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NCURA holds the 5th Leadership Convention

The first NCURA Leadership Convention was held in Philadelphia in 2005. Attendance was made up of regionally selected delegates, the board of directors and staff. The convention has been held annually since its 2005 inception and has brought national and regional leadership together to discuss the future direction of NCURA, using the Strategic Plan as the cornerstone for discussions. Then President, Jerry Fife, led a very successful meeting, focusing on designing succession paths for NCURA’s future leaders; discussing recruitment and retention of members, and looking at ways of enhancing the national and regional partnership. The tone of the convention, one which promoted honest and open discussion, allowed for very positive outcomes that included many new and creative ideas. Each convention since then has built upon that success while continuing to seek feedback from the delegates on how to keep NCURA at the forefront of the profession and the leader in the field of professional development for research administrators.

Before kicking off the 2009 Convention on June 5th at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park Hotel, the Board of Directors reviewed and updated the Strategic Plan. As stated in the plan, NCURA’s core purpose is “To serve its members by advancing the field and profession of research administration.” The associated goals are:

**GOAL A:** NCURA will be the leader in professional development, knowledge exchange, and individual development for research administration.

**GOAL B:** NCURA will be the leading information resource for the research administration community.

**GOAL C:** NCURA will have sufficient financial resources and infrastructure to meet its objectives and respond quickly and creatively to opportunities.

**GOAL D:** Research administration will be a respected and valued profession within the research community.

For NCURA to uphold its core purpose and meet its goals, we must be able to adapt and adjust to economic times such as those facing us today by finding solutions that benefit the membership at large. Keeping this in mind, the theme of this year’s Leadership Convention was “Volunteerism, Programming and Communication.” The Convention brought together the Board of Directors, regional leadership representatives, the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee and the Professional Development Committee, the Senior co-Editor of NCURA Magazine and staff.

The Volunteerism group had the task of identifying the expectations of our volunteer members and determining how to keep our volunteers involved and vested in the future of NCURA. In addition, the group was tasked with looking at ways to attract new volunteers.

The Programming break out session discussed how to utilize technology to supplement, NOT replace our current meeting structures. With these economic times, membership will count on more electronic means for professional development, but as an organization we need to keep in mind that face to face meetings are integral to networking. It is incumbent upon NCURA to continually look towards the future to implement mechanisms to reach all members, using the most recent available technology. The group discussed the kinds of technology, impact on social networking, viability of electronic programming, ability for regional tie in, and associated required tools.

Enhancing speaker care was the second topic for the Programming group. They tackled the question, “What is the incentive to attract the next generation of speakers, keeping in mind the importance of succession planning and generational differences?” Items such as the evaluations process and the creation of a speaker database were discussed.

The Communications dialog focused on the prospect of rebuilding or “retooling” the current member profile to enhance usability to our members. Their second area of conversation centered on our main communication portals, the NCURA main website, and regional websites. Topics included functionality, usability, search ability, and navigation.

Since the Convention, the Officers have already begun to look at implementing some of the recommendations, and as the relationship between the national and regional leadership continues to grow and strengthen through the conventions and the quarterly conference calls (that also began in 2005 under Jerry Fife’s Presidency), the outcomes for the entire membership are extremely exciting. These interactions have been very beneficial and I look forward to watching the outcomes of this year’s convention come to fruition.

Denise Clark

Denise Clark serves as Assistant Vice President for Research Administration and Advancement, University of Maryland, College Park.
This year’s 51st Annual Meeting will offer an engaging program designed to help research administrators find their footing on an ever-shifting landscape. While the new administration and the advent of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) have caused an amazing roller coaster of new research opportunities and an unprecedented number of new rules and regulations, the basics of research administration remain the same. This year’s program will offer a fusion of the basics, to build core competency or augment existing skills, as well as opportunities to explore new and timely issues involving compliance, ARRA reporting and international collaboration. A significant number of the pre-conference workshops are tailored to mid-career and highly experienced research administrators. These offerings are interwoven throughout the meeting to create a blend of interrelated learning experiences that will increase skill breadth and depth.

In response to positive feedback from last year’s meeting, we will again offer the Science Track and Case Study Sessions. We are also pleased to introduce a new series on the final day of the conference. “Decompression Sessions” will provide an opportunity for NCURA members to ask those burning questions and discuss issues that may not have been addressed during the conference.

An Overview of This Year’s Workshop Offerings

This year the traditional Sunday workshop day shifts to Wednesday, October 21. NCURA continues its commitment to traditional core essentials tailored to help meeting attendees rapidly assimilate professional fundamental knowledge. We will offer full-day and half-day workshops on the basics of pre-award, post-award, proposal development, the OMB Circulars, the FAR, and departmental administration. In addition, this year we have added two new basic workshops focusing on conflict of interest and research compliance - topics with which all research administrators should be acquainted. Concurrent Sessions and Discussion Groups compliment essential workshop topics such as regulations, subawards, proposals, conflict of interest, contract terms & conditions, and effort reporting (see the list on the following page for a complete listing).

