Advancement, University of Maryand at College Park; Anthony DeCrappeo, President, Council on Governmental Relations; Susan Sedwick, Associate Vice President For Research And Director; University of Texas at Austin; and Richard Seligman, Associate Vice President For Research Administration, California Institute of Technology.
Universities receiving economic stimulus funding are faced with challenges in supporting the submission and reporting requirements that come along with these special funds. Most universities, if not all of them, have struggled with limited personnel resources and training to keep up with the current federal reporting requirement demands. University administrations will need to take a closer look at the opportunities these funds will create, but also be cognizant of the resources being further compromised to support these opportunities at their universities.

Mario R. Medina, MPAcc, is Director of Business for the Institute of Economic Development, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTING REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Communications</td>
<td>Immediate/Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula block grant allocation reports</td>
<td>Immediate/Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial weekly reports to help populate early phases of Recovery.gov</td>
<td>3/3/09-5/12/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly financial reports</td>
<td>Starting 5/8/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award-level reporting consistent with what is currently required for USAspending.gov</td>
<td>Starting 5/5/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-wide Recovery Act plans</td>
<td>NLT 5/1/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-specific Recovery Act plans</td>
<td>NLT 5/5/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient reporting</td>
<td>Starting 7/10/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

CARLO ERACLEO is now Senior Financial Associate at Harvard Medical School, within the Department of Global Health and Social Medicine.

VIVIAN HOLMES is now Assistant Director for Sponsored Research at the Broad Institute.

RICHARD STEINER is now the Vice President for Research at Cleveland State University.

PEG VIGIOLTO will be moving to UNC Chapel Hill as Associate Vice Chancellor for Research.

PAM WHITLOCK will be retiring from her position as Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at University of North Carolina at Wilmington in June.
How can research managers become more aware of international activity in their field on a regular basis? In this article, the ACU’s Research Management Team describes the development of the world’s first global network in the field – and invites NCURA to join them.

Research managers increasingly need a global outlook. Over the past decade, research funding has become more competitive, project based and likely to involve international consortia. At the same time, the financial, legal and ethical environments in which projects take place has become increasingly complex. The need for a strong research management profession in all parts of the world, with a common understanding of such issues, has never been greater.

Until recently, no structure existed for individual research managers to interact with colleagues throughout the world. The research management programme of the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU), launched in April 2001, was an attempt to provide such a forum. Since that time, the programme has grown rapidly. It now welcomes participation not only from within the higher education sector, but also from independent research institutes, research sponsors and policy makers - in fact anyone who is concerned to ensure that university research is managed and utilised to maximum effect. It has also moved outside its traditional base in the Commonwealth, and is increasingly attracting members from other regions.

In recent years, the activity has evolved to form the Global Research Management Network (GRMN) which includes members from around 350 institutions in more than 40 countries. However, GRMN membership is open to everyone and non-ACU members may take out subscriptions to join. The goal of GRMN is to develop a global community that shares best practices in research management and benefits those from developed and developing countries alike. At present, 22% of members are from African institutions, 12% from the Americas, 23% from Asia, 15% from Australasia and 28% from Europe. The ACU also collaborates with the Association of Research Managers and Administrators UK (ARMA), the Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS), the Danish Association of Research Managers and Administrators (DARMA) and the Society of Research Administrators International (SRA), on the development of the network – and members of the above mentioned associations are entitled to subscribe to the GRMN at a reduced rate. GRMN members receive copies of Research Global magazine, the International Journal of Technology Management and Sustainable development, and regular email briefings. The GRMN website is at http://www.globalrmn.org/

The ACU’s research management programme has been active in raising awareness on University Research Management and has organised several events for this purpose including the 2002 Seminar on Managing University Research held in Goa, India, the 2005 seminar on the Demand for Research Management Support in African Universities, held in Cape Town, South Africa, and the next conference of the International Network of Research Management Societies which will be held in 2010. The programme also conducts benchmarking exercises and surveys to gauge ‘activity’ within the profession.

In addition, the ACU’s research management programme attracts external funding from donors such as the British Academy, The Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Department of Universities, Innovation and Skills (DUIS) UK. A few of our recent and ongoing projects are listed below:

The Carnegie Project to Strengthen Research Management in African Universities

The Carnegie Corporation of New York plays a significant role in strengthening research management - contracting the ACU to deliver specific projects in its member universities (Carnegie member universities are universities that have received sizeable grants from the Corporation for development programmes.). Carnegie-funded projects are often open to the wider ACU membership – with best practice, reports and lessons learned, being disseminated via the activities of the Global Research Management Network. The Carnegie Corporation recently awarded the ACU just over USD 500,000 to run a 3-year project developing research management in 5 institutions in four countries. This project, which runs from 2009-2011, will assist the universities in converting their awareness of research management issues into robust, sustainable structures, and in developing appropriate professional standards within the established structures. The participant institutions will also be partnered with ‘mentor’ universities from the economic north, who will assist in the development of specific proposals and provide guidance on identifying their institutional strengths and weaknesses.
The Establishment of Regional Research Management Associations

The ACU played a central role in the development of the regional research management associations for Southern and West Africa. The ACU and the Department for Foreign and International Development (DFID) UK supported a research management best practice workshop in Durban, South Africa in 2001. The workshop convened senior research management and university staff in Southern Africa and provided a forum for discussing the establishment of a research and innovation management association for the region. The Southern African Research and Innovation Management Association (SARIMA) was established the following year (2002).

The West African Research and Innovation Management Association (WARIMA) was set up in November 2006, at a meeting in Lagos of over twenty universities from five African countries. In March 2007, the Institute of Education, University of London, with the ACU and the Universities of Ibadan, Ghana and Sierra Leone, successfully obtained a grant from the DIUS, for a project to support the development of WARIMA in its first year. The one-year project, which was managed by the ACU, built on the work already started by the West African Universities in 2006 and: 1) supported three international meetings in West Africa; 2) provided resources and materials for the above mentioned meetings and for WARIMA members; and 3) covered the costs of the central office set-up and the office administration support.

