On the Cover:

2009 in research administration! A year like no other that our profession has experienced in recent memory! For many of us, our professional and sometimes much of our personal lives have revolved around all facets of ARRA for the majority of the year. A phenomenal ARRAAlanche, if you will, of funding opportunities, reporting requirements and new and interesting audit concerns came rolling over the top of us all. True to our character as research administrators, like the thrill seeker in the cover photo, we all smiled through the ride knowing what was coming right over our shoulders.

There is little doubt that 2009 will go down in research administration history as the year that brought one of the greatest funding boosts we have had the good fortune to encounter. There is also little doubt that in the ever changing and evolving world of research of research administration, the changes ARRA has brought are sure to keep us challenged well into the coming year. Carol Blum provides us, in her Capital View article this month a review of ARRA and highlights important ARRA related efforts by The Association of American Universities (AAU), the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) and The Science Coalition (TSC) – a new website www.ScienceWorksforUS.org.

This issue of the NCURA Magazine wraps up the year with articles spanning a wide variety of perspectives covering the many levels of research administration experience. Included in the pages of the magazine are the perspective of a Senior Research Officer at a major university system on the future opportunities of technology commercialization and innovations centers; the perspective of established and experienced research administrators on the principles of human subjects research and immigration issues; and a first year review from the perspective of a new research administrator with great hints for handling our profession as a newcomer.

An exciting set of topical articles includes information on how research outside the US is thriving despite the global economic challenges; a report from Sweden on the CIP Forum 2009; how one university has created a University-HMO Partnership; and a book review on an exciting new publication - Excellence Everywhere: A resource for scientists launching research careers in emerging science centers.

Dedicated volunteers continue to spend their valuable time putting together the amazing content of this publication and we continue to extend our thanks to them and hope that you enjoy this issue and find the information helpful as you wind down this eventful year and look towards 2010!

Lynette Arias
Co-Editor
JUDY FREDENBERG, Interim Director of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Montana, was elected Vice President/President-Elect of NCURA. Fredenberg joined NCURA in 1992 and has been an active member at both the regional and national level for a number of years. She served as Chair of Region VII in 2001-2002 and prior to that, she served as regional Secretary/Treasurer in 1997-1999. Other service includes membership on regional committees as well as the national Finance and Budget Committee (now the Financial Management Committee), the Membership Committee, and many program committees. Fredenberg’s most recent service includes NCURA Board of Directors member, 2005-2006; Nominating & Leadership Development Committee – member, 2000; Vice Chair, 2007; Chair 2008-2009, and AM51 Program Committee, 2009. As Vice President, Judy will be responsible for the 2010 Annual Meeting. When asked her thoughts about being NCURA’s incoming Vice President/President-Elect, Judy responded, “There’s a saying, ‘We all drink water from wells we did not dig.’ Through NCURA, I drink every day from existing ‘wells’ of knowledge, commitment, camaraderie, and volunteerism. In a time where ‘shovel-ready’ is a common catch phrase, I’m honored and excited to take up my own pick and shovel and join my colleagues in maintaining those existing wells, and perhaps even in digging a few more!”

MARIO MEDINA, Director of Business Operations, Institute for Economic Development at the University of Texas at San Antonio, was elected Treasurer-Elect. Since joining NCURA in 2002, Medina has served as a member of the Financial Management Committee, 2008-2009 and also as Contributing Editor for the NCURA Magazine’s Financial Corner. When asked about his volunteer role as Treasurer-Elect, Mario had this to say, “It is a crucial time for our members to step up in NCURA at all levels of the organization. I look forward to continuing to always serve in the best interests of our NCURA members.”

The NCURA membership also elected BARBARA GRAY, Director of Grants and Contracts, Valdosta State University, to the position of Secretary. Since joining NCURA in 1990, Gray has served in a number of roles including Chair of Region III, 1997-1998 and, prior to that, Gray served as the Region III Secretary/Treasurer, 1995-1996. Other service includes the NCURA Finance and Budget Committee, 1995-1996; Co-Chair of the Electronic Research Administration V Special Topics Conference, 2000; LDI Advisor, 2003; NCURA Board of Directors member, 2001-2002, 2004-2005, and 2007, serving as the Chair of the Board Working Group for NCURA’s e-poll on membership issues in 2002 and as Chair of the Board Task Force on Succession Planning, 2007; and 48th Annual Meeting Program Committee Senior Track Planner, 2006. About her upcoming role as Secretary, Barbara responded, “It’s an honor to have been given this leadership opportunity in an organization that has had such a positive influence on my own professional and personal development. I’m looking forward to working with Dave, Judy, the Board of Directors, regional leaders, the NCURA staff, and the entire membership as we embark on new initiatives that will ensure the best education for research administrators in the friendly and supportive environment that makes NCURA so special.”

BETTY FARBMAN, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Programs, New York University, was elected to the NCURA Board of Directors. Farbm an joined NCURA in 1993 and has served as Chair of Region II, 2001-2002; on the Region II Steering Committee, 1993-1994 and 2003-2004; and on many regional Program Committees. In addition, Farbm an was the co-recipient of the first Region II Distinguished Service Award in 2006 and served on the NCURA Nominating & Leadership Development Committee, 2005-2006. About her election to the Board of Directors, Betty offered, “having the opportunity to work with Dave Richardson, Judy Fredenberg and the rest of the leadership team to consider the ways we might continue to move NCURA forward is a welcome challenge. I’m looking forward to the next two years. Many thanks for the opportunity.”

NCURA 2009
Election Results

ANTHONY (TONY) VENTIMIGLIA, Contracts and Grants Administrator III, Auburn University, was elected to the NCURA Board of Directors. A member since 2000, Ventimiglia’s service to NCURA has included membership on the Region III Membership Committee, 2004-2005; LDI graduate of the class of 2005; Region III Volunteer Coordinator, 2005-2007; Region III Chair-Elect and Program Committee Chair, 2008; Region III Chair, 2008-2009; representative to the 2007 and 2008 NCURA Leadership Convention; and, most recently, Tony served as Co-chair of the NCURA 51st Annual Meeting. When asked his thoughts about serving on the NCURA Board, Tony told us, “I was very excited to find out that I was elected to serve on the NCURA Board of Directors as an At-large member. I look forward to the privilege to serve the NCURA membership in this capacity by actively supporting the mission and goals of the organization, while working closely with the other members of the Board, NCURA national staff, and the general membership to steer the organization into its next fifty years.”

Both Farbm an and Ventimiglia will begin serving on the Board of Directors on January 1, 2010 and will serve for two years. Fredenberg will take office on January 1, 2010 and will serve for one year after which she will succeed to a one-year term as President of NCURA. Medina will become Treasurer-Elect on January 1, 2010 and will serve for one year after which he will succeed to a two-year term as NCURA Treasurer. Gray will take office as Secretary on January 1, 2010 and will serve a two year term.
If you haven’t heard about the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, also known as ARRA, the Recovery Act, the stimulus, and, depending on your perspective, various other appellations and characterizations, then you just haven’t been paying attention. The ARRA awardee reporting requirements — first reports due on October 10 — plagued the universities. Those reports have been compiled with other recipient and agency data and can be accessed on the federal government’s website, www.Recovery.gov. The debate on the accuracy and usefulness of the jobs information began before the reports were widely available and that debate will continue for many years to come.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) weighed in a November report entitled RECOVERY ACT: Recipient Reported Jobs Data Provide Some Insight into Use of Recovery Act Funding, but Data Quality and Reporting Issues Need Attention (GAO-10-223). The GAO gently observed that “while recipients... appear to have made good faith efforts to ensure complete and accurate reporting,” GAO’s review found “a range of significant reporting and quality issues that need to be addressed.” The GAO’s recommendations focus on greater guidance from the Office of Management and Budget encouraging clarification and standardization in the use of full-time equivalence (FTE) to measure jobs created and retained including defining the period of measurement and explicit instructions that jobs to “are to be reported as hours worked and paid for with Recovery Act funds.”

The Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) and the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) continually update the COGR-FDP Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) link on each organization’s website (www.cogr.edu; www.thefdp.org). These FAQs are developed in consultation with OMB, the relevant federal agencies and the experiences of your colleagues across the country. When new and/or additional information is available, a notation will be added to the FAQ to indicate an update has been made.

As the counting of the numbers of jobs created and retained has garnered the greatest number of headlines, you may have missed the announcement of another website reporting on Recovery Act funding and you might be able to help.

The Association of American Universities (AAU), the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) and The Science Coalition (TSC) organized and launched a new website, www.ScienceWorksForUS.org at a press conference on November 17, 2009. The goal of the initiatives including the website is simple — to highlight the scientific research and related activities that have been made possible by the Recovery Act. The website features the stories of the $21.5 billion for scientific research, purchase of capital equipment, and science-related construction projects research being supported by the Recovery Act.

The purpose of ScienceWorksForUS is to inform the public of the important work being made possible by the funding for scientific research that was included in the ARRA. We all know how difficult it can be to explain the short and long-term impact of investments in research. ScienceWorksForUS hopes to bridge that gap by presenting the research and researchers in a way easily accessible to the public. The stories go beyond the counting of jobs to introduce the investigators and describe the investment in innovations and inventions that will support the economy in the future.

Carol Blum is Director of Research Compliance and Administration at the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR).
THE 2009 POOL OF APPLICANTS FOR THE CATHERINE CORE MINORITY TRAVEL AWARD WAS VERY IMPRESSIVE, AND THE NCURA NOMINATING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (NLDC) EAGERLY ANTICIPATES THE PARTICIPATION AND LEADERSHIP THAT OUR AWARDEES WILL BRING TO FUTURE NCURA ACTIVITIES.

THE CATHERINE CORE MINORITY TRAVEL AWARD IS AVAILABLE TO MINORITY APPLICANTS WHO, BECAUSE OF FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS, COULD NOT OTHERWISE ATTEND NCURA’S ANNUAL MEETING. THE AWARDEES RECEIVE UP TO $1,500 TOWARD TRAVEL-RELATED EXPENSES ASSOCIATED WITH ATTENDING THE ANNUAL MEETING. IN ADDITION TO ASSISTING IN THE FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF ATTENDING THE ANNUAL MEETING, THIS AWARD ALSO OFFERS A WIDE VARIETY OF SERVICES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE AWARDEES TO INTERACT WITH THEIR PEERS AND COLLEAGUES FROM OTHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AROUND THE COUNTRY.

What did this year’s recipients have to say about their experience?

**Stefanie Coltrain**  
Accounting Specialist/Account Technician III, Budget & Finance Office, Department of Psychology & Neuroscience, University of Colorado, Boulder

“It was an enriching experience to meet so many kind and genuine people from around the country with whom I have something in common. Although I have only one year of experience in Research Administration, I now have a better understanding of the importance of my role to the successful life of an award Having attended the NCURA conference has empowered me to return to my departmental office renewed, re-energized and eager to meet and conquer the daily challenges of research administration.”

**Danielle Johnson**  
Grants/Contracts Specialist, Pennington Biomedical Research Center

“As a Research Administrator, I am committed to providing the very best knowledge and service to the researchers at my institution. Because of the detailed and broad range of information that was presented at the conference, I feel as though I am better equipped to serve. My attendance at the 51st Annual Meeting will have both short term and long term affects on my career as a Research Administrator and I owe that to being a recipient of the Catherine Core Minority Travel Award.”

**Elena Reyes**  
Effort Reporting Specialist, University of Kansas Medical Center Research Institute, Inc.

“Attending the 51st Annual Meeting made me realize how much I have learned in the past 3 years as a Research Administrator, but it also made me realize how much more I have to learn in this ever changing world of Research Administration. At this meeting I was not only able to learn from the information provided at the sessions, I was also able to learn from talking to people. As I sat at the banquet dinner and looked around the room and saw people of all ages, races, and genders, I thought to myself, “wow, we really are one world connected through research; it’s not just a slogan.”

**Bin Ye**  
Grant and Contract Specialist, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Wisconsin-Madison

“The meeting not only provided me a face-to-face meeting with experts from the different research institutes and funding agencies such as NIH and NSF, but also created great opportunities for me to learn and exchange knowledge and ideas with research administrators from various regions and universities.”