The Annual Meeting offers workshop sessions for all levels of staff. More than half of the workshops are targeted to intermediate or advanced sponsored program professionals. Check the descriptions carefully, many of the topics are offered at both the basic and at the intermediate/advanced level. The intermediate and advanced workshops will assume that attendees have basic knowledge of the topic or its underlying regulations, and are now ready to expand their knowledge by solving real-life problems, addressing case studies, or via examining the advantages and disadvantages of alternative policy or procedural choices.

If you already know how to handle the “basics” and are ready for more challenging issues, you might be interested in some of the specialty workshops like “Financial Compliance: What You Need to Know,” “Export Licenses and Other Government Approvals,” “Risk Assessment,” “Developing Effective Conflict of Interest Management Processes and Plans,” “Advanced Issues in Subawards and Collaborations,” “Federal Contracting,” and “Preparing for Audits: Guidance for the Central Office and Departmental Administrators.”

Also offered this year, are several outstanding personal development workshops and sessions to increase your effectiveness as a negotiator, enhance your presentation skills, build employee morale, improve your ability to resolve conflict and master the impossible: multitasking.

Some Highlights

- **NIH Day and NSF Day Are Back!** We are thrilled to be able to offer these popular full-day workshops onsite at the Marriott on Tuesday, October 20. Presented by NIH and NSF officials, this is an amazing opportunity to get an insider’s perspective of these agencies; priorities, policies, organizational structure, application submission and peer review process. Participants will be able to network with NIH/NSF personnel over lunch and be involved with important discussions that may address less common situations specific to your institution.

- **Effective Presentation Design & Facilitation:** Jeffrey Cufaude presents his popular full-day workshop which explores the principles and practices of an effective presentation and provides the tools and techniques you need to engage your audience. The morning focuses on what is known about adult learners and how this can inform presentation design. Practical application is demonstrated in your 30 minute presentation design. The afternoon includes peer review of your draft design, discussion and a review of best practices. Don’t miss this opportunity.

- **Troublesome Terms from Non-Profits, Foundations and Industry: Caught Between a Rock and a Hard Place:** Presented by an experienced group of faculty led by Katherine Ho, Stanford University, this workshop joins ever-present issues (confidentiality, intellectual property, liability) with new issues (export control and anti-terrorist language, invoicing, financial reporting) in the context of working with non-profit, foundation and industry awards.

- **Advanced Issues in A-21, A-122, A-110, A-133:** NCURA President Denise Clark, University of Maryland, College Park, along with her experienced co-faculty will take you beyond the basics of understanding the Circulars. Using case studies oriented around difficult real life situations, participants will obtain working principles to solve a range of situations, simple to complex.

- **Developing Training Programs: Multi-Modal Delivery and Assessment:** How is your institution developing or adapting existing training programs given the current economic crisis? Danielle McElwain, University of South Carolina, and her team of experienced trainers will walk you through the steps of identifying campus curriculum needs, defining learning objectives, designing program content, creating support materials and evaluating your training efforts.
Annual Meeting workshops offer members the opportunity to learn directly from our profession’s experts. We encourage you to attend and benefit from their shared experience and wisdom.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2009
8:30 am – 4:30 pm
FULL DAY WORKSHOPS

1 O NIH DAY
2 O NSF DAY

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2009
8:30 am – 4:30 pm
FULL DAY WORKSHOPS

16 A SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING
17 A RISK ASSESSMENT
19 I COST SHARING ON SPONSORED PROJECTS: WHY NO GOOD DEED GOES UNPUNISHED

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2009
1:00 – 4:30 pm
AFTERNOON WORKSHOPS

20 B FAR BASICS
21 B NEGOTIATION SKILLS FOR THE RESEARCH ADMINISTRATOR: ACHIEVING THE 'BEST' AGREEMENT
22 I CREATING AND NEGOTIATING AN MTA, NDA, MOU, IPA, CRADA, OTA, AND END LICENSES
23 A SERVICE CENTERS: HOW TO OPEN AND OPERATE LEGALLY!
24 I REPORTING, TRACKING AND MANAGEMENT OF EFFORT
25 A FAR AND FEDERAL CONTRACTING
26 I ISSUES AND HOT TOPICS FOR PUs
27 A THE “HOW TO’S” OF DUAL-USE AND OFAC EXPORT LICENSING: A HANDS-ON APPROACH TO COMMERCE AND TREASURY EXPORT CONTROLS AND EMBARGOES
28 I PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT (NON-NIH)
29 A DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE CONFLICT OF INTEREST MANAGEMENT PROCESSES AND PLANS
30 A PREPARING FOR AUDITS: GUIDANCE FOR THE CENTRAL OFFICE AND DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATORS
31 A DEVELOPING TRAINING PROGRAMS: MULTI-MODAL DELIVERY AND ASSESSMENT

Bruce Morgan is Workshop Co-Coordinator and serves as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research, Office of Research, University of California – Riverside; Dan Nordquist is Workshop Co-Coordinator and serves as Assistant Vice Provost for Research & Director, Office of Grant & Research Development, Washington State University.
An Update on Patent Reform Legislation

Because of the importance of patents to universities and their role in technology commercialization and economic development, the university associations in Washington led by the Association of American Universities have been heavily involved in Congressional patent reform activities. Over the course of the four-year patent reform process, the associations have raised a number of issues with Congress, some university-specific, others shared by other groups.