Both WARIMA and SARIMA, like their northern equivalents, have been instrumental in developing the research management profession in their respective regions and have organised several conferences and training events since their inception.

Similar projects for the establishment of research management associations for Eastern Africa, India and the Caribbean are expected to take place soon.

The ACU Research Management Good Practice Index

The ACU’s experience in promoting and strengthening research management systems internationally, and significantly in Africa, led to its involvement in the Research Africa programme - a research funding and policy publication service tailored for African universities with emergent research management structures. The ACU’s principal role here was to design an extensive database of research management policies and procedures: in essence, an electronic library of good policy practices in the field. The purpose of the index is to provide a resource for the African research management community to study and compare different models of research management at policy level, to help emergent research management offices to design new procedures that might suit their particular needs.

Since the establishment of the index in 2006, over 135 universities and research institutes from around the world have contributed 1,400 policy documents to the library, providing models of intellectual property management, commercialisation, contract and grant management, research ethics, revenue sharing, and all aspects of pre-award and post-award research management. The good practice index is available online at http://acu.research-africa.net/acu/home.jsp, and the ACU continues to accept examples of good practice for inclusion in the index. Members of NGURA are welcome to contact us with any interest in contributing an example of good policy practice in the field.

Benchmarking and Surveys

The programme has undertaken three international surveys of research management and administration, the first two focusing on the development of structures and processes around the world, the most recent, in 2008, taking a closer look at research management staff, the skills they require, their career paths and what they think of their profession. This largely online survey attracted 400 responses from 24 countries. The results can be found at www.acu.ac.uk/researchmanagement.

The ACU’s international research management benchmarking programme, funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), brought
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The Global Research Management Network (GRMN) is managed by the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) and is dedicated to the development of international collaboration amongst the research management community. The network directly provides regular information, analysis and networking opportunities to individual practitioners and their institutions.

Network members receive Research Global magazine, the International Journal of Technology Management and Sustainable Development, regular emails, including a monthly international news briefing, and are kept informed of forthcoming international events and other opportunities. Each ACU member institution is entitled to one free individual subscription.

Subscription rates start at GBP 55 per annum for individual membership for those based at institutions in developing countries and for members of the collaborating organisations.

See www.globalrmn.org or email resman@acu.ac.uk for further details on the GRMN.

To get a free copy of the most recent issue of Research Global, email resman@acu.ac.uk.
The Economic Stimulus Package: Big Challenges for Small Institutions

by Jerry Pogatshnik

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) is the most significant expansion of sponsored research funding that has come along since the growth of the NIH budget. ARRA funding provides greater opportunities for smaller institutions; but there are challenges as well. Perhaps the biggest challenge is simply keeping track of the myriad of guidelines and programs implemented under the Act. In addition to regular announcements from nearly every federal agency, there are also state funding initiatives that have cropped up on several levels. Small offices with limited staff will have a hard time keeping track of these dizzying changes, and effectively communicating them to their faculty.

So what can small offices do to make sure they are able to take full advantage of the opportunities afforded by ARRA? Fortunately, most federal agencies have set up websites that are specifically dedicated to ARRA programs. These typically have URLs of www.yourfavoriteagencyhere.gov/recovery. Many of these are set up with automatic email or RSS feeds that can alert your office when programs are updated. One relatively easy way to assist your faculty is to compile a list of these websites on your sponsored programs home page. But given the ever-changing information posted on these websites, simply posting this information is not enough.

Effective communication is especially critical. Various professional agencies have put together webinars that highlight ARRA programs and many professional conferences are including special presentations on the stimulus package. A number of federal agencies have posted slide presentations with great advice on pursuing these funding opportunities. Webinars or downloaded slideshows can serve as foci for brown-bag luncheons or other activities that can be used to familiarize faculty with these programs and adopt strategies for pursuing funding. Special newsletters, regular email updates, and face-to-face meetings are great ways of getting out the message. Make extra efforts to contact your most active scholars and alert them to some of the new funding opportunities. Sponsored program staff may wish to actively pursue meetings with key departments and colleges, committees of departmental chairs, faculty senates and other appropriate constituencies.

It is also important to keep tabs on how agencies are treating their ARRA funds. For example, much of the NSF funding will go toward proposals already in the pipeline: proposals that had been favorably reviewed, but funding had not been sufficient to support these proposals. In these cases, submission of new proposals may not be the most effective strategy for obtaining additional support.

However, NSF has announced the launching of programs on Academic Research Infrastructure and the Science Masters program, with guidelines for these coming out in the weeks ahead. Sponsored programs offices may wish to learn more about these programs to see if they might lead to worthwhile opportunities. The Department of Education has a broad portfolio of funding opportunities linked to the ARRA. In addition to greater funding for their federal programs, the Department is also providing substantial funding to the states through the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund. Sponsored programs offices may wish to get in touch with state-level administrators to familiarize themselves with this program. Frequent contacts with program officers may bear particular fruit in our current environment.

This may be a good time to rekindle collaborative partnerships with larger institutions. Multi-institutional proposals, particularly among those with diverse missions, can broaden the impact of proposals in many areas and make them more attractive for funding. One benefit is that the larger institutions have greater capacity for meeting the short time frames associated with many of the ARRA programs. Collaborative arrangements will help you leverage your internal resources. Keep in mind that there is likely to be additional compliance burdens on subrecipients and subrecipient monitoring. Make sure collaborative partners know that you are prepared to assume the additional compliance requirements and will be responsive to their needs in the event that collaborative proposals are funded.