---

**The 2009 Catherine Core Travel Award recipients are:**

**STEFANIE COLTRAIN**, University of Colorado, Boulder  
**DANIELLE JOHNSON**, Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Louisiana State University System  
**ELENA REYES**, University of Kansas Medical Center Research Institute, Inc.  
**BIN YE**, University of Wisconsin-Madison

---

The application for the 2010 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award will soon be available! We look forward to many outstanding applications in 2010!
The mobility of researchers is something we all want to encourage, to enable them to gain valuable experience and knowledge abroad. Achieving this mobility is not easy though, and there is a lot to be learned and a lot of advice needed from research management in order to make the life of a roaming researcher a little easier.

The topic of this article is not, however, the various problems of everyday life and how to help researchers to deal with them. Rather, it is intended to look at the problems that roaming researchers face when it comes to Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and in particular protecting knowledge and securing access rights. A lot of guidelines are available for this purpose, but how can research managers help and really make sure that everything is in order? Is it the responsibility of administrative staff to take care of researchers’ IPR interests? This can be answered both ‘yes’ and ‘no.’

Yes, in the respect that it is the role of research managers to ensure that contracts and other papers are in order. They should therefore give as much information and advice to researchers about IPR, protection and so on.

No, in the respect that administrators are not able to know what exactly is being generated in research and what background the researcher is going to use in the end. Research also evolves, and it is not the administrators that take part in research work and follow the research progress, but the researchers.

Difficulties with Access Rights
This is illustrated rather well by one case of research mobility. A researcher came to a university from his home country and institution to participate in a cooperation project between several entities. All the necessary papers had been completed. The researcher had submitted his research plan which had been discussed and approved. Contracts between parties were negotiated and an agreement with the researcher and the host institution was signed.

As the project proceeded, it became apparent that the researcher had achieved results which his home institution wanted to exploit and thus needed to restrict the use of them. These results overlapped with the research the visiting researcher was carrying out in his new host institution and project, and were needed as background in the new project.

What’s more, the host institution had promised certain user rights to the researcher’s background material to the other parties in the new project. In addition, the researcher in his own agreement with the host institution had promised to give sufficient access rights to his background, and had also assigned his right to results to the host institution.

However, because of these earlier rights to his home institution, the access rights in the new project were different from what was originally assumed. This meant that the researcher was not able to give his background to be used in the new project as extensively as needed.

Important Learnings
So there is a lesson to be learned here. Research managers can do their job in accordance with regulations and ensure that each and every intended paper is signed. But it is still up to the researcher to understand what he or she is doing, and the meaning of the conditions in the agreements. Without this support from the researchers, research managers cannot work properly. Another lesson learned is always to conclude agreements with the home institution too.

But what if the background is built up in another institution, not the present home institution, or even in two or three other institutions? Clearly, agreement with the home institution is not enough, and you need the researcher’s support as you cannot possibly know all of the places that the roaming researcher has worked in.

Funding organisations foster and finance mobility too, for example, the EU with Marie Curie programmes, and here research managers face other problems. Funding organisations state that it is acceptable for researchers to travel aboard and this is actually encouraged, but they do insist that certain access rights or ownership of results are ensured.

These guidelines are all well and good, but what do you do when the researcher goes to the United States, for instance. Here, according to their legislation, universities seem unable to allow researchers and their home institutions to own results. They must be owned by the host university.
Different Legislation in Different Countries

In addition, research managers cannot be familiar with different legislation in different countries. So they have no way of knowing what kind of restrictive clauses may exist in any agreement. Yet, according to most funding organisations’ rules, it is the responsibility of the grant-holder to ensure that the rules of the funding organisation are met.

But how can you follow two different kinds of rules? If on the one hand the research mobility to a country is allowed, but on the other hand, there is legislation against the funding organisation’s rules?

The Situation in Finland

For example, our national funding organisation in Finland encourages research exchange in principle, but at the same time states in its rules:

When implementing the researcher exchange, the recipient shall be obliged to prevent any uncontrolled leak of information from the project. The recipient must in particular, oversee that the ownership and title to the background material released to a national project as well as the ownership and title in the results that have already been generated or will be generated, including intellectual property rights, are not transferred or assigned to the receiving community.¹

So research management should know in advance if it is possible to have ownership of knowledge generated in the host country, or if there is legislation preventing knowledge export. Unfortunately, it is just not possible to know everything and be familiar with every statute in every country, especially in advance.

Furthermore, we all know how these things often come to research management’s knowledge: when arrangements to implement the exchange are almost completed and the exchange is already set as part of the proper implementation of the project. Often, there is not enough time to study things in advance.

Problematic Conditions

In EU programmes and their guidelines, we also find problematic conditions as in the case of Marie Curie programmes. As stated in the recently published IPR Helpdesk Guide for Marie Curie Actions:

The ownership regime may be adapted to fit the parties’ wishes as transfers of ownership are allowed. It should be noted, however, that the general rules on the potential objection of the European Commission are also applicable to Marie Curie actions. In that respect, where the transfer (or an exclusive licence) is planned to be made to a third party established in a third country (i.e. including a partner institution), the European Commission may object if European interests are at stake.²

So unless agreed upon beforehand, the European Commission may always object to results being owned by an institution in a certain country.

In addition to strict legislation, there is also the problem of loose or non-existent legislation, especially where IPR is concerned. If the culture and legislation in the country of the host institution are not well-developed, all your attempts to protect and secure proprietary interest and leaks of information may be in vain, even though these are required by the rules of the financing organisation.

So research managers should always look into the following issues well in advance. Firstly, that the funding organisation accepts the conditions of the intended and agreed mobility. Secondly, if you have a cooperation project, that the other parties also understand and accept the conditions of the mobility.

But what happens if the other project partners do not agree or the funding organisation finds problems in the conditions? Can you really tell a distinguished researcher that he or she should abandon all their plans and forget all their arrangements? Probably not.

In Conclusion

In reality, no one can stop a researcher from going abroad, especially when we are talking about distinguished and able researchers. They will find the means to go abroad if they want to. So the home institution has two choices: either to allow the researcher to go without any strings attached. Or just allow mobility and try to somehow struggle through all the regulations.

All in all, despite a worldwide recession, roaming researchers are surviving and thriving in the global economy, as long as their research is well-managed.

Pirjo Konikainen, LL.D. is Legal Counsel for Research Affairs at the University of Helsinki, Finland. Her field of expertise is copyrights and other intellectual property rights within university research and teaching. This article originally appeared in Issue 91 of the Link newsletter, published by the European Association of Research Managers & Administrators (EARMa), and is reprinted with their permission.

The text is shortened here. Full text can be obtained from:
2 http://www.ipr-helpdesk.org/documents/Marie_CurieFP7.xml.html?mode=subscription
SO YOU WANT INNOVATION!

by Dr. Keith McDowell

Dong.

The sound of an email arriving in my new i-Phone. Dong. What do you mean I have to create a UT System research continuity plan? Dong. You're kidding! Weekly ARRA reporting to the state on all proposals and all grant awards? Dong. Don't worry, all the animals survived the vivarium fire. Dong. You have been selected for a random document retention audit. Dong. Two companies in the incubator have declared bankruptcy. Dong. Help Desk, how do I turn off the dong?

INNOVATION!

You've gotta love it. It's produced instant gratification for information. We're electronically wired 24x7. Of course, you might not like the message. But innovation is essential for America to maintain its dominance in global competition. No one disagrees with that premise. The issue is how do we maintain and accelerate innovation in the context of the university research enterprise, given its history as the engine of basic research and the current drive to make universities engines of commercialization and economic development. Are such missions compatible? What is the role of research administration?

As a newly minted vice president for research in 2001 at The University of Texas at Arlington, my first question was "where is the gold key?" Naively started the job expecting to be handed the gold key that opened doors to the inner sanctum of senior administration – the putative smoke filled rooms where real decisions are made. Instead, I met with an audit team who informed me that I must undergo a change of management audit. "How can this be," I muttered? "It's my first day on the job." Little did I know!

But then, I had a secret weapon that few possess. I had Dr. Marianne Woods, the 2009 winner of the NCURA Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award, as my Associate Vice President for Research. Without her, I would have accomplished next to nothing. As a result, I learned the first and most important lesson about being a Vice President for Research: if you don't already have a top research administrator, hire one. Even more important, I would convert this into my first recommendation for improving innovation in America: enhance the professional status of research and technology commercialization administrators. Without this core of professionals, innovation will creep along at best.

How serious is America when it comes to accelerating innovation? How serious are universities? We are all aware of the rapid transformation and expansion of university culture to move from technology transfer to embrace technology commercialization. My goodness, we've even taken the bold step in many universities of changing the name of the Technology Transfer Office to the Office of Technology Commercialization under the pretense that we know the difference. What is the difference and what do we mean by technology commercialization?

Technology commercialization has become a catchall phrase to describe the role played by universities in knowledge transfer from the laboratory to industry. A specific element is traditional technology transfer through licensing of intellectual property (IP). But technology commercialization encompasses much more including marketing of IP in the innovation marketplace, formation and mentoring of startup companies, creation and management of business incubators, partnering through public-private partnerships, and creation of research or innovation parks. Technology commercialization professionals must possess a wide range of skills and the ability to interact with a spectrum of people from faculty, university administrators, venture capitalists, angel investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, government officials, politicians, and, yes, lawyers. It presents a daunting array of challenges. But what about research administrators? How will you be affected by this ongoing commercialization transformation?

The Future Ain't What It Used To Be — Yogi Berra

As universities engage in technology commercialization, my crystal ball tells me to expect some changes in strategy and practice that will affect research administration. Here is my list with some explanation as to what they are and the potential consequences.

INTEGRATION ACROSS UNIVERSITY OFFICES

One of the prominent, emerging strategies for technology commercialization, especially tailored for industry, is the notion of building a long-term, trust relationship – not just engaging in deal by deal interactions. The goal is to build a network of relationships. In some measure this strategy is a response to the negative press generated by industry, venture capital, entrepreneurs and politicians about how difficult they claim it is to work with universities. These claims mostly arise from anecdotal stories as opposed to case analysis, but they are effective as a message. On the other hand, the relational network approach is a powerful strategy in its own right and one that I advocate. It requires that the office of sponsored projects and office of technology commercialization work with the outreach or development offices to generate an integrated and planned
interaction with external entities, including companies and venture capital, to achieve the creation of new inventions or innovations and their enhanced commercialization as university intellectual property. Although some research administrators are currently engaged in such activity, it is going to increase significantly in the future. Integration to achieve commercialization is a great concept, but how one structurally accomplishes it is a challenge with no clear best practice at present.

**University mission**

There are many who believe that universities should remain pure – an ivory tower free of external influences and encumbrances including commercialization. My comment to the purist is “get over it.” It’s a done deal. It happened while you were deeply engaged in the pursuit of knowledge and understanding. Universities have become major players in regional innovation ecosystems. Indeed, institutions in The University of Texas System are required by the Board of Regents to include commercialization language in their mission statements.

**Regional knowledge and innovation ecosystems**

There are some who believe that globalization will diminish the need and the power of regional ecosystems. Others believe that universities must step forward and fuel the growth of regions through alignment of their programs and the spinout of their knowledge into startup companies. Whatever the future specifically holds in store for us, it is clear to me that regional engagement by universities will become a key component of their mission. How will that engagement play out?

Traditionally, universities have participated in standard economic development by helping to attract and retain industry through the educated workforce they provide and through various forms of research or industrial parks. More recently, university incubators, startup mentoring, and entrepreneurial programs have gained in prominence. But the future will involve more complex and fluid dynamics. Instead of ecosystems that reflect a gatekeeper control and command structure, regional ecosystems will reflect more the character of self-assembled and constantly changing organisms that adapt and mutate to meet a turbo-charged timescale. Gateways rather than gatekeepers will be the norm. Notwithstanding this rapid and dynamic systems, there will always be the need for the core functions of research administration and technology transfer. How will those functions be organized and administered as universities create and dissolve partnerships, especially as universities assume a dominant and leadership role in managing research and technology transfer activities? How loose will the boundaries between the university and self-assembled entities become? Lest we forget, compliance and accountability are not going to disappear simply to make America more agile and the world leader in innovation.

**Public-Private Partnerships**

The President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology produced a report in November 2008 entitled University-Private Sector Research Partnerships in the Innovation Ecosystem. It stressed that public-private partnerships are a “critical component of the innovation ecosystem.” I agree. So, why don’t we have more? Have our offices of sponsored programs and technology commercialization become gatekeepers instead of gateways as some have argued? Are universities to blame when regional economies falter or fail? No, of course not! Public-private partnerships are complex undertakings that are part of the warp and woof of regional ecosystems, but not the only factor. There is no simple rule or process that ensures growth of the partnerships, nor their sustainability. Nonetheless, universities must encourage and participate in public-private partnerships, determine what works and what does not, and reform the culture of research administration and technology commercialization to make sure they become gateways to innovation.