If the PUI listserv is any indication, there are a number of states that are trying to foster collaborative proposals among state institutions in targeted areas that would, hopefully, be more competitive for stimulus funding. Research administrators at PUs must work to identify relevant research on their campuses that can “plug in” to these collaborative projects. Nearly all of these programs have extraordinarily aggressive time frames that are required to meet the ARRA objectives of getting the funds quickly into the economy. These short timelines place significant hardships on smaller institutions, particularly at a point in the academic year where faculty are working toward the end of the term. Down the road, the additional requirements for reporting on “job creation” and financial reporting will place greater compliance burdens on sponsored programs staff that are already stretched thin.
In spite of the challenges, the ARRA program presents great opportunities for smaller institutions. Public and private colleges and universities are facing enormous budgetary pressures. The large influx of funding from competitive grant programs is a source that cannot be overlooked by campus presidents and college deans. Sponsored programs offices at smaller institutions must be prepared to capitalize on the greater visibility afforded to them by the heightened level of interest in competitive awards.

As always, NCURA is here to help. The NCURA Professional Development Committee is currently developing a podcast that will address many of the key questions and issues related to ARRA funding. Look for upcoming announcements from NCURA for more information about the program.

Jerry Pogatchnik is Dean of the Graduate School and Associate Vice President for Research, Eastern Kentucky University.

PUI

Will PUI's benefit from the Recovery Act? It is not clear whether Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (otherwise known as the Recovery Act). Looking through the various agency websites, it seems that much of the funding is earmarked for existing grantees. For instance, the National Endowment for the Arts will fund a number of competitive grants, but institutions must have received a grant in the last four years from NEA to be eligible. Many of the programs that NIH has announced are specifically for institutions that already receive NIH funding. One bright light is the new NIH initiative, Challenge Grants in Health and Science Research, which will provide two years of funding for "novel" research. The U.S. Department of Education seems to be targeting Pell grants and work study, although there should be an infusion of funding for the Teacher Quality Program. However, we can look to the states to provide more funding opportunities for education programs from their DoED allocations.

The National Science Foundation seems to have some good opportunities. For those institutions involved in K-12 education, the Math and Science Partnership program is a good prospect. And the Major Research Instrumentationprogram targets non-Ph.D. granting institutions as well as our larger sisters. NSF's programs will also be re-considering individual research proposals that were recommended for funding but did not result in awards due to budget constraints; program officers have already begun contacting some PIs at PUIs.

While there does appear to be some funding opportunities for PUIs, perhaps we should also consider developing partnerships with larger institutions who are eligible to receive Recovery Act funds. PUI's can benefit from collaborations with research intensive and local/state educational institutions which are poised to move forward with applications related to stimulus funding. Thinking "subaward" could be a good alternative for cashing in on this funding stream!

Sally Tremaine is Chair of the PUI Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Academic and Government Grants, Quinnipiac University.

INTERNATIONAL corner
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together senior staff from 15 HEIs in Australia, Canada, China, India, Japan, New Zealand, South Africa, the UK and the US in a detailed examination of RM practice generating 87 good practice statements relating to pre-award and post-award activities.

The report can be found at:
http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Pubs/RD/reports/
2006/rd11_06/or www.acu.ac.uk/
researchmanagement.

The International Network of Research Management Societies

The ACU is one of the founding members of the International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS). INORMS' establishment, in 2001, reflected both the proliferation of national and regional research management organisations throughout the world, and the clear need for international collaboration and common standards in the global market for university research.

INORMS holds a congress every two years - the first one was held in Australia in 2006 and the second in the UK, in 2008. The next INORMS congress will be jointly hosted by SARIMA and the ACU, and will take place in Cape Town, South Africa in 2010. INORMS 2010 will provide an opportunity to reflect on the status of our profession as a whole, benchmark the standards of countries throughout the world and, uniquely, encourage the progress of research management within Africa. The organisers are also taking advantage of the location to stage a funders forum, drawing together leading funding bodies of research from throughout the world. Further details of the congress will be available shortly on the SARIMA website www.sarima.org and the ACU website www.acu.ac.uk.

Taken together, the global network provides an exciting opportunity for progressive research managers not only to compare their own practice with those elsewhere, but to play a part in the building of a global research management profession. We’d welcome your participation.

For further information on the ACU’s Research Management Programme, contact the research management team at resman@acu.ac.uk or visit our website at www.acu.ac.uk/researchmanagement.

This article was written by the ACU Research Management Team, consisting of John Kirkland, Deputy Secretary-General; Julie Stackhouse, Senior Programme Officer; Liam Roberts, Programme Officer; and, Patrice Ajai-Ajagbe, Programme Officer).
Training and Mentoring Post-docs
by David Morton

To maintain the U.S.’s position as a world leader in science and engineering research, it is essential that the next generation of America’s research leaders receive outstanding training and mentoring. In addition to their education at the undergraduate and graduate level, the top tier of American scientists has completed a number of years of additional research training following their PhD degrees. This post-doctoral training is a critical step in the process of becoming independent scientists. It is a period when scientists hone their research skills and ideally learn all the requirements for running a research laboratory. Data from the National Science Foundation (NSF) show that in 2006, 45% of the most recent recipients of U.S. doctoral degrees in science, engineering and health had completed or were participating in postdoctoral training. A recent Sigma Xi survey of current U.S. scientists holding post-doctoral appointments (postdocs) estimated that there are currently over 50,000 postdocs in the United States. The importance of postdocs to the U.S. research enterprise as a whole is underlined by the finding in 1999 that 43% of first authors of research articles ranked scientific publications in the world) were postdocs.

The availability of top quality postdoctoral training is essential to maintain the preeminent position of U.S. science research and in many fields, especially the life sciences, it is now mandatory to have several years of postdoctoral training before an individual is able to obtain an independent position in academia or industry. In 2000 the National Academy of Sciences published a report based on surveys of postdocs, advisers and administrators that indicated that “the employment conditions for postdocs, especially in universities, need to be significantly improved if the United States is to develop the human capital needed to assure a healthy research enterprise and global leadership in science and technology.” Given the importance of postdocs, it is then surprising that the institutional status of postdocs is often poorly defined. When I first began my postdoc in the early 1980s and went to the human resources department of the university where I was studying, they couldn’t classify me. I wasn’t a student or faculty member, so what was I? I think the situation has improved since then. Most universities now have a clear category for postdocs. Postdocs are broadly defined across institutions in the U.S. as persons who hold temporary appointments, usually in a university, industry or government, for the purpose of gaining additional education and training in research.