**National Innovation Foundation (NIF)**

Do we need an innovation czar? Do we need a foundation to manage the innovation ecosystem through both policy and funding? We clearly need policy and funding already exists. The SBIR and STTR programs along with the Manufacturing Extension Program are examples that could be characterized as innovation programs. Many others have been identified in the innovation literature. As President Obama stated on August 5, 2009, “Innovation is more important than ever.” Many believe that the formation of an NIF is a natural extension of the Vannevar Bush model that has informed science and technology policy since World War II. Only time will tell whether America takes this step.

**Tenure and promotion guidelines**

While tenure and promotion committees have long considered invention disclosures and patents in their decisions – although perhaps in a casual manner, the inclusion of commercialization activities such as marketing of intellectual property or participation in the formation of startup companies is now being adopted. For example, The University of Texas System Board of Regents in March, 2008, formally accepted invention disclosures, patents, and commercialization activities as appropriate metrics for tenure and promotion. The net effect of this culture change is to put increased pressure on research administration to work with faculty to achieve greater success in commercialization, especially by helping to build relationships through sponsored research agreements with industry or through public-private partnerships.

**Innovation centers**

The concept of an innovation center at a university is growing across America and is taking on many forms. Often the center is part of the regional ecosystem and located at a research park. For my purposes, I define an innovation center in the context and tight definition of innovation as adding commercial value to a discovery or invention following an invention disclosure. As such, the innovation center would house a group of professionals skilled in applied research and development as well as market analysis of intellectual property and the development of a business plan. The game would be to triage invention disclosures and process the ones in need of further development through the innovation center. Enabling technologies would be especially susceptible to this form of processing as new products could be envisioned and created. There are drawbacks to these centers such as the cost and questions about the use of students to perform thesis research on enabling technologies. But how one structurally accomplishes it is a challenge with no clear best practice at present.
A Poem: NSF Report

Now I lay me down to snore
So here’s my NSF report.
If I should die before I wake
Just grab my cash and buy a cake.

It really wasn’t quite so bad
To write this thing
But I’m so sad
I didn’t write it long ago.
And failing that, I write these lines
In stark reminder of my crimes
And pecadillos that I know
Did victimize my friends and all
The granty people down the hall.
Who treat me far too well, and so
Should not put up with me at all.

I’ll dine on water, and on gruel
A waiting my next grant renewal.
The last I did, it seemed well written
At least it seemed when I was sittin’
With my ‘top across my lap.
But then I woke up from my nap
To gaze upon my limpid screen
And see what I had never seen:
The text of mediocrity
The megal-o-verbosity
The drivel that was oh, so clear
And seemed so clever and so droll
Was not enough to make the roll.
At NSF, who by design
Let pass a long and baleful time
Then failed to fund my grant last year.
And tho, unfunded, high and dry,
I never weep, or sniff, or cry.
I merely seek for that employ
That suits the bad-grant-writing boy.
Who cannot publish, write or speak,
And hit the skids downtown last week.
I do not care, I really don’t
It doesn’t bug me, so I won’t
Complain at all. I don’t. I’m not...
Hey! I’m just talkin’ here, so what?

Another grant I must submit?
One more report, as yet unwrit?
I laugh, I cry, my sides are split.
Cut me some slack, I’m over it.

Chad Nusbaum serves as Co-Director, Sequencing and Analysis Program, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA.
JOANNE BERDEBES, Columbia University Medical Center, formerly the Director of Sponsored Projects Administration, is now the Associate Vice Dean for Research Administration and Finance.

JERRY FIFE, Vanderbilt University, is now serving as Vice Chancellor for Administration.

NATALIE GOODWIN-FRANK is now the Manager of the Photosynthetic Antenna Research Center (PARC) at Washington University effective September 21, 2009.

TAMMY HOULE, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, has been promoted to Assistant Director, Office of Sponsored Programs

ROSEMARY MADNICK, formerly with the Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science, is now the Assistant Vice President for Research Administration at the Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute.

BRUCE MORGAN, formerly at the University of California, Riverside, is now the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research at the University of California, Irvine.

CYNTHIA WELLS, University of California, Riverside, is now serving as the Interim Director for Sponsored Programs Administration.

MILESTONES

Have you or any of your colleagues made a career move? Please contact NCURA so our entire membership can help celebrate the change!
Do you remember your induction into the field of research administration? Do you remember your first six months and the vast amount of knowledge you gained, and sometimes didn’t understand? I have been employed at a predominately undergraduate institute (PUI) since 2000, but in August 2008 I began working in the sponsored programs office. My previous role on campus dealt with students, parents, and staff, but rarely faculty. Now my role has placed me right in the middle of the faculty population, where I am finding myself having to learn a new way of thinking. My first week, the assistant director handed me the “Top 10 Reasons We Love Research Administration” by Victoria Ratcliffe and Dawn Bennett. Their tenth reason was, “the only thing you know for certain is that nothing is for certain.” I realized fairly quickly that every day would be different and I would always be gaining new knowledge.

My first couple weeks in the office were spent reading various materials, and honestly, much of the information did not stick; it was mostly foreign to me. I started to catch on to basic terms and concepts the more I engaged in grant discussions. I remember asking our director and coordinator of post grant awards many times what indirect costs were. And I never knew there were so many websites that in seconds could bring you such a vast quantity of information about the educational world, something our assistant director had mastered. It seems there are acronyms for everything and a never ending glossary of grant-related terms. I started to read the various circulars, documents our grant accountants seem to have memorized, but decided the documents were something I should tackle when I have a better understanding. When I first started attending our bi-weekly office staff meetings, I was mostly silent, sometimes guessing at what the right response to a question might be. Much of the post award language I had yet to understand and was often lost in conversation, which made me smile at what I had yet to experience.

Our director is a great leader and mentor, something not every administrator possesses. She has great confidence in the ability of her staff and believes that mistakes happen and can be fixed. She has a great way of “painting the whole picture” as she words it, and always has an appropriate example available for those that learn from the tangible. There were times when she was placed in unfamiliar situations and feels it is a great way to learn; she is right about that. She had confidence in my abilities well before I did, which is just a wonderful feeling. I was a little nervous at first to be thrown into the battlefield, but there are many knowledgeable individuals working the front lines who are willing to help.

I am a person who feels that if I am not at least ten minutes early to an event, then I am late. So, this new world of submitting grants has been a challenge for me in terms of sometimes pressing that submit button at the last minute. There are various departments responsible for review and final changes to be made, all which take time. I know none of this is new to some of you, but to someone experiencing this type of environment for the first time, it can be a bit shocking and overwhelming. I also had to get accustomed to tracking the application’s approval through the different University offices and submit on time. What a challenge.
The feeling of accomplishment is quite satisfying when a proposal is submitted. There is so much time and effort put into an application by the faculty or staff member and our office. I often found myself pulling pending proposal files from our filing cabinet to see when the award information are going to be announced, just because I wanted to know. And if an agency announced that awardees would be announced on March 30th, I took that literally and was looking for a list on the website. I was so anxious to see if the hard work of the principal investigator (PI) and our office paid off. I have since learned to add a 2-3 week extension on the anticipated announcement and award date. I write the date in a little notebook and review periodically for notification from either the faculty member or the funding agency.

I have presented two workshops to occupational therapy students on researching funding opportunities, prepared information for grants.gov, uploaded files to MEGS and NIH systems, assisted in presenting information to faculty, attended outside workshops, viewed several applications webinars, reviewed proposals for grammar accuracy, organized a proposal for submission, written budget narratives from example, and so much more. Yet I know this is just the beginning for me. I cannot tell you how much I have expanded my abilities and the confidence I have in those abilities. I have also made errors in judgment, and learned from them.

I still have much to learn and thoroughly enjoy my new role at our University, I have many faculty to meet; their fields of study are so varied and interesting, increasing my scope of knowledge. Every question they ask is based upon assumptions, so I have to learn to ask the right questions to get the answer needed.

Looking back, it has been a great year for our University, both in the grants world, and as an overall institution. We received several awards, with new faculty members and staff receiving their first external grant. It is great to be a part of an educational community that places great emphasis and pride in recognizing the research and program efforts of faculty and staff.

My goals for the future are to continue my learning curve. As time progresses, my involvement will become more in-depth. I hope to be a mentor myself and present topics of interest in a forum to those eager to learn and increase their knowledge. I see this area of interest as my long term field of study. So until that day when I have the knowledge and confidence to sit with a faculty member with a brand new idea for a research project and see their proposal from “cradle to grave,” I look forward to the continual learning process and the day when I understand concepts and rules with certainty.

My suggestion to anyone who has just started working in research administration: Enjoy learning! Remember you have a support team to help you expand your knowledge, and remember to also support them; your expertise and services are appreciated and needed.

**HERE ARE 10 HELPFUL HINTS TO THOSE NEW TO RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION:**

1. Ask questions, several times if needed.
2. Sign up for any free webinars, teleconferences, or workshops.
3. Join several listservs; they are great learning tools.
4. Familiarize yourself with grants.gov.
5. Ask to be included in an initial grant discussion with a faculty member.
6. Take notes on language you hear that will assist you in explaining the topic to someone later.
7. Develop confidence in your ability; it may take three years to fully understand research administration. Give it time.
8. Wait until 3:30 on deadline day to start to worry; but know that it will work out.
9. Read relevant publications or search websites when you have time.
10. Organize your email with folders for ease in searching, especially if you join listservs.

*Prepare yourself for an exciting journey!*

Melissa Woodward serves as the Administrative Secretary for the Office of Sponsored Programs at Saginaw Valley State University, Michigan. This article was edited by Janet Rentsch.
As the opportunities for scientists to engage in research continue to grow, one thing remains a constant; the need for research participants. For research administrators, understanding human subject compliance and the Institutional Review Board (IRB) process is a part of the post award process that is a very important component of on-going research, but is something that is not always well understood. Although it is the Principal Investigator as well as the co-investigators that have the primary responsibility for protecting the rights and welfare of human research subjects, as a research administrator one must be familiar with role of the their individual IRB as well as the and the Federal guidelines for protecting human subjects.

Protecting human participants in research involves following basic ethical principles. Anyone engaged in research must understand these guidelines and principles for and apply them to their work. The Belmont Report (http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.htm) provides the basis for the federal regulations and the guidelines for the ethical treatment of research participants. It calls attention to the three basic principles as being central to this process. These three principles are embodied in 45 CFR 46.111 (http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm), the criteria for IRB approval of research as codified under the Department of Health and Human Services.

The first Belmont principle, autonomy, refers to the right of individuals to self determination within the context of research participation. In order for a person to truly make an autonomous choice to participate in a project, the process by which their permission is obtained must be free of coercion and undue influence. It may require that persons with diminished autonomy such as children, prisoners, students or employees are given additional protection in order to ensure that their interests are not overlooked. Treating potential participants as autonomous individuals is usually achieved through the process of obtaining their informed consent after providing them with information on the purpose, procedures, risks, benefits, alternatives, confidentiality procedures, contact information, treatments (if injury occurs), and a statement about the voluntary nature of their participation.

Often the process of informed consent is misunderstood in that researchers merely refer to the signature on a document as “informed consent” but nothing could be further from the truth. Obtaining informed consent is a process whereby potential participants are provided with information about a study, have any questions answered and given an appropriate amount of time to consider this information. This process starts with the initial recruitment of participants and can require that participants are provided with additional information as the study progresses and given additional opportunities to freely choose to continue to participate. As a part of its review process, the IRB evaluates the informed consent process and any associated documents in order to determine: 1) If participants are being treated as autonomous individuals; 2) If any additional protections are needed for persons with diminished capacity; 3) If the research meets conditions under which consent can be waived; 4) If the methods of recruitment and participation respect the participant’s privacy; and 5) What form of documentation of consent is appropriate for the study.

The following areas in 45 CFR 46.111 deal with the principle of autonomy.

(4) Informed consent will be sought from each prospective subject or the subject’s legally authorized representative, in accordance with, and to the extent required by §46.116.

(5) Informed consent will be appropriately documented, in accordance with, and to the extent required by §46.117.

(7) When appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of data.

(b) When some or all of the subjects are likely to be vulnerable to coercion or undue influence, such as children, prisoners, pregnant women, mentally disabled persons, or economically or educationally disadvantaged persons, additional safeguards have been included in the study to protect the rights and welfare of these subjects.

The second Belmont principle, beneficence, involves both protecting research participants from harm and maximizing the good that the study does. In order to achieve this, risks presented by enrollment in a study must be minimized and benefits maximized in terms of both probability and magnitude. This may entail some additional costs beyond those required for obtaining study results. For example, in order to maximize benefits, a control group may have to be offered a treatment that has been found to be beneficial in the experimental group even though new scientific data may not be obtainable from this administration of the treatment.

The benefits of a research project can be both direct and indirect. Direct benefits accrue to the participants in a study. The most commonly thought of direct benefit is the receipt of experimental treatment or therapy for a condition where adequate treatment is not available outside of the research context. However there may be other direct benefits such as the opportunity of the participating individuals to learn something about themselves or the topic of the research. Indirect Benefits are benefits that do not affect the participant in research but
Huron professionals understand the complexities surrounding ARRA and the impact on the Research Enterprise

We are actively helping institutions respond to the challenges associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) by:

- Providing interim management and staff support
- Developing customized reporting tools
- Enhancing effort reporting practices
- Advising on non-traditional grant and contract proposals and awards
- Preparing institutions for increased federal oversight and monitoring
- Evaluating the impact of indirect and direct cost recovery

Huron resolves difficult business issues with creative and practical solutions. Our teams focus on the interaction and support among central and academic units, the mechanisms for providing critical information to faculty, and the regulatory challenges which collectively are at the heart of effective research administration.

For more information contact:

Greg Bedell
(312) 550-3010
gbedell@huronconsultinggroup.com

Mary Beth Rudolf
(312) 550-0034
mrudolf@huronconsultinggroup.com

Huron Consulting Group helps clients in diverse industries improve performance, comply with complex regulations, resolve disputes, mitigate losses, leverage technology, and achieve growth. The company focuses on its clients to deliver sustainable and reimbursable results. Huron provides services to a wide variety of both financially sound and distressed organizations, including leading academic institutions, healthcare organizations, Fortune 500 companies, medium-sized businesses, and the not-for-profit community. Learn more at www.huronconsultinggroup.com.
COMPLIANCE

The Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) has recently issued two new draft guidance documents, one on continuing reviews and the other on handling IRB approval of research with conditions. OHRP has invited comments on both documents, which are due by January 5, 2010. The draft guidance documents are available here: http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/requests/.

AHRPP (Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs) has issued a final version of its revised accreditation standards. AHRPP has indicated that the standards themselves have not undergone major changes, but they have been reorganized and some items have been better defined to clarify AHRPP’s expectations. The revised standards are available here: http://www.aahrpp.org/www.aspx?PageID=316

Kati Elfers is a member of the Departmental Neighborhood Subcommittee and serves as Business Manager, Academic Health Center Office of Finance & Administration, University of Cincinnati.

DEPARTMENTAL

Customer Service with Consistency

Department administrators, grant managers and central administration must all work together to ensure timely submission of proposals and set-up of awards as well as to maintain compliance throughout the life of a grant. Sometimes these processes go relatively smoothly, but that’s certainly not the norm, particularly during the post-award phase.

Customer service is a crucial part of all these roles, but good customer service isn’t sufficient. Timely responses to questions are extremely helpful especially when a deadline is looming. Friendly and courteous interactions always make our jobs a little more bearable, but it’s still not enough. What we all need is consistency. Consistency in the responses we receive even when situations differ, consistency in the manner in which we are treated or treat others and consistency in the amount of time it takes to process a request. There are always extenuating circumstances, but in general, consistency in the messages that we deliver and the services that we provide should be maintained whenever possible.

Consistent timelines are currently a hot topic in my university. Employee turnover, new internal financial policies and new ARRA post-award guidelines have all contributed to longer processing times than most of us are accustomed to. To combat these problems our central administrative offices along with the departments are working on producing a list of functions and associated time frames. Another major issue is being able to provide and/or being provided with clear, accurate and consistent information concerning the management of awards.

Oftentimes it seems that when similar situations are presented to the authorities of the university, different responses as to how to proceed are presented. Application of appropriate OMB circulars and funding agency guidelines seem to differ when no significant difference is apparent amongst the situations presented. In life, the resolution of issues is left up to interpretation of rules and guidelines. But, when dealing with most if not all funding agencies, interpretation shouldn’t even be in our vocabulary.

In a world of incessantly impending deadlines and ever changing guidelines, maintaining consistency is of the utmost importance. Not only will consistent application of rules and regulations help in the case of an audit, which we all dread and fear, it will help to garner good will and faith in the employees we work so closely with on a regular basis.

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

INTERNATIONAL

The recent NCURA Annual Meeting was a solid success in terms of international research administration. The meeting had a number of strong international sessions that were well attended, and the Thursday night dinner at Buca di Beppo was beyond capacity, requiring a second table! A good time was had by all, and gave everyone a chance to mingle with others that they normally wouldn’t have the opportunity to spend time with. This illustrates a major aspect of research administration (international or domestic)—that personal relationships and skills are critical for institutional and professional success. The success of the international dimension at the annual meeting is due to the hard work of many people, but I want to recognize the following for their leadership (in alphabetical order): John Carfora, Denise Clark, Wiktor Kurzeja, Kathleen Larmett, David Mayo, David Richardson, and Denise Wallen. Thank you!

At the end of this year I will be stepping down as chair of the International Neighborhood. It has been a pleasure to build upon the solid foundation left by John Carfora and I know that my successor will continue this strong legacy. If anything, international research administration will continue to increase in importance in the years ahead and all research administrators should build their basic expertise in the area. You never know when you will need it.

James Casey is Chair of the International Neighborhood and serves as Director of Contracts and Industrial Agreements at The University of Texas at San Antonio.
At institutions where compliance with export control regulations is hinged upon the ability to conduct research activities as fundamental research (as defined in the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) and the Export Administration Regulations (EAR)), it can at times be a trying task to negotiate terms and conditions with a sponsor that allow for open publication and dissemination of project results and do not restrict a project’s participants to U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

For contract awards that are subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), the review process includes close scrutiny of each FAR clause to ensure that these principles are intact. Specific to contract awards from Department of Defense (DoD) agencies, negotiation may include the request for deletion of clauses such as DFAR 252.204-7000 (Disclosure of Information) (December 1991), which mandates prior approval by the awarding agency for any releases of project information outside of the recipient institution. In contrast, DFAR Clause 252.204-7009 (Requirements Regarding Potential Access to Export-Controlled Items) (July 2008) is desirable provision to have incorporated in a Federal contract, as it further supports an institution’s position of being fundamental research. The clause sets forth that the parties do not anticipate that the institution will generate or need access to export-controlled items, and further – should the circumstances change – the provision provides for the ability to negotiate a contract modification to eliminate the requirement for performance of work that would involve export-controlled items.

The Library section of the Pre-Award Neighborhood website has reference tools to aid in the review of FAR-based contracts, which were graciously made available to the NCURA community by some of its member institutions. Additionally, other useful resources are available to aid in tackling the many contractual issues that can arise in the negotiation of award terms and conditions.

Kevin Stewart is a member of the Pre-award Neighborhood Subcommittee and serves as Sponsored Projects Officer, University of California-Santa Barbara.

Why it is Important for Research Administrators at Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions to Participate Actively

As the red and golden leaves start to fall here I sit with a pile of notes and handouts, trying to summarize for a report all that I learned at NCURA’s national meeting. How can I convey not just the core content of the sessions I attended, but also the incomparable value of three full days with my research administration colleagues from across the country? For those of us who work at predominantly undergraduate institutions the opportunity to attend lively discussion groups, participate in conversations at the breakfast and luncheon tables, compare policies and strategies with sponsored research administrators with more years of experience, and quite simply to spend time with our peers is invaluable.

Within the PUI neighborhood we have a great variety of institutions. Our membership ranges from research administrators at public and private comprehensive universities with thousands of students, hundreds of faculty, and millions in federal funds to independent residential colleges with PIs and grants that balance teaching and scholarship to community colleges with multiple campuses, diverse student populations, and more programmatic than research-intensive sponsored projects. Despite this diversity our work has many common characteristics. More often than not PUI sponsored programs offices have small staffs – sometimes only a single person – and our responsibilities frequently cover both pre- and post-award, some financial administration, as well as most compliance matters. PUI research administrators tend to be spread thin and to have limited resources for the wide extent of work we do. On any given day we can find ourselves reviewing grant proposals, leading workshops, assisting with budget preparation, evaluating expenditures, answering questions from the IRB chair, compiling award documents for auditors, discussing federal and agency regulations with PIs, requesting a no-cost extension, and working on close-out materials.

Although our responsibilities can be much broader than our colleagues at research universities, our work has the same dual nature. Each day we strive to serve our institutions and uphold sponsors’ regulations and requirements. We need to be at our professional best for the work we do, and we can’t do that alone.

Membership and participation in NCURA is essential for research administrators at PUIs. In a variety of ways it contributes to our professional development, assisting us in maintaining current knowledge in the field, including the very necessary awareness of funding opportunities and thorough understanding of agency and federal-wide policies. NCURA offers us both the range of educational opportunities found at the national meeting, and it provides more intensive, focused training, such as the Sponsored

continued on page 19
"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times," these words from Charles Dickens “Tale of Two Cities” quite succinctly sum up the year many of us in research administration have faced in the era of travel restrictions and furloughs, as offset by the advent of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) which caused an “ARRA-lanche” of new research opportunities and an unprecedented number of new rules and regulations.

It is during these challenges (and challenge grants) that over 1,700 NCURA members found a brief respite at the NCURA 51st Annual Meeting “One World Connected Through Research” held October 21st – October 24th, 2009 at the Marriott Wardman Hotel in Washington, DC. This year, the traditional Sunday workshops shifted to Wednesday, October 21st where NCURA continued its commitment to traditional core essentials tailored to help attendees rapidly assimilate professional fundamental knowledge in an interactive format. The Wednesday evening banquet offered an opportunity for attendees to network with their friends and colleagues, as well as provided us with humorous insight into the differences between men and women (as seen through the eyes of Dave Barry)!

Dr. Neil Turok, Executive Director of the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, presented a thought-provoking keynote address on the origins of the universe and the importance of science and mathematics in our lives. As the founder of the African Institute for Mathematics Sciences (AIMS), Dr. Turok shared his vision of connecting talented students with world-class researchers with the possibility of the next Einstein being African.

In addition to the diverse topics offered in both concurrent sessions and discussion groups, attendees were also given the prospect of four science sessions to learn more about the scientists (and science) that we support and ten cases studies that enabled attendees to discuss in-depth a specific topic of interest.

Of course, no annual meeting would be the same without a celebration, and celebrate we did – 70's style – at the “TGIF” party. The highlight of this “groovy” celebration was recognizing Soul Source and the No-Cost Extensions for twenty incredible years of Rock & Roll.

The 51st annual meeting provided both opportunities for professional and personal growth, as well as time to reconnect with friends and colleagues from the U.S. and abroad.