What are the needs of postdocs and how do they differ from graduate students? A postdoctoral appointment is like an apprenticeship and is thus a one-on-one relationship with the head of the lab who has hired the individual. The focus for most graduate students is primarily one of education. They learn detailed knowledge of their chosen area and how to form and test a hypothesis. In addition, they are likely to gain specific research skills and are trained in writing and presenting scientific results. Many will also have gained experience in teaching undergraduate students. Graduate students are overseen by a graduate program that has been put together and developed by a large group of faculty and the individual student will also get advice and guidance not only from their thesis advisor, but also usually from a small committee of faculty who will monitor their progress and advise them on future career choices. In addition, the university has well developed policies and guidelines for graduate student appointments, salaries and benefits.

The most important component of a postdoc’s training is the research that they are carrying out. In many ways, the first few years of a postdoctoral appointment should be the most exhilarating and satisfying period of a scientist’s career. They know how to plan and carry out experiments. They’ve chosen their research area based on what most excites them and initially they have no other responsibilities other than their science – which is the reason they embarked on this career in the first place. The lab head who hires them is responsible for almost all of the postdoctoral research training and advising. In larger laboratories there may be other postdocs and senior graduate students who can share ideas and advice, but frequently there will just be a single senior scientist (the lab head) who can provide advice and guidance. This makes this one-on-one relationship extremely important for a successful postdoctoral experience. Although there are many horror stories of incompatibilities between postdocs and their advisers, it is encouraging that in the 2005 Sigma Xi postdoc survey most respondents gave high marks to their advisers on a variety of attributes, suggesting that this part of the system is working well.

Running an independent research laboratory requires many more skills than just the ability to carry out research. Postdocs fortunate enough to be recruited to a tenure-track faculty position will have to become rapidly proficient in a wide variety of other skills for which they likely have no formal training. These necessary skills include expanding a research project into a research program, teaching, writing grants, reviewing grants and manuscripts, running a lab, managing a budget and laboratory personnel.
The Sigma Xi postdoc survey identified 4 particular areas of training: writing skills, teaching skills, negotiating skills and group or lab management. More than 90% of the respondents felt that they received no training or only informal or on-the-job training as opposed to the availability of a workshop or formal coursework. In another important area, proposal writing, only 17% reported the availability of a workshop or formal coursework. Additional skills will be required for postdocs who move into an industrial setting with the added problem that their adviser likely has no experience in industry and is unlikely to be able to offer advice on the types of skills that need to be developed to successfully transition into the private sector.

In 2000 the National Academy of Sciences released the results of their study aimed at enhancing the postdoctoral experience in U.S. universities. They identified ten key points that need to be accomplished to provide better training and mentoring environment for postdocs. These are shown in the box below. To this list I would add two additional items. First, the university should provide help and advice for foreign postdocs on visa and tax issues. Foreign nationals make up a large proportion of the postdoc population in the United States. In the Sigma Xi survey, 54% of those surveyed held a temporary U.S. visa and their data suggest that this was an under-representation of the number of postdocs who were non-U.S. citizens or permanent residents. The second area that I feel is particularly lacking for postdocs in academic settings is the availability of guidance and skill sets for moving into an industrial setting. This is not particularly surprising as most faculty have little experience with industry and even have a historical antagonism towards research carried out in the private sector. It is particularly important for postdocs to receive training suitable to enter industry as it is becoming more and more competitive to obtain tenure track positions at universities.

For the continued vitality of scientific research in this country it is essential to provide postdocs with the best opportunity to succeed when they transition into independent positions. The skills listed above are ideal subjects, which can be taught in university courses or workshops. University research administrators should be strongly encouraged to develop and expand such offerings if they are not currently available at their institution. Along with a postdoc’s personal drive and self-motivation, it is critical that the institutions themselves recognize the importance of postdocs and provide the resources for their advancement. A brief survey of major research universities reveals that most have postdoctoral associations or offices that provide information, resources and guidance to postdocs. In addition, there are national organizations that can provide additional advice (http://www.nationalpostdoc.org). While it seems that the call from the National Academy has to a large extent been heeded, there are still many ways that members of this invaluable human resource can be given a helping hand to fully realize their potential.

TEN ACTION POINTS

The National Academy of Sciences identified the following 10 items in their 2000 study that were needed to enhance the postdoctoral experience.

1. Award institutional recognition, status, and compensation commensurate with the contributions of postdocs to the research enterprise.

2. Develop distinct policies and standards for postdocs, modeled on those available for graduate students and faculty.

3. Develop mechanisms for frequent and regular communication between postdocs and their advisers, institutions, funding organizations, and disciplinary societies.

4. Monitor and provide formal evaluations (at least annually) of the performance of postdocs.

5. Ensure that all postdocs have access to health insurance, regardless of funding source, and to institutional services.

6. Set limits for total time of a postdoc appointment (of approximately five years, summing time at all institutions), with clearly described exceptions as appropriate.

7. Invite the participation of postdocs when creating standards, definitions, and conditions for appointments.

8. Provide substantive career guidance to improve postdocs’ ability to prepare for regular employment.

9. Improve the quality of data both for postdoctoral working conditions and for the population of postdocs in relation to employment prospects in research.

10. Take steps to improve the transition of postdocs to regular career positions.

David B. Morton is a Professor in the Department of Integrative Biosciences, Oregon Health & Science University.
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“We cannot safely assume that other people’s minds work on the same principles as our own.”

- Isabel Briggs Myers

With research administration changing at such a rapid pace, promoting effective work relationships is essential to our interpersonal and organizational success. By gaining awareness and appreciation of the different ways you and your colleagues prefer to process and act on information within your environment, you can learn to work more effectively and become a better leader. In his book, Type Talk at Work, author Otto Kroeger writes about the importance of understanding those around us so that we may connect quickly to solve the problems at hand. He states that “success at any level requires that you must rely heavily on others and be tuned in to each individual’s needs, preferences, and styles.”