Please visit NCURA’s Volunteer(s) of the Month website at http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/volunteer_of_the_month.php where this month’s recognition highlights the 51st Annual Meeting volunteers who gave of their time at the NCURA Services Desk, Store, Hospitality & CPE Booth, E-Check-in Stations, and/or as Annual Meeting and Night of Networking Greeters, Power Walk Leader, and the NCURA Tech Team.
NCURA Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration recipient Marianne Woods, University of Texas at San Antonio

Keynote Speaker Dr. Neil Turok, Executive Director, Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics

Annual Meeting Co-chairs Tony Ventimiglia, Auburn University and Michelle Vazin, Vanderbilt University

Dave Richardson, Pennsylvania State University and Neil Turok, Cambridge University

NCURA 51st Annual Meeting Program Committee: Row 1, L-R: Tony Ventimiglia, Auburn University; Michelle Vazin, Vanderbilt University; Dave Richardson, Pennsylvania State University; Brian Squilla, University of Pennsylvania. Row 2, L-R: Candyce Lindsay, Arizona State University; Samantha Westcott, California Institute of Technology; Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana; Pam Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington (retired); Suzanne Rivera, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas; Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico; Pat Green, Vanderbilt University; Kallie Firestone, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Christa Johnson, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville; David Kennedy, Council on Governmental Relations (COGR). Row 3, L-R: Bruce Morgan, University of California-Irvine; Dan Nordquist, Washington State University

Joseph F. Carrabino Award Recipient Marcia Hahn, National Institutes of Health, and Distinguished Service Award recipients James Casey, The University of Texas at San Antonio; David Mayo, California Institute of Technology; Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii; Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota; and Pam Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington (retired)
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2009 NCURA Board of Directors: Row 1, L-R: Heather Offhaus, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor; Gunta Liders, University of Rochester; David Mayo, California Institute of Technology; Denise Clark, University of Maryland College Park; Dave Richardson, Pennsylvania State University; Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii; Brian Squilla, University of Pennsylvania; Row 2, L-R: Tommy Coggins, University of South Carolina; Susan Wyatt Sedwick, University of Texas at Austin; Matt Berry, University of Oklahoma Norman Campus; Robert Lowman, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Brenda Kavanaugh, University of Rochester; Tom Roberts, Florida Gulf Coast University; Kathi Deleboy, Colorado State University; Barbara Siegel, Huron Consulting Group; Kathleen Larmett, NCURA

NCURA Past Secretaries and Treasurers: Row 1, L-R: Julia Jacobsen, Sweet Briar College; Marjorie Forster, University of Maryland Baltimore; Denise Clark, University of Maryland College Park; Row 2, L-R: Nan Wells, College of St. El; Cheryl-Lee Howard, Johns Hopkins University; Richard Seligman, California Institute of Technology; Kerry Peluso, Emory University; Cindy White, Belmont University; Laura Wade, University of Houston – TX Center for Superconductivity; Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota; Tommy Coggins, University of South Carolina

Award-winning author and humorist Dave Barry

N CURA President, Denise Clark and N CURA Vice President/President-elect and Chair, 51st Annual Meeting, Dave Richardson

2009 NCURA Leadership Development Institute Class: Row 1, L-R: Roseanne Luongo, Harvard University; Cheryl Anderson, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas; Carolyn Elliott-Farino, Kennesaw State University; Row 2, L-R: Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana, Chair, Nominating and Leadership Development Committee; Greg Luttrell, University of Notre Dame; Joyce Ferland, Brown University; Charna Howson, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; David Ngo, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Jeff Ritchie, Aurora Health Care; Pam Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington (retired), Vice-Chair, Nominating and Leadership Development Committee

NCURA Staff Members: Row 1, L-R: Marc Schiffman, Pegay Lowry, Carrie Donahue, Steven Caldwell, Kathleen Larmett, Ivone Wells; Row 2, L-R: Stephanie McJury, Kim Goldson, Julio Hernandez, Jose Navas; Row 3, L-R: Latasha Johnson, Tara Bishop, Neo Abreu-Hernandez; Row 4, L-R: Elise Fritz, Myrta Stager
Projects Administration and Financial Research Administration traveling workshops. Throughout the year the neighborhood lists offer a network of peers and an invaluable resource for our daily work.

The knowledge we gain from participation in NCURA helps us serve our predominantly undergraduate institutions across the range of our responsibilities. What we learn from our colleagues enables us to maintain compliance (financial and non-financial) and avoid the types of mistakes that could lead to audit findings, especially at this time when the number and extent of federal and agency audits is increasing. Quite simply, NCURA makes it possible for us to manage our full range of work more efficiently and effectively.

At the same time research administrators at PUIs also have much to offer our other NCURA colleagues. We often have a broader perspective on research administration than those at larger institutions because we are both generalists and specialists who need comprehensive knowledge as well as areas of expertise. Because of the size of our institutions we are closely connected to faculty PIs in dozens of disciplines and to managers of sponsored programs in many fields and parts of the campus. These differences make it vital for us to have input into both NCURA’s programming and into federal policy development.

Because we have certain types of professional needs and our institutions have somewhat different missions than research-intensive universities, it is important for us to be active and to contribute. If you’re a member of the PUI neighborhood and you haven’t signed on to the email list, please do so; you have a network of colleagues who are eager to offer their advice and insight and who would welcome your contributions. If you haven’t attended a national or regional meeting or a traveling workshop, try to get to one. NCURA is the vibrant organization that it is because of volunteers within its membership, and active participation by members from all types of PUIs can strengthen it further and give back some of what we’ve gained from it over the years.

Sally Southwick is a member of the PUI Neighborhood Subcommittee and serves as Associate Director, Corporation and Foundation Relations, Bates College.

Advertisement

Vice President For Research

The University of Louisiana at Lafayette invites applications and nominations for the position of Vice President for Research. The University of Louisiana at Lafayette is one of eight publicly supported universities in the University of Louisiana System. Our university consists of eight degree-granting colleges and the Graduate School. The University’s enrollment is 16,300, and it employs 618 full-time faculty. At present the university offers 78 undergraduate degrees, 27 master’s degrees, and 9 doctorates. Over the past decade the university has had rapid growth in research funding from external agencies and has a research park which serves as the campus for various facilities. Additional information about UL Lafayette is available at www.louisiana.edu.

The individual holding this position reports directly to the Provost and has the following areas of responsibility:

- Continuing the growth in the University’s research mission through vision and leadership.
- Building alliances with business and governmental entities that lead to increased resources for the university.
- Coordinating the activities of the university in the area of research including identifying on-campus research efforts, promoting selected research opportunities, and identifying national trends in which the university should participate.
- Directing efforts of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.
- Overseeing the efforts of the University Research Park and University Research Centers.
- Working with industries and federal, state and local agencies to support campus projects.
- Recommending campus-wide research policies to the Provost.
- Serving on various university and state committees directed to the maintenance of quality in research.
- Supporting technology transfer and economic development activities of the university.

Qualifications include: an earned doctorate from an accredited institution; a visionary leader capable of working well with departments, college deans, business leaders, and government agencies at all levels; and excellent communication skills. The ideal candidate must be a proven leader in the development of successful R&D organizations; be able to demonstrate previous administrative success; and be supportive of economic development and conversant with technology and technology transfer issues.

Candidates should send a PDF electronic letter of application containing a statement of their professional philosophy as it relates to research and economic development; a résumé; and the names and addresses of five references to:

Dr. Bradd Clark, Chairman
QSN Committee for Vice President for Research
nrn@louisiana.edu

For full description of position, please visit http://infotech.louisiana.edu/vacancies/EEO-PR1-09.pdf. Screening of applications will begin on February 8, 2010, and will continue until the position is filled.

The University of Louisiana at Lafayette is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer
was great to see many of you at the 51st NCURA National Meeting in DC. Region I had 158 attendees, including our 3 Region I travel award winners Estelle Lang, Brown University, Heather Dominy, Brown University and Katie Newhall, Marine Biological Labs. At our annual business meeting we provided committee updates, fiscal update and took the opportunity to thank our outgoing Officers (Bethanne Giehl outgoing treasurer, Tom Egan outgoing Immediate Past Chair, Franc Lemire outgoing Chair, and Barbara Siegel, outgoing Region I Elected Board Member) for their service. We also announced our new officers Kevin Brodrick- Treasurer and Bethanne Giehl Chair Elect who will begin their terms on January 1st. Region I attendees could be spotted throughout the meeting wearing their flashing lighthouse pins in support of the spring meeting which is scheduled from April 25-28 at the Sheraton Harborside Portsmouth Hotel and Conference Center, in Portsmouth New Hampshire.

We will be holding the final RAGD meeting of the year on December 16. This will be our holiday celebration, and our guest speaker will be Marcia Hahn from NIH. We are very excited to be finishing the year on such a high note.

We have made a lot of progress in 2009 with Franc Lemire as our Chair. Franc convened a website committee for Region I which has successfully launched our new independent website. We have also created a volunteer webmaster position which is currently held by Estelle Lang from Brown University who has done an outstanding job. Region I is proposing changes to the Bylaws to add the position of Treasurer Elect and to accommodate other administrative changes. The addition of this position will increase opportunity for members to participate in regional leadership and it will insure a smooth transition to the role of treasurer. Please keep an eye out for this important email, and make sure that you vote.

We are looking forward to an exciting new year with some new members to the Advisory Committee and new Standing Committee chairs who can bring some fresh ideas to Region I. If you are interested in volunteer opportunities please contact Randi Wasik (2009 VMC Chair) or Kris Monanhan (2010 VMC chair). We will provide an updated listing of Regional Leadership and volunteer opportunities in the next edition.

Susan Zipkin is the Chair of Region I and serves as the Director of Radiology Research Finance at Brigham and Women’s Hospital.
selected as a result of our call for topics in November, so feel free to contact any member of the Program Committee to volunteer.

I have spent the last two years getting to know our regional membership and I have enjoyed every minute. From my fellow officers to the numerous volunteers, it has been a pleasure working with you and I look forward to future NCURA endeavors. Happy Holidays!

Alexandra A. McKeown is Chair of Region II and serves as Associate Dean for Research Administration at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.

REGION III

Southeast

www.ncurarregioniii.com

It is with great sadness that Region III acknowledges the passing of one of its members and leaders on October 28 of this year. Carol Cook retired from the University of Florida after being a member of NCURA for many years. She served as Region III Secretary-Treasurer from 1988-1990 and then as Region III Chair from 1991-1992. Nancy Wilkinson, University of Florida, who in 1992-1993 followed Carol as chair and in 2000 served as NCURA's president, remembers Carol's encouragement and support: "Carol mentored a lot of us and helped get us moving into leadership roles on behalf of NCURA." Let Region III honor Carol's memory by continuing to embrace the profession, get involved and mentor others. NCURA and Region III are what WE make of it!

Region III's approach to the annual meeting reflected the value we place on leadership, service, and collegial support. The annual meeting was co-chaired by two Region III members, Michelle Vazin of Vanderbilt University and Tony Ventimiglia of Auburn University. Three Region III members served on the Program Committee: David Brady of Virginia Tech, Pat Green of Vanderbilt, and Pam Whitlock of University of North Carolina at Wilmington (retired). Sixty program offerings, including workshops, concurrent sessions, and discussion groups, were led by a presenter or co-presenter from our region.

Congratulations are in order for several Region III members who were recognized at the Annual Meeting. Carolyn Elliott-Farino of Kennesaw State University and Charna Howson of University of North Carolina at Greensboro received certificates of completion for the 2009 Leadership Development Institute (LDI). For his outstanding contributions to the field of research administration, Tommy Coggins, University of South Carolina, received the Region III Senior Service Award, presented by Tony Ventimiglia, Immediate Region III Past Chair, at 10:30pm on Thursday, October 22nd in the Region III Hospitality Suite. Congratulations to Carolyn, Charna, and Tommy! Region III is proud of your accomplishments.

In addition to providing leadership in organizing and programming, members can also be proud of Region III's contribution to rocking the house. No annual meeting would be complete without a performance by NCURA's own party band, which includes five Region III members: Steve Smartt, Pat Green, and Jerry Fife of Vanderbilt University, Tim Conlon of University of Virginia, and Region III Chair-Elect Jennifer Shambrook of St. Jude Hospital. Region III Chair Jill Frazier Tinchker served as an honorary Soul Sister followed by Pat Green of Vanderbilt University serving as a Blues Brother. We look forward to their next performance at the Region III meeting in Memphis. A live video capture of "Mustang Sally" will be available soon on YouTube.

Region III recognizes that it is just as important to welcome newcomers as it is to congratulate long-serving members. To strengthen our outreach to the 48 new members who registered to attend the Annual Meeting, we tried something different this year. We decided to conduct the New Member Orientation in our hospitality suite immediately prior to the NCURA Pre-Banquet Reception and Banquet at 5:30 on Wednesday, October 21st. New members who attended the orientation were able to become acquainted with a few colleagues and to feel more comfortable and included as they walked into the reception and banquet together. The outreach effort was a success! The Region III leadership encourages all members to help us build on this success by looking for opportunities to reach out to new members at the upcoming regional meeting in Memphis. A small, meaningful gesture that makes a newcomer feel welcome is a great way to contribute to the success of Region III.

Laura Letchter and Sam Gannon serve as Region III's newsletter contributors. Laura is Director of Proposal Development for the Office of Grants and Contracts at Kennesaw State University. Sam is Education and Training Manager for the Office of Grants and Contracts at Vanderbilt University Medical Center.

REGION IV

Mid-America

www.ncurarregioniv.com

Region IV is still glowing with the knowledge and camaraderie gained from attending the 51st Annual Meeting this past October. The national meeting truly lived up to its theme: "One World Connected through Research." It celebrated what all of us as research administrators have in common: the science!