One tool that can help research administrators acquire such awareness and appreciation of others is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute (LDI) uses this tool to help research administrators learn to understand why people act or say the things they do and, as a result, interact more effectively with faculty and colleagues in their institutions and communities. After completing the assessment online as a homework assignment, LDI students share their results and learn how the knowledge of others’ styles can make a difference in their work. The MBTI is one of the most commonly used assessment tools today. Developed over 60 years ago by Isabel Briggs Myers and her mother, Katherine Cook Briggs, the MBTI is based on psychologist Carl Jung’s theory of personality types. The tool provides a framework for understanding why people behave and think the way they do. The MBTI indicates one’s natural preferences along four scales:
• Extraversion or Introversion: Whether you get your energy from the world of people and things (E) or from the reflective inner world of images and ideas (I)

• Sensing or Intuiting: Taking in information by attending to facts, details and the present (S) or by attending to patterns, themes, possibilities and the future (N).

• Thinking or Feeling: Making decisions by objective, facts-based analysis (T) or by subjective, values-based analysis (F)

• Judging or Perceiving: Dealing with the outside world by being decisive, planned and orderly (J) or by being more flexible, open and spontaneous (P).

Each of these four dimensions is made up of a pair of opposite preferences or “dichotomies,” all of which are valuable and are used by everyone at least some of the time. This results in sixteen possible psychological types, each having different strengths and areas of growth. However, Myers and Briggs theorized that individuals naturally prefer one dichotomy, using it more than the other.

It is important to note that there is no “right” or “wrong” personality type; there are only differences. Individuals are unique, each with their own combination of personality preferences, interests, values, talents and skills. Kroeger teaches people to apply the knowledge from the MBTI model to celebrate these differences and use them constructively rather than to create conflict. It helps us understand that we all have different preferences and ways of thinking, thus enabling us to objectively view actions that we might previously have taken personally.

Once the MBTI is administered and you understand and confirm your four-letter ‘type’ (ISTJ, ESFP, etc.) you can appreciate your innate strengths and recognize possible weaknesses or blind spots. Knowing your MBTI profile allows you to seek opportunities that capitalize on your strengths and develop skills in your areas of growth.

Furthermore, the MBTI can help you gain a perspective on others’ personality types and what that means for your effectiveness, and theirs, and your interactions with each other. For example, an Introvert who prefers to do things independently, think things through before speaking, and work quietly, might be interested in knowing that her extroverted colleagues could be misinterpreting her as aloof and uninterested.

By improving our understanding of the needs and behavioral preferences of the people around us, we can learn to promote collaboration and reduce conflict by defining problems in typological terms rather than interpersonal ones. Anita Mills, a 2007 LDI graduate and Associate Director of Research Administration Training at New York University, finds that this level of self-awareness has enabled her to create a productive workplace environment that allows conflicts to be dealt with more easily. Utilizing the MBTI has helped her to relax and have fun with individual differences, while at the same time continuing to move projects forward.

MBTI knowledge can also be used as a powerful team-building tool. It can help identify your team’s strengths as well as areas for growth, and assist you in developing a plan to further improve the interaction and, thus, the effectiveness of your team. Understanding individuals in your team whose preferred behaviors might be different from the others can improve your team’s overall effectiveness and productivity. According to Kroeger, preferred behaviors will emerge very early in a group’s formation and such behaviors will tend to support the typological needs and tendencies of the group members. He asserts that the goal for any successful group is not to change or neutralize individual members’ preferences, but to use this knowledge in an effort to maximize the effectiveness of the group.

An astute leader will utilize the group’s typological information to ascertain how decisions are made and what level of information is needed to make such decisions.

• First, by looking at the E/I distribution, the leader can identify what effect these differences will have on general interaction among the group members. When faced with a decision, Extraverts typically seek out guidance and support from others – they prefer to talk things through and use the energy they gain from others to help make their decision. Introverts, on the other hand, prefer to be alone so that they can process their thoughts – they tend to use introspection when making decisions.

• Second, by looking at the group’s S/N distribution, the leader can identify the group’s dominant need for receiving information, be it detail-oriented or big picture. Sensing people choose to rely on their five senses – they prefer to gather data and focus on the here and now. Conversely, Intuiting people trust their intuition – or “sixth sense” – and prefer to rely on themes, patterns, hunches and impressions in order to understand things or people.

• Third, by looking at the group’s T/F distribution, the leader can identify the group’s most-preferred decision-making style, be it based on logic or based on feelings. Thinkers base their decisions on objective criteria – they are more interested in finding practical solutions and making decisions quickly. Feelers, on the other hand, base their decisions on values, emotions and effect on people – they trust their gut and care about how their actions will make others feel.

• And, finally, by looking at the J/P distribution, the leader can better balance the process for making decisions with making the decision itself. Judgers are decisive and product-oriented – they can analyze the pros and cons of a situation quickly – while Perceivers are process-oriented and in search of alternate possibilities and solutions.

Leaders who have used the MBTI know what a difference it can make in their ability to work well with others and improve team relationships. With this new knowledge, leaders can begin to recognize the variations of the personality types and the importance that such diversity brings to the workplace. Furthermore, once leaders understand why they do things a certain way, they can learn to appreciate how others may interpret their actions. Many people who participate in this powerful self-understanding process discover a new self-worth and personal belief in their own abilities and potential.

Theresa Partell is a Senior Grant & Contract Administrator for the Research Foundation of SUNY at Binghamton University. Candyce Lindsay is the Assistant Director for Sponsored Projects Services at Arizona State University. Both are graduates of the 2008 LDI, whose class is writing Leadership Tips this year. Contributing Editor: Ty Lane.
The tenth Financial Research Administration conference was celebrated in style. Located in the beautiful LaQuinta resort in LaQuinta, California, the conference was a great success as we learned new things, revisited old ones, and gathered with friends and colleagues to share our experiences and knowledge in research administration.