A scientific keynote and several new Science Sessions, which shared the expertise and experience of scholars, were prominently featured. Participants gained an understanding and appreciation for the work they routinely support.

In addition to science, a multitude of pre- and post-award sessions were enjoyed by beginners and senior level administrators alike. Region IV also hosted a "D.C. After Dark Tour", a group dinner, and the popular, "new member" reception. Let's not forget the memorable "TGP" party, which more than lived up to the flashy style of the 1970s! Finally, the new decompression sessions presented a nice platform for any remaining questions to be addressed.

Soon the Annual Meeting "glow" will turn into a sparkling holiday season for all NCURA members. Yet, like many of our colleagues, Region IV is already looking ahead to next year. Our Spring meeting will be held in Omaha April 25 – 28, 2010. Christa Johnson and her program committee are currently working on an outstanding agenda. We look forward to learning more and welcoming in a shining 2010!

Jaynee Tolle is Chair of Region IV and is a Senior Grant Administrator at the University of Cincinnati. Natalie Goodwin-Frank is Chair of the Region IV Communications Committee and is the Manager of the Photosynthetic Antenna Research Center (PARC) at Washington University.

continued on next page ➤
The 2009 Annual Meeting went very well although it did take some getting used to with all the changes this year. I always enjoy seeing old friends and meeting new ones and a good time was had by all in our shared Hospitality Suite with Region II.

The Region was very well represented in the awards area with Marianne Rinaldo Woods of The University of Texas – San Antonio receiving the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award and James Casey of The University of Texas – San Antonio receiving the Distinguished Service Award. We also watched our member Cheryl Anderson of University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas graduate from the Leadershhip Development Institute. Congratulations to all of you.

At the Business Meeting held on Friday afternoon it was reported that the Executive Committee had decided to increase the Spring travel awards to $750 each and to add a new appointed position of Historian which Matt Berry has agreed to fill. Kathryn Schoonover of Northeastern State University was recognized as the travel award winner for the annual meeting. Many door prizes were given out and Valarie Hutchison of University of Texas Health Science Center was the winner of the free Spring meeting registration.

Wishing each of you very Happy Holidays.

Gail Davis is Chair of Region V and serves as Director of Contracts and Grants at Lamar University.

REGION VI

During this year’s outstanding 51st Annual Meeting, Region VI proudly launched its new professional development program, a regional mentorship program called LEAD Me, at a reception honoring the nine pairs of primary mentors and mentees selected to participate in the inaugural program. LEAD Me is adapted from NCURA’s successful Leadership Development Institute. A distinguishing feature, however, is the use of multiple short-term mentors (volunteers still needed!) to ensure that mentees are afforded an opportunity to maximize having their needs for specialized knowledge and skills addressed. The nine primary mentor/mentee pairs are listed below:

- Rosemary Madnick, Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute/Ella Taylor, Western Oregon University
- Ann Pollack, University of California, Los Angeles/Kristin Martinez, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center
- Linda Patton, California State University, Fullerton/Perilla Johnson-Woodward, Charles Drew University of Medicine & Science
- Maggie Griscavage, University of Alaska, Fairbanks/Sharyl Kasarskis, Research Corporation of the University of Hawaii
- Joyce Freedman, Independent Consultant/Cecelia Manoochehri, California Institute of Technology
- Debbie Caulfield, University of California, San Francisco/Derick Jones, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center
- Joyce Freedman, Independent Consultant/Heather Kubinec, The Broad Foundation
- Sinh Simmons, University of Washington/Mitali Ravindrakumar, Centers for Creative Technologies
- Cecelia Manoochehri, California Institute of Technology/Rene Remillard, Portland State University

I very much enjoyed reconnecting with Region VI members and meeting several of our new members at the annual meeting. Kudos to Region VI members for your very active, visible participation in the annual meeting.

Best wishes for a happy holiday season!

Julie Guggino is Chair of Region VI and serves as Associate Director of Research at Central Washington University.

REGION VII

It seems hard to believe that a month has already passed since our 51st Annual Meeting was held in Washington, D.C. The program built around the theme “One World Connected Through Research” was enjoyed by 89 Region VII members, approximately 1/4th of our membership! It was terrific to see so many members in attendance. Travel awards were given to Colleen Hunter from the University of Montana and Marilyn Morrissey from Colorado State University.

If you were not able to join us in D.C. in October, I want you to know we were pleased to introduce new officers for the Rocky Mountain Region. Tim Edwards, University of Montana will be Chair-Elect; Christine Pacheo, University of New Mexico is our new Secretary/Treasurer; and Kimberly Page, Boise State University will serve as Member-at-Large. They will begin their terms on January 1, 2010.

As we look forward to a new year, please be sure to mark your calendars for our Regions VI & VII Joint Spring Meeting to be held at the Newport Beach Marriott Hotel and Spa, Newport Beach, California on April 18-21, 2010. Best Wishes to all Region VII members for a Happy, Healthy Holiday Season!!!

Dianne Horrocks is Chair of Region VII and serves as Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at Idaho State University.
The Principles of Human Subjects Research Continued from 12

may help to further the understanding of the research topic by contributing to generalizable knowledge so that others may benefit from the finding in the future. If there is neither a direct benefit to the participant nor a contribution to generalizable knowledge, then even though risks may be low or even non-existent, conducting the study would violate the principle of beneficence. Risks and benefits are not only physical, but can also be psychological, legal, economic or social. In fact, in most social and behavioral research, the greatest risk is that associated with a potential breach of confidentiality that could cause participants harm if their personally identifiable information became known to persons outside of the research team. As a part of the review process the IRB must evaluate whether or not all risk to subjects have been minimized, if risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits to subjects or the knowledge that may be obtained, adequate provisions are made for monitoring data to ensure the safety of subjects and that confidentiality is maintained. The IRB also makes a judgment about the overall risk level of every protocol. This judgment is usually binary in nature in that the risk can be determined to be greater than minimal risk or not greater than minimal risk. For most cases, minimal risk is defined in 45 CFR 46 as the point where “the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.” This determination has practical consequences for the allowability of waiving or altering the consent process to not include some required elements, waiving the requirement for written documentation of consent, the involvement of minors and methods of parental permission, and the involvement of prisoners and pregnant women in research.

Keep in mind that just because a study is not greater than minimal risk, does not mean that risks have been minimized. Consider as an example of a not greater than minimal risk study, one that involves a records review where the research team already has access to the records. In this case additional procedure such as the use of a code in place of names may still need to be implemented for the research data in order to minimize confidentiality risks.

The following areas in 45 CFR 46.111 deal with the principle of beneficence:

(1) Risks to subjects are minimized: (i) By using procedures which are consistent with sound research design and which do not unnecessarily expose subjects to risk, and (ii) whenever appropriate, by using procedures already being performed on the subjects for diagnostic or treatment purposes.

(2) Risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits, if any, to subjects, and the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result.

(6) When appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provision for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of subjects.

(7) When appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of data.

The third Belmont principle, justice, involves the selection of research subjects. It not only requires that there must be fair selection procedures resulting in fair selection outcomes but also seeks to ensure that the burden of participation in research is distributed over the populations that will benefit from the research. Research that will benefit all of society should therefore not be arbitrarily restricted to only one subset of society based on gender, age, ethnic background, or other such criteria. This does not mean that research participation cannot be restricted to specific groups, but rather that the restriction should not be merely for the convenience of the researcher. There must be a scientifically valid reason for limiting participation to or specifically targeting recruitment efforts toward a specific population (e.g., restricting a study on the effects of a spouse’s death to only one gender could be problematic in terms of the justice of a study whereas restricting most research on pregnancy to women would be scientifically justified).

The following area in 45 CFR 46.111 deals primarily with the principle of justice:

(3) Selection of subjects is equitable. In making this assessment the IRB should take into account the purposes of the research and the setting in which the research will be conducted and should be particularly cognizant of the special problems of research involving vulnerable populations, such as children, prisoners, pregnant women, mentally disabled persons, or economically or educationally disadvantaged persons.

As research is an ongoing activity, the continued participation of human subjects will be essential to further scientific advances. The opportunity to engage in human subject research is a privilege that should not be taken lightly. As research administrators it is important to understand the principles outlined in this article and to use these principles as a starting point in developing an understanding of human research protection requirements. By doing so, research administrators will be better able to assist investigators in the development of research protocols that protect participants’ rights and welfare and consequently meet the requirements of their local IRB.

Erin Bailey is the Departmental Research Administrator for the Buffalo Center for Social Research at the University at Buffalo School of Social Work and is a member for the Social and Behavioral Sciences IRB. She is also a member of the LDI class of 2010.

Christian Marks holds a Ph.D. from the State University of New York at Buffalo. He is a Certified IRB Professional and has served as the Social and Behavioral Sciences IRB Administrator for the past seven years.
Immigration Issues 101 for Research Administrators

by Susan Wyatt Sedwick

Why should immigration issues be of any concern to research administrators? The processing of international visas is one of the few things we don’t have on our plates right now, but spotting an immigration issue up front can help avoid issues down the line that could delay or even derail a research project. The types of non-immigrant visas can most assuredly be described as alphabet soup. However, familiarity with different visa classifications is critical to advising faculty on even as simple an issue as whether a post-doc can be moved to a different program.

Below is a brief summary of non-immigrant visas commonly held by our foreign national students, employees and visitors. Non-immigrant dependents including spouses accompanying non-immigrants on these visas will hold a visa beginning with the same letter followed by a “2” e.g. a J-2 visa would be the spouse of an exchange visitor.

- **B-1/B-2: Visitor for Business/ Pleasure**: Visitors on these visas may accept honorarium and/or reimbursement for travel but cannot be paid a salary. While these visas are fairly easy to obtain and the process is expedient, the visitor must provide proof of an academic or business purpose for the visit which is limited to six (6) months, renewable for up to 12 months. In addition, if the visitor is being paid an honorarium, the length of stay at a single institution is limited to nine days.

- **F-1: Academic Students**: These visas are available to foreign national students with indication of adequate English proficiency who have been admitted to an academic program of study at an institution in the U.S. These students must provide evidence of financial viability for the length of their course of study. Students with F-1 visas may remain in the U.S. as long as they are making academic progress. A post-degree practical training extension for up to 12 months is permitted with approval. F-1 visa holders are permitted to work on-campus and, in cases of unexpected need, may be employed off-campus. However, special employment approvals are required, so work closely with your international office to ensure proper authorization is secured. In addition, a spouse traveling under an F-2 visa may not work in the U.S. Finally, F-1 visitors may change status or program of study but Federal agencies interested in national security issues have raised concerns when that occurs.

- **J-1: Exchange Visitor**: (professors, researchers and students) – These visas are issued to: (a) foreign national students who have been invited to participate in an academic program in the U.S. with sponsorship and evidence of adequate financial support for the length of that program; and (b) foreign national professors and researchers who have been invited to teach, lecture or conduct research. There is no limit on the amount of income for on- or off-campus work with the sponsor and an accompanying spouse on a J-2 visa may work, but an off-campus work permit is difficult to obtain, especially for work in industry. Students under J-1 visas may earn unlimited income for off-campus work with a sponsor but they may not be self-funded and may not change program of study. The student and dependents may remain in the United States as long as academic progress continues and the visa(s) may be extended for up to 18 months for additional academic training. Post docs may qualify for an extension of up to 36 months. Professors and researchers on these visas must provide an indication of adequate financial support for the length of their program with a maximum stay of up to three (3) years and a two-year home residence requirement may apply. J-1 exchange visitors may not change their program objective. Finally, visitors with a J-1 visa have insurance requirements that may be a potential issue if a sponsored award doesn’t allow or limits fringe benefits charges.

- **H-1B: Temporary Worker (Specialty Occupations in fields requiring highly specialized knowledge)**: Foreign national visitors who possess a professional degree and specialized skills may fill temporary positions requiring their professional skills even though the foreign national may have a long term intent to immigrate. H-1B visa workers are not subject to a home country residence requirement and may earn unlimited income from the university but must be paid a prevailing wage. The visa is issued for an initial period of up to three (3) years but extensions for longer stays are available.

- **O-1: Extraordinary Ability in Sciences, Arts, Education, Business and Athletics**: These visas are available to those who possess a professional degree and skills, and demonstrate extraordinary ability. Unlimited income from the university is allowed; however, employment is temporary with an initial period of three (3) years, renewable annually. These visas are harder to acquire and require extra documentation of special ability. The US Department of State announced in June efforts to address the unreasonable delays and backlog in visa processing, with a goal of two-week processing time for routine requests. That announcement was greeted with
support from academia. Faster processing will hopefully alleviate the situations where researchers in the US on visas who leave the US have been stranded abroad and will hopefully ameliorate the visa difficulties that have discouraged scientific organizations from holding meetings in the United States.

Finally, border and Customs searches of electronic devices have raised concerns for all researchers traveling abroad. Various directives govern the manner in which these searches may be conducted. Such searches do not require the consent of the arriving traveler, or that suspicion be directed specifically at that person. The device may be detained or information may be copied for further review so the original information may be returned to the traveler. Generally such reviews must be completed within 30 days unless outside assistance is employed by the government. However, the search must be completed within a reasonable time and confidential business information and medical information must be protected appropriately. Supervisory approval is required for a device to be retained by the government after the traveler is released.

Privacy Act protections apply in these situations. The search must be transparent to the traveler with the purpose of the search or reasons for the retention of information or the device disclosed to the traveler at the time of the search or retention. The government must minimize the intrusion, limit use of the information or device to the purpose of the search, maintain the quality and integrity of the data and is accountable for the security of the device and/or data. It is imperative that researchers who possess sensitive information know what they are carrying on their laptops when traveling abroad.

Last but far from least, institutions that allow research involving export controlled information must monitor foreign visitors to research laboratories using or developing export controlled technology. Visiting scientists and scholars along with their employing entity should be screened against the Denied Parties and Specifically Designated National lists.

Susan Wyatt Sedwick is Associate Vice President for Research and Director, Office of Sponsored Projects at The University of Texas at Austin.
Creating a University-HMO Partnership in the CTSA
by Christopher Kelleher

Introduction
In October 2006, NIH began the Clinical and Translational Science Awards (CTSA) program with the announcement of 12 centers across the country. In the three years since then, the CTSA Consortium has grown to 46 members and next year it will reach a final size of 60. In addition to increasing the pace and quality of clinical and translational research, the CTSA program intends to transform research in the United States by streamlining research processes and creating novel partnerships between institutions. The Oregon Clinical and Translational Research Institute (OCTRI) is one of the original 12 CTSA and remains one of the more ambitious endeavors because it aims to create a close partnership between an academic medical center (AMC) and the research arm of a large Health Maintenance Organization (HMO).

Oregon Health and Science University (OHSU), founded in 1887, and now among the top 20 universities in NIH funding, boasts over a thousand investigators and remains Oregon’s sole AMC. Kaiser Permanente Northwest is a non-profit group-model HMO with 475,000 members and 1,300 clinicians. Since 1965, it has been home to the Center for Health Research (KPCHR), an autonomous research entity that receives the vast majority of its funding from the NIH and has 38 full-time investigators who specialize in health services research and epidemiology.

From the outset, the organizations agreed that the purpose of their partnership was to extend and complement one another, not simply take advantage of each other’s resources. That meant pursuing full scientific collaborations that built on the unique research strengths of OHSU and KPCHR. Moreover, the organizations dedicated themselves to creating a joint leadership structure and processes designed both to span and reduce the organizational divide. It’s important to recognize that this was not just new territory in Oregon. Because OCTRI was among the first 12 CTSA, there were literally no precedents to look to as examples. And because no similar University-HMO partnerships had ever been created, there were no models to follow. Academic medical centers and HMOS are very different creatures, and any marriage between them requires patience and creativity in addressing differences in culture and business philosophy.

When creating OCTRI, we recognized that there was little chance of our accurately predicting the exact types of research that were most likely to thrive within the partnership. As expected, therefore, the first years were characterized by systematic probing of investigator populations at both institutions. We used opportunities for pilot funding and the provision of in-kind support for research development, along with the development of interest groups and other forms of outreach to “prime the pump.” By capitalizing on and learning from the successes of that initial period, we have refined the partnership’s focus. Improved targeting of effort and resources has produced a higher investment-to-reward ratio.

What follows is an exploration of the initial steps, early challenges, key innovations, and important lessons learned in establishing one of the nation’s first Clinical and Translational Research Institutes. Subsequent articles will examine an investigator’s perspective, creating an evaluation program to measure CTSA success, and the evolution of an institute facing its first competitive renewal.

Structures & Implementation
In first establishing OCTRI’s investigator-support structures, we attempted to forecast investigator demand. However, because we didn’t know what types of research would thrive within the partnership, we had no way to predict precisely what structures would be best suited to facilitate that research. Unsurprisingly, the first 1-2 years were characterized by experimentation and adaptation. Frequently, this meant adapting on the fly as we watched our “good on paper” processes play out in the real world.

In some key respects, OHSU and Kaiser are mirror opposites of one another. To over-simplify somewhat: OHSU has a large number of investigators but a small number of patients while KPNW has a small number of investigators but a large and well defined patient population. It was clear at the inception of OCTRI that this dynamic offered great potential by making the two organizations complementary. We expected that the sheer difference in investigator numbers would produce a certain “from-OHSU” tilt — more scientific interest flowing into Kaiser with its rich patient and data resources than in the opposite direction. Nevertheless, when we “opened for business,” the steepness of that tilt was surprising.

Building Relationships with Investigators
OCTRI came into being at a time when rapidly evolving compliance standards made it difficult for investigators to navigate regulatory requirements, particularly when attempting to initiate projects outside their home institutions. OCTRI was dedicated to assisting investigators, but an unintended consequence of OCTRI’s playing this intermediary role was that investigators often associated the new institute with...
the compliance rules it was attempting to interpret on the investigator’s behalf. For instance, when OCTRI staff told an investigator, “you aren’t permitted to do X,” it often came across as OCTRI itself not permitting X. Moreover, investigators who had previously conducted inter-institutional research with few difficulties discovered a more arduous terrain and identified the increased difficulty with OCTRI. As a branding strategy, this left much to be desired.

The need for careful branding (or, initially, a recognition of the costs of poor branding) was itself an important discovery. Although the term “branding” might carry a connotation of superficiality or commercialism that is inconsistent with scientific endeavor, our experience demonstrates that effective branding is essential to the success of any new research enterprise — particularly one that depends on convincing a diverse population to embrace new relationships, practices, and attitudes.

Ironically, the very positive public relations splash made by the partnership at the founding of OCTRI lead to negative public relations post-implementation. The news of a very large and groundbreaking award to form a unique partnership created the not unreasonable impression that new streamlined paths already existed. But agreeing to streamline is not the same as being streamlined. Agreeing to reach close alignment is not the same as being closely aligned. And agreeing to facilitate high-impact science is not the same as having well-calibrated structures and practices to make it happen.

Moreover, there was the sense that an award of such size — $55 million over 5 years — must translate into robust financial support for cross-institutional projects. OHSU investigators accustomed to receiving subsidized research support from the General Clinical Research Center (the predecessor grant to the CTSA) assumed that similar resources were now available for clinical research at Kaiser. In fact, OCTRI was structured to provide support for developing cross-institutional projects and did not have the ability to subsidize actual study activities. The result was a frequent mismatch between expectations and capacity.

Systems built up over decades at an academic medical center often presume the presence of a responsible investigator within the organization who can take responsibility for a project’s scientific integrity, budget management, and regulatory compliance. By working with organizational leaders, OCTRI was able to smooth some of these paths. For example, OCTRI brokered new systems for verifying compliance certifications across the organizations, eliminating the need for investigators to provide verifications themselves and reducing staff work within both IRBs.

OCTRI also provided support for interpreting and complying with the organizational requirements of the two organizations, including preparing IRB applications for selected researchers and serving as a liaison with compliance officers. But neither organization could reasonably be expected to abandon well-established business and compliance policies and hold cross-institutional researchers to lesser standards than investigators within the home organization. So while OCTRI was able to streamline the infrastructure and provide hands-on assistance to researchers, there were fixed dynamics working against any project that did not possess a responsible partner at both organizations.

Innovations and Evolution

One of OCTRI’s key innovations was to create an office called the Front Door that would provide investigators with a single point of entry for accessing the Institute’s services and requesting its assistance. This was not a partnership-specific structure but was cross-staffed at both organizations and designed to function as a “research concierge” that could answer questions, connect collaborators, and coordinate services.

The Front Door was paired with a program called Investigator Support and Integration Services (ISIS) that was dedicated to streamlining compliance processes within and between the organizations while also providing investigators with hands-on support. We saw this as an essential function given the number of projects that tended to bog down because of compliance-related confusion and mistakes. Anyone with experience in implementing or conducting research knows that these challenges are by no means unique to cross-institutional collaborations — but the need to navigate multiple entities only multiplies the potential for difficulty.

The Front Door was designed to act as a concierge. By analogy, the concierge service in a hotel can advise customers on restaurant choices, but it does not assist with preparing or delivering a quality meal. Because OCTRI is dedicated to facilitating high impact, high quality projects and because the research terrain for cross-institutional projects is extraordinarily complex, we came to the conclusion that concierge-level support was not sufficient.

In place of the original structures, we have now established what we call “case management” teams that are available in certain priority areas. OHSU researchers who want to develop protocols that involve Kaiser’s strengths in (a) tissue, (b) data, (c) clinical research, and/or (d) community partnerships are directed to content experts in those areas who can help investigators develop successful protocols. When projects involve more than one priority area, the case managers operate as a team under the direction of a KPCHR Portfolio Manager who ensures strong coordination. The same support works in the other direction when CHR investigators seek to establish collaborations in these priority areas with investigators at OHSU.

Importantly, the case management team has responsibility for facilitating the project throughout its life cycle, which eliminates the problem of too many hand-offs. The content experts have dedicated FTE within OCTRI, ensuring that we maintain capacity. They have sufficient training to provide high-quality protocol-development assistance, and in many cases they have the ability to take responsibility for the project with the KPCHR IRB.

OHSU investigators interested in conducting Kaiser-based research outside of these priority areas can still receive support, but it is somewhat more limited and more closely resembles the concierge model. This reflects an essential compromise and an important philosophical shift: rather than provide modest support to a very wide range of projects, we have decided to focus our resources and dedicate our efforts to advancing projects in the areas that we have determined to offer the greatest potential scientific impact, in alignment with our strategic plan.

continued on page 29 ➤
A report from Sweden
ON THE CIP FORUM 2009 by Clark McCartney

On a quiet Sunday afternoon, the 6th of September 2009, in Gothenburg, Sweden this NCURA observer registered as an attendee for a very special three day conference entitled "The Future of Innovation." This forum was jointly sponsored by the University of Gothenburg (School of Business, Economics, and Law) and Chalmers University of Technology. This collaboration was located at the Center for Intellectual Property Studies (CIP), a joint center between the University of Gothenburg and Chalmers University of Technology. The mission of the CIP is to drive and facilitate a shift to a knowledge-based economy.

The geographical context and setting for the forum was in the host City of Gothenburg. The surrounding region is considered the most international part of Sweden and is located on the western side of Sweden, facing an extension of the North Sea. The City contains the only ice-free port in the country. This region accounts for one-quarter of Sweden's national export value. The concentration of corporate investment in R&D is second in the European Union.

Collaboration across the triple interface of industry, the public sector, and the academic sector continues to increase the importance of this regional activity in the world's economy. As an example, a current initiative in the region is to improve manufacturing practices at various companies in the region and is driven by the two universities mentioned above with eight major manufacturing clusters in Western Sweden.

The Chairman for the forum, Mr. Marshall Phelps, VP for IP Policy Management at Microsoft Corporation, indicated in his introductory speech that the forum's purpose was to provide a much needed awareness for business leaders, academics with their institutions, and entrepreneurs to help chart the way forward through current problems in the existing innovation ecosystem. Problems cited were: a weak global economy, reduced venture capital investments in "start-up" companies, the growing uncertainty over IP (intellectual property) rights, eroding government support of R&D research, and an increasingly byzantine regulatory environment.

The structure of the forum provided for numerous plenary sessions, along with four specialization tracks composed of speakers and seminars, i.e. Open Innovation, Early Innovation and Knowledge, IP Management, and Valuation/Finance of IP. Needless to say this writer was very busy trying to cover as many seminars, presentations, and workshops as possible in the three days. I refer the reader to a full compilation of the meeting at www.cipforum.org.