This year's conference offered an array of topics, including Post Award issues, Costing issues, in depth discussions on the Facilities and Administrative Rate, Clinical Research, Federal Policy issues, Audit and Compliance, Open Forums, and Management Issues. Fifteen workshops and seven senior level seminars were also offered.

Two plenary sessions offered some great perspectives to this year's participants. Dr. Gene Stanaland from GSE provided an overview of the current economy in a humorous and easy to understand manner. And, Jane Younger's discussion with two Chief Research Officers (Brian Herman from University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio and Brad Fenwick from University of Tennessee, Knoxville) to see what kept them up at night was also very enlightening.

Jane Youngers and Cathy Snyder would like to thank the entire program committee, the NCURA staff and all of the participants for making this conference such a wonderful experience and a huge success!
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On Being a Scientist: A Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research

by Robert Killoren

The previous edition of On Being a Scientist came out in 1995. It would be an understatement to say that a lot has happened since then. First of all, the advancement of computer technology makes data acquisition, analysis, and presentation much more sophisticated and at the same time easier to accomplish. Complex data imaging that was not even dreamed of in 1995 can now be displayed on laptop computers that don’t weigh much more than keyboards did back then. And the explosion of the Internet since 1995 has greatly enhanced the dissemination of research data, scientific information, and new knowledge, especially the speed with which they can be released.

On the other hand, enhanced computing has created a host of new challenges and temptations for researchers. For example, the new edition cites 2002 research that found a quarter of the scholarly papers under study bore signs of having been inappropriately tampered with. What made this possible were software advances not even available in 1995 that by 2002 had become household tools. In fact, “photoshopping” has become a term of art for digitally manipulating images and is derived from one of the first products to offer a full range of imaging tools. The study demonstrated just how easily scientific data could be altered with new software advances and how easily researchers could fall into the trap of thinking it was all right to present a better “picture” of their results.

But the most radical changes have occurred in the understanding of science and the scientist in relation to society. While they existed back in 1995, IRBs and IACUCs were not even mentioned in the second edition; in the third there is a complete unit dedicated to them. This reflects the fact that concern for human research participants and animal care and use in experiments simply were seen as an add-on to the proposal review process, as opposed to being a part of the very fabric of the research itself. There is a full shift in the thrust of the book from a primary concern for scientific method and professional standards to one of trust and social responsibility. For instance, the 1995 version was concerned about being honest in order to maintain trust between scientists – while the 2009 version is all about sustaining the trust society has in science and scientists. That is a sea-change!

In looking at role models, scientists went from being perceived as the ones who passed the torch of the scientific method from one generation to the next to a concern that scientists may not always be the best role models for responsible research and that sometimes they have been known to pass on “tricks of the trade” that were actually contrary to professional standards. The third edition makes clear that concern about the ethics practiced by scientists is not primarily one of researchers knowing what is right and proper, but one of researchers adhering to their social responsibilities as teachers, role models, and peers.

In the second edition it was all about being careful in your research because there are standards and regulations out there to follow and your performance will be monitored as to how well you follow them. Now it is all about making right decisions lest you waste people’s time and money, slow the advancement of knowledge, and/or erode personal trust. To counter these dangers, three obligations are offered:

1. Scientists must honor the trust that society and their peers place in them.
2. Scientists must be faithful to their own selves. There are no short cuts to success.
3. Scientists must be dedicated to and serve the public good.

If scientists obey these short rules by maintaining and modeling high standards of conduct, they will have the moral authority to demand the same from others.
There are several sections in the updated book that were not in the previous edition:

- Advising and Mentoring
- Human Participants and Animal Subjects in Research
- Laboratory Safety
- Intellectual Property
- Competing Interests, Commitments, and Values (replacing the section on just Conflict of Interest)

The third edition presents more interesting case studies that better reflect today’s world. In addition, it has some very helpful advice offered in little inserts, such as one for graduate students called, “Choosing a Research Group.”

This new edition is a “must read” for graduate students, postdoctoral associates, young faculty, and well-established faculty. It is also a great resource for research administrators who can now rely on some rules for the road that are “in writing,” which seems to be one of the most frequent demands of faculty who do not particularly care for “rules.”

*On Being a Scientist* is available from the National Academies Press at www.nap.edu/. Institutions might consider buying the book in bulk and distributing them to new faculty and faculty who run into self-manufactured pot holes. But even better, institutions could refer faculty to the new version of *On Being a Scientist* in the read-only format that NAP provides. The format really is very easy to read. You can even include on your office home page a picture of the book with an imbedded web link to the read-only version by pulling some special html code from the NAP webpage and inserting the code on your own site.

However you do it, I recommend getting the book into your faculty’s hands and then hoping they get the message.

Robert Killoren is Associate Vice President for Research Administration at The Ohio State University.
University labs are led and staffed by researchers that pride themselves on their intellectual prowess and their ability to solve difficult scientific and technical problems. These labs and researchers form the economic engine for University-based research and their innovations and publications strongly affect the three Rs of higher education: Reputation, Recognition, and Rankings.

While universities typically look for academic pedigree in their choice of new faculty in the sciences and engineering, most graduate and postdoctoral programs do not train them to be experts in human resource and operations management, key elements of successful enterprises. Furthermore, little training, if any, is provided in the form of strategic planning for these lab leaders, placing their new labs in a reactive state of survival versus a proactive state of sustainability and growth. With a few simple tools, it is possible to transform research labs from reactive entities to proactive enterprises by bringing strategic planning into the picture.