However, a few highlights are noted. Chairman Phelps made a significant remark in his opening speech that "innovation occurs out of collaboration" and that universities were the most logical places to bring all parties together with intellectual cross-pollination resulting in increasing efficiency for open innovation. Many other speakers praised "open innovation" initiatives. However, with few exceptions, university speakers indicated that obstacles to sharing in the innovation of IP are deeply-rooted in proprietary culture and the world-wide IP framework (pre-internet), which deters the speed of innovation.

A second significant highlight was the concern that distrust prevents more open innovation especially within cooperative groups of industry, academia, and the public sector. Sweden stands alone in the industrialized world with its current law that provides for individual faculty/student ownership of IP! Many speakers at the forum, including Swedish, consider this model to be "behind the curve" and should be modified to recognize university and public funding of research.

The third highlight was commercialization of IP at universities. This was a very highly charged and debated subject. Four IP models for commercialization were presented and discussed: the public domain model, the industry collaboration model, the university/faculty licensing model, and IP creation through venture capitalization.

The final highlight on the concluding day was the open question/answer seminar. Several challenging questions were presented without conclusions, such as:

1. How can university research reach underdeveloped countries?
2. Are royalties from licensees too high thus raising prices on the innovation licensed?
3. Should a portion of billions in royalties be paid to the sponsoring government?
4. When is a university's return on investment on particular IP not enough?
5. Isn't the primary purpose of university funded research to expand knowledge?
6. Doesn't institutional ownership of IP provide for sharing of institutional tools?
7. With movement of faculty and student innovators isn't there a problem with IP rights? And perhaps even more litigation to occur on movement of IP?

The forum, from my consensus of attendees, was very successful. 2010 should be another great forum to attend. Oh! And the Swedish food and sightseeing were great.

---

Clark McCartney was President of NCURA in 1973 and 1974. During his presidency he served as Executive Director of Contracts and Grants at the University of Southern California.
As NCURA concludes its 50th anniversary celebration, it is already looking to the future by awarding a $40,000.00 grant to the University of Central Florida. The grant, to be used to implement an online Master’s degree in research administration, was awarded after an RFP was sent out to the higher education community in August of this year.

Upon receiving notification of the award, Tom O’Neal, Associate Vice President, Office of Research and Commercialization at the University of Central Florida stated,

“We at UCF salute NCURA’s vision and leadership role the organization has shown with this initiative. This is a game changing act that we believe will make a meaningful difference for our profession.”
NCURA IS PLEASED TO INTRODUCE OUR NEW CO-EDITORS!

DEBORAH L. SMITH is Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research at The University of Tennessee Health Science Center in Memphis, began her research administration career at UTHSC in 1985. Her background includes teaching, financial analysis, business administration, and career counseling. She is a graduate of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute and The University of Tennessee Leadership Institute. She has presented at regional and national professional meetings and published in professional journals. She is past chair of the Region III Nominating and Elections Committee and the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee, served on the Professional Development Committee, and currently serves on the Peer Review Team and on the planning committee for the Region III 2010 meeting. She is a founding member of the Mid-South Area Research Administrators.

Debbie's responsibilities at UTHSC include policy development and implementation, pre-award activities, and post-award non-financial activities. She has developed strong working relationships with faculty and staff, and serves on the UTHSC Conflict of Interest, Clinical Trial Billing Compliance, and Faculty Senate Committees.

Debbie's volunteer community activities have included the Memphis Public Library's radio station, the Tennessee Master Gardener Program, the Memphis-MidSouth Komen Race for the Cure, the Rape Crisis Center, and the American Association of University Women.

TOM WILSON is the Senior Research Administrator and Assistant Vice President at Rush University Medical Center in Chicago, Illinois. Tom Wilson has over 30 years of experience in research administration at Baylor College of Medicine, and MD Anderson in the Texas Medical Center in Houston, Texas, the Beckman Research Institute of the City of Hope in Duarte, California and the University of Arizona in Tucson, Arizona.

Tom’s responsibilities have included all aspects of pre-award and post-award research administration and he has been a member of National Council of University Research Administrators since 1987. He has served on the NCURA Board of Directors, as member and Chair of the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee, Chair of the Professional Development Committee and is the NCURA representative on the National Institutes of Health eRA Commons Working Group. Tom has been a frequent presenter at the NCURA annual meeting, regional meetings, and workshops on a variety of topics in research administration and has authored and co-authored a number of NCURA publications.

His responsibilities at Rush include co-chair of the Executive Committee that is developing the curriculum for a Masters of Science in Research Administration and chairs a sub-committee on E-Mail Policy for University/Research/Faculty/Student Governance. Tom manages and assigns research space for Rush including the renovation of existing laboratories and is a member of the Medical Affairs Budget Committee. Tom received a B.S. in Accounting from Rutgers University, and a M.B.A. from the University of Arizona.
ERIN BAILEY is the Departmental Research Administrator for the Buffalo Center for Social Research at the University at Buffalo School of Social Work and is a member for the Social and Behavioral Sciences IRB. She is also a member of the LDI class of 2010.

JOHN CARFORA is Executive Director for Research and Sponsored Projects at Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles. John is also Chair of NCURA's Commission on International Research Administration.

CHRISTOPHER KELLEHER is the Deputy Director of the Oregon Clinical and Translational Research Institute. Before joining the Kaiser Permanente Center for Health Research in 1998, he worked as a study coordinator at Oregon Health & Science University. He is a graduate of Vassar College and began his research career at the University of North Carolina when a three-week assignment took on a life of its own. He has been involved with OCTRI since the earliest grant-writing phase, when no one was sure what to call it.

PIRJO KONTKANEN has been Legal Counsel for Research Affairs at the University of Helsinki since 2002. Her field of expertise is copyrights and other intellectual property rights within university research and teaching.

CHRISTIAN MARKS holds a Ph.D. from the State University of New York at Buffalo. He is a Certified IRB Professional and has served as the Social and Behavioral Sciences IRB Administrator for the past seven years.

CLARK MCCARTNEY is a native Californian, completed Fresno High School, then traveled across the U.S. to Cambridge and matriculated at Harvard University. He completed his required military service and returned to graduate study at the University of Southern California Law School. He has worked in government (U.S. House of Representatives), private industry, and higher education. He served as NCURA President in 1973 and 1974. Retired now, he lives in Palm Springs, CA and spends summers at his cottage in Sweden.

DR. KEITH MCDOWELL is the Vice Chancellor for Research and Technology Transfer at The University of Texas System having previously served as the Vice President for Research at The University of Alabama and the Vice President for Research and Information Technology at The University of Texas at Arlington. Dr. McDowell has served in numerous other administrative capacities. He received his doctorate in chemical physics from Harvard University in 1972 and is the author of many refereed publications in theoretical chemical physics. He was honored as an Alfred P. Sloan Fellow in 1978 and won The University of Texas Chancellor's Teaching Award in 2000.

SUSAN WYATT SEDWICK is associate vice president for research and director of the Office of Sponsored Projects at The University of Texas at Austin, where she is responsible for both pre- and post-award financial administration units with oversight of about $500 million in annual sponsored projects awards and serves as the institution’s empowered official for export controls. She is also a clinical professor in the Department of Educational Administration for the Higher Education Administration Program. She received her Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration from Texas A&M University and is a Certified Research Administrator (CRA). She is a frequent speaker on the topic of export controls as they apply to universities. She authored the chapter on export controls included in the NCURA/AIS publication, Sponsored Research Administration: A Guide to Effective Strategies and Recommended Practices.

MELISSA WOODWARD is the Administrative Secretary of Sponsored Programs at Saginaw Valley State University. She is responsible for disseminating grant application notices to faculty and staff. She assists with the preparation of grant proposals, providing assistance with conformity of guidelines, typing, and formatting, and prepares government forms and budgets.
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WRITE AN EFFECTIVE FUNDING APPLICATION
A Guide for Researchers & Scholars

In a world where the opportunity to advance scholarly and scientific knowledge is dependent on the ability to secure sufficient funding, researchers and scholars must write funding proposals that stand out from the competition. The practical advice in this guidebook is designed to aid academics in writing successful applications at all stages of their careers.

This book will help grant applicants plan and craft funding proposals that are concise, complete, and impressive—and that satisfy the mandates of the agencies to which they are applying. Applicants will learn how to:

- Avoid common writing blunders
- Understand the central importance of the research budget
- Overcome procrastination
- Choose and secure professional references
- Develop a career path with a view toward funding opportunities
- Maintain a winning attitude that will improve the chances of success

Write an Effective Funding Application details the all-important preparation stage in drafting a grant application, from identifying sources of funding and securing registration numbers to crafting a schedule for meeting the application deadline. It reviews the nuts and bolts of writing and polishing a winning application, stressing the importance of logical thinking and thoughtful presentation. The book includes detailed information on developing budgets, “before” and “after” versions of proposals, and descriptions of common pitfalls that everyone can avoid.

$22.00 paperbacks

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS
1-800-537-5807 • www.press.jhu.edu
UNLOCK THE PROMISE OF YOUR RESEARCH

The key to maximizing your award chances

SciVal Funding is the most comprehensive online research intelligence source available. It supports you through every stage of the pre-award process by identifying the most worthwhile funding opportunities based on peer-reviewed data. It also gives you access to award-winning information and the latest trends, helping you to shape and strengthen your proposals.

See how SciVal Funding can help you find the most impactful open opportunities by requesting a FREE 30-day institutional trial at www.unlockresearch.com/scivalfunding.
NCURA Calendar of Events

ONLINE TUTORIALS
A Primer on Clinical Trials – 7 week program
A Primer on Federal Contracting – 8 week program
A Primer on Subawards – 7 week program
Visit the website for enrollment periods

FUNDAMENTALS OF SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION
Miami, Fl ..........................................................January 20–22, 2010
Los Angeles, CA .................................................February 10–12, 2010
New Orleans, LA ................................................March 15–17, 2010

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION XI CONFERENCE (FRA XI)
San Antonio, TX ..................................................March 3–5, 2010

SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION II WORKSHOPS
New Orleans, LA ................................................March 15–17, 2010

DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOPS
Miami, Fl ..........................................................January 20–22, 2010
Los Angeles, CA ................................................February 10–12, 2010

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOPS
Boston, MA ........................................................December 2–4, 2009

2010 NCURA TV SATELLITE BROADCAST SERIES
Managing Financial Requirement of Awards ................................January 26, 2010
Critical Issues for the Department Administrator .....................March 23, 2010
Non-Financial Research Compliance ........................................June 15, 2010
Negotiating Federal Contracts and Pass-Through Awards .............September 21, 2010

NCURA ANNUAL MEETING
52nd Annual Meeting, Hilton Washington,
Washington, DC .................................................October 31 – November 3, 2010

REGIONAL MEETINGS
Region V/VI (Western/Rocky Mountain)
Newport Beach, CA .............................................April 18–21, 2010

Region III (Southeastern)
Memphis, TN ................................................................April 24–28, 2010

Region II (Mid-Atlantic)
Princeton, NJ .........................................................April 25–27, 2010

Region I (New England)
Portsmouth, NH ..................................................April 25–28, 2010

Region IV (Mid-America)
Omaha, NE ........................................................April 25–28, 2010

Region V (Southwestern)
South Padre Island, TX .......................................April 25–28, 2010

For further details and updates visit our events calendar at www.ncura.edu
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DEADLINES:
Submission of Articles: December 11, 2010
Space Reservation for Ads: December 11, 2010
Submission of Ads: December 18, 2010
Take a look at the program for FRA XI! While a few details remain, it is clearly going to be an opportunity for both a broad survey of the variety of financial issues faced by research administrators as well as an in-depth look into some of the more complicated issues that we ponder. The FRA XI final program will include over 90 educational sessions ranging from a full day of workshops to 60-90 minute discussion groups and concurrent sessions. As our theme, Adapting, Recovering, Repositioning, Advancing, suggests, the program includes several offerings on a variety of stimulus funding issues but you will also find traditional sessions on common post-award and costing issues, special sessions designed with the clinical research and hospital audience in mind and tracks dedicated to management issues and the current hot topics that keep our jobs interesting. For those of you that would like to expand your knowledge and have an additional opportunity to network with other FRA XI attendees, there will be ten round table discussions set up with the breakfast Friday morning. A new feature for FRA XI will be a group of post-award sessions committed to a more interactive, less presentational format. While all of the topic tracks offer discussion groups designed to facilitate a structured conversation, the post award track is also offering several concurrent sessions that will be conducted with adult learning styles in mind. FRA XI promises to build on the success of ten years of valuable programming while also exploring new ways to make the most of this valuable professional development opportunity.