So why strategy? At its most fundamental level, strategy deals with the allocation of limited resources to achieve operational objectives. In the university environment, many research labs claim to be short on funds, staff, equipment and space, a problem of limited resources on many levels. By bringing strategic thinking into the operation of the research lab, not only can the faculty focus on what to do, but perhaps more importantly, identify what NOT to do. Given the nature of research and discovery, there will always be significantly more ideas to pursue than resources allow. Spreading these resources too thinly can actually set a lab up for failure, by reducing the probability of successful completion of any of the research ideas. The strategic allocation of resources to prioritized actions can help keep a lab focused on its objectives and ensure the research is supported adequately for completion and (hopefully) successful discoveries. The strategic management of the lab is not meant to stifle inventive and innovative creativity to pursue new research ideas or explore interesting tangents, but it does force the lab enterprise to understand that the operating plan must include the allocation of budgeted resources for such unplanned discovery processes. Otherwise, the prioritized actions will necessarily suffer from a reduction in resources due to the shift in focus, potentially changing the timeline for successful completion of the existing research activities.

The strategic planning process for the research lab looks very much the same as any other strategic planning process, with the four basic steps identified in Figure 1. To facilitate this process, the entire lab should be represented, including faculty, staff, and students, with the objective of creating a common understanding of what the lab is trying to achieve. It is remarkable how often it is assumed that everyone on a research team has the same unspoken set of objectives and priorities, but time and again undertaking this strategic planning process initially reveals discontinuities in lab visions and direction, and thus daily operations and results.

The first step in the process, Vision Definition, requires the team to disconnect from their current understanding of their daily research activities and think about the future. More precisely, the team should openly ask “What do we want our research lab to be in five years?” This may be as simple as a round table brainstorming process, or as involved as a benchmarking effort to identify, emulate, and perhaps surpass other research labs that may be considered best-in-class. The Vision Definition is essentially a statement or description of the research lab that will act as the basis for defining what makes up the structure and performance expectations in step 2. This vision of the future acts as the target for the research lab to shoot for, and will be used to strategically pull the lab to a new level of performance. A sample Strategic Future Pull Chart from a recent research lab retreat is shown in Figure 2, highlighting the main elements created in each step of this process.

Other suggested reading:


In the Conversion step, the strategic action plan is developed to define how gaps will be closed between the current and future state, the timeline for closing such gaps, the resources required, and the individuals responsible for the closure. This step is not so much about science as it is about good strategic management. If there is no plan to improve or no one responsible for the improvements, then they are not likely to occur spontaneously. Figure 2 shows a summary of these conversion actions from our example lab. The basis for the Future Pull Summary Chart is a detailed plan of action that the research lab will manage and revisit on a monthly, weekly, and sometimes daily basis depending on the conversion activities defined and their anticipated timeline. This last step also brings to the forefront the issue of resource scarcity, and thus the need for prioritization. Conversion actions for the next 12 months will be set based on the lab’s desire to close a particular gap and the resources required/available for that action.

From implementing this strategic planning process for research labs, several organizational improvements can be expected. First, a common understanding can be established amongst all who participate in the research lab. This helps focus action and reinforce productive interaction amongst lab members. Second, ownership of actions can be strategically allocated to the lab’s faculty, postdocs, students, and staff. This will drive the research towards completion and create a proactive environment versus a reactive environment. Third, the participation in this process on an annual or semi-annual basis creates buy-in from the research lab. This creates a sense of common purpose and a sense of personal value for individuals who see their ideas and actions forming the basis for a successful research lab. Finally, for the postdocs and students who intend to go on and form their own successful labs, participation in this process provides them with the training they will need to successfully build their own research careers and labs in the future.

Cory Hallam is the Assistant Vice President for Commercialization Alliances and Innovation, and Director of the Center for Innovation and Technology Entrepreneurship (CITE) at The University of Texas at San Antonio. Charles Keller is an Assistant Professor at the Greehey Children’s Cancer Research Institute (GCCRI).

**Figure 2 – Strategic Future Pull Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Lab Operations</th>
<th>Current State (per year)</th>
<th>Conversion Activity (Next 12 Months)</th>
<th>Future State (+5 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funding</td>
<td>SX</td>
<td>4X fold increase in grant writing</td>
<td>$2.5X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Publications</td>
<td>6 pubs</td>
<td>Convert data backlog to pubs</td>
<td>12 pubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Contracts</td>
<td>3 posters</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 posters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercialization</td>
<td>0 major talks</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 talks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 disclosures</td>
<td>Business development</td>
<td>$30Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2 royalty</td>
<td>Fewer devices, more therapeutics</td>
<td>$6Z royalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>5 postdocs</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 postdocs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 grad students</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 grad students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 staff scientists</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 staff scientists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduations</td>
<td>1 faculty</td>
<td>Add junior faculty and train as PI</td>
<td>2 faculty/PIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 postdoc</td>
<td>Graduate postdocs every 2-3 years</td>
<td>1 postdoc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nationally recognized child cancer research lab focused 50% on Basic science (e.g., cell of origin, factors responsible for metastasis) and 50% Molecular therapeutics. Lab results will be converted to clinical trials with partner organizations and strong relationships with industry will spin off new innovations for commercial application. The multi-PI lab will achieve a significant growth in stable, but diversified funding, have a higher percentage of publications in top tier journals, and graduate post docs to lead in the creation of new successful research labs.
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Cory Hallam is the Assistant Vice President for Commercialization Alliances and Innovation, and Director of the Center for Innovation and Technology Entrepreneurship (CITE) at The University of Texas at San Antonio. This center serves as a pipeline for generating entrepreneurs focused on new technology ventures. Cory holds a PhD in Technology Management and Policy, an MS in Technology and Policy, and an M.Eng in Aeronautics and Astronautics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has worked in the Telecommunications and Aerospace Industries as an Engineer, Program Manager, and in Lean Enterprise Transformation. Cory also headed the design and development of MIT’s AeroAstro Learning Labs, an integrated effort aimed at linking curriculum, pedagogy, learning styles, and facilities into a new style of learning environment. His work has led him to lecture in North America and Europe on strategies for the Exploration of Mars, Learning Environment Design for Higher Education, and Accelerating Lean Enterprise Transformation. Current Research efforts focus on Lean Enterprise for Health Care, Technology Venture Performance, and accelerating the process of creating Technology Entrepreneurs in a university setting.

Charles Keller is an Assistant Professor at the Greehey Children’s Cancer Research Institute (GCCI), which aims to improve therapies for specific types of childhood cancer. Dr. Keller is a board-certified pediatric oncologist specializing in the development of more effective, less toxic therapies for a type of childhood muscle cancer called rhabdomyosarcoma, and a type of childhood brain tumor called medulloblastoma. Dr. Keller joined the Greehey Children’s Cancer Research Institute in January of 2005 as a Principal Investigator in Developmental Cancer Genetics and Therapeutics and as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Cellular & Structural Biology. Dr. Keller attended Tulane University where he received a degree in Biomedical Engineering prior to attending Baylor College of Medicine where he received his M.D. degree. After completing his internship and residency in Pediatrics at Texas Children’s Hospital, Dr. Keller trained in Pediatric Hematology-Oncology at the University of Utah and as a post-doctoral fellow in the laboratory of 2007 Nobel laureate, Mario E. Capecchi.

Robert Kilgore is Associate Vice President for Research Administration at The Ohio State University. He is a past president of NCURA and of the University Industry Demonstration Partnership. He is currently a co-chair on the Government-University-Industry Roundtable project on international research collaborations (called i-Group). He has been a university research administrator for 32 years.

Ty Lane is a Senior Grant and Contract Specialist in the Office of Sponsored Projects at The University of Texas at Austin, where she enjoys negotiating contracts and agreements with industrial, government and international sponsors. Before joining UT in 2003, Ty worked in industry negotiating complex technology and environmental services contracts with corporate clients. She is a graduate of the 2008 class of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute and serves as this year’s Contributing Editor for the NCURA Magazine’s “Leadership Tips” column written by LDI classmates. Happily serving in a variety of capacities for NCURA - Region V, Ty is also a Certified Professional Contracts Manager (CPCM) and a Certified Research Administrator. Other than being passionate about her work and NCURA, she enjoys yoga, oil painting, gardening and cooking for friends and family.

David B. Morton is a Professor in the Department of Integrative Biosciences, Oregon Health & Science University. David B. Morton received his B.A. and Ph.D. degrees in Zoology from the University of Cambridge, UK. He then came to the United States to carry out post-doctoral research at the University of Washington. His first faculty position was at the University of Arizona in Tucson, where he stayed for seven years before moving his lab back to the Pacific NW, joining Oregon Health and Science University in 1998. Dr. Morton is currently a professor in the Department of Integrative Biosciences. He has trained several graduate students and postdocs during his independent research career.

Theresa Partell is a Senior Grant and Contract Administrator in the Office of Sponsored Programs at Binghamton University. She guides faculty and staff in all pre-award activities from identification of funding sources, through submission of proposals to negotiation, acceptance, and monitoring of awards. Theresa has worked at Binghamton University for six years and has been a member of NCURA since 2004. She has a masters degree in Public Administration (MPA) and earned designation as a Certified Research Administrator (CRA) in December 2007. She is also a 2008 graduate of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute.

Lisa R. Pitler is the Senior Director of the Research and Clinical Trials Administration Office at Rush University Medical Center in Chicago, Illinois. In this role, Lisa centralized the research office and implemented a process to ensure proper billing for clinical trials. Lisa is a health management, formulation, and implementation of clinical research initiatives including the Education and Workforce Development Subcommittee of the National Science and Technology Council and consultation committee for the Department of Education Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program. Psalmonds served on the board of directors for Oak Ridge Associated Universities, and member of the North Carolina Board for Science and Technology, NASA Minority Business Resource Advisory Council, and executive committee of the Council on Research Policy and Graduate Education of the National Association of State Colleges and Land Grant Universities. She has held administrative positions at the Georgia Institute of Technology and Georgia State University, and she became the first vice chancellor for research at North Carolina A&T State University. Psalmonds served as principal investigator for numerous federally funded projects, made numerous presentations, and is the co-author of copyrights to two software systems. She was honored by the Republic of Senegal through acceptance into the Order of the Lion. Psalmonds received the baccalaureate and master’s degrees in education from Tuskegee University and Ph.D. in higher education leadership with a concentration in management information systems from Georgia State University.

Beth Seaton is the Director of Sponsored Projects at Western Illinois University in Macomb, Illinois where she has worked for 20 years. Prior to joining WIU she was a research administrator at Texas A&M University. Her background provides her with experience at a predominately undergraduate institution (PUI) as well as a large research-intensive institution. At WIU Beth oversees the pre-award and non-financial post-award functions of the office as well as the compliance area. Beth has served as a presenter for NCURA at both the regional and national levels. She has also served on the NCURA Professional Development Committee, the Region IV Board and the Region IV Newsletter staff. Beth is currently a member of the NCURA peer review team, and member of the NCURA Fundamentals faculty. Beth has B.S. and M.A. degrees in Economics.

Mary Ellen Sheridan served as the Associate Vice President for Research and Director of University Research Administration at The University of Chicago until September 1, 2007. She is a past Chair of the NCURA Board of Directors and a past member of the Board of Directors of the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), an organization of the major research-intensive universities, chairing the Research Compliance and Administration Committee. She served as NCURA president in 1986 and was the recipient of the 2006 NCURA Award for Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration. Since her retirement, Mary Ellen continues to assist research universities and institutions with a number of research administration and research compliance issues. She currently serves as Co-Chair of the Business & Operations Advisory Committee at the National Science Foundation as well as on the NSF Governing Board’s Research Security Act Committee.

Josine Stallinga is a Product Manager in the Academic and Government Group at Elsevier and is based in Amsterdam. Josine is spearheading the development of a funding solution, launching later this year.

Lauren A. Wilson is the Senior Associate Director in the Office for Sponsored Programs at The University of Alabama. She received her B.A. in Communications from The University of Alabama in 1986, and her J.D. from Cumberland School of Law in 1989. Prior to her employment with The University of Alabama over ten years ago, she enjoyed practicing law in civil state and Federal litigation as well as Administrative law.
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