Issues raised by the higher education associations and Congressional response

- **FIRST-INVENTOR-TO-FILE**: The higher education associations requested that if the U.S. were to harmonize U.S. patent law with international patent law by moving from a first-to-invent to a first-inventor-to-file procedure for establishing patent priority, that Congress adopt a grace period designed to promote publishing under that procedure, strengthen the inventor’s oath, and maintain provisional applications. Congress has done all three.

- **CREATE ACT**: We requested that Congress make the necessary changes to conform the Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement (CREATE) Act of 2004, which facilitates research collaborations, to a first-inventor-to-file procedure. Congress has done that.

- **PRIOR USER RIGHTS**: Earlier legislation included a broad expansion of prior user rights as a defense to infringement. That expansion would have greatly increased the ability of companies to employ trade secret procedures to develop products that would be immune from the assertion of patent rights, increasing patent uncertainty and impairing the ability of universities to license their patents to the commercial sector for development. That provision has been eliminated, substituting a study of prior user rights.

- **EXPANDED U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (PTO) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY**: The associations were among the groups expressing concern over the expansion of PTO rulemaking authority included in S. 1145, the prior version of Senate patent reform legislation. That provision has been omitted in S. 515.

- **ASSESSMENT OF DAMAGES**: Earlier versions of both Senate and House legislation included damages provisions that would have had the effect of skewing the process of awarding damages disproportionately toward small awards, diminishing the capacity of damages to serve as a deterrent to patent infringement. S. 515 removes those provisions, replacing them with “gatekeeper” language that provides instructions to courts on procedures for handling damage assessment cases, and basing the assessments on existing case law rather than new statutory provisions. In contrast, H.R. 1260 contains detailed provisions for courts and juries to determine “reasonable royalties” for the use made of the invention by the infringer, which would tend to result in a disproportionate number of small awards.

Congress has been working for more than four years to reform U.S. patent law to enhance the ability of the U.S. patent system to promote innovation and strengthen the nation’s economic competitiveness. The Congressional patent reform effort was prompted by seminal reports by the National Academies and the Federal Trade Commission. In its 2004 report, A Patent System for the 21st Century, the National Academies recommended reforming U.S. patent law to accomplish three goals: 1) harmonize U.S. patent law with international patent law; 2) improve patent quality; and 3) reduce unwarranted patent litigation costs. The process has been complicated by the fact that different industry sectors rely on the patent system in varying ways and are affected differently by proposed reforms. However, a compromise recently was reached among these sectors and a resulting bill, S. 515, was reported by the Judiciary Committee in early April on a 15—4 vote and now awaits a vote by the full Senate. As the Senate is considering S. 515, the House of Representatives has recently begun to act on its own version of the bill (H.R. 1260). While similar, there are some significant differences, as further discussed below.
APPLICANT QUALITY SUBMISSIONS: The prior Senate bill included an extremely problematic provision — Applicant Quality Submissions — which called for mandatory submission from patent applicants of prior art and other material relevant to patentability. This provision was opposed by virtually all groups and is omitted in S. 515.

POST-GRANT “SECOND WINDOW”: Earlier versions of both Senate and House legislation included an expansive procedure for challenging patents after their first year for the remainder of the term of the patent. The higher education associations and other groups expressed concern about the harmful effect on patent certainty of such a broad procedure. Extensive negotiations in the House in 2007 involving a number of groups, including the higher education associations, developed a compromise procedure by modifying the existing inter partes reexamination procedure administered by the USPTO. That narrower procedure, which is limited to the objective evidence of patents and printed publications, was endorsed by the higher education associations.

EXPANSION OF INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION: Both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees included the House’s modified inter partes reexamination procedure in the bills introduced this year, S. 515 and H.R. 1260. However, both bills included a substantial expansion of the evidentiary basis for inter partes reexaminations that would have transformed this procedure from an administrative challenge based on objective evidence — patents and printed publications — into a complicated, costly process involving extensive discovery into subjective evidence of whether a claimed invention had been “in public use or on sale.” The bill adopted by the Senate Judiciary Committee eliminates this language, returning the inter partes reexamination procedure to the one endorsed by the higher education associations in 2007. The “public use or on sale” language remains in the House version.

In late April 2009, the associations’ Patent Reform Task Force, made up of university presidents and chancellors and technical advisors, met to discuss the provisions of the legislation, outstanding areas of concern raised by several member institutions, and the overall strengths and weaknesses of the bill. The Task Force recognized that several universities have continuing concerns that remain unaddressed, particularly related to the potential for “serial” or duplicative challenges in the post-grant patent review procedures. However, Congress has been responsive to the major issues raised by the higher education associations. In considering all these factors, the Task Force concluded that S. 515 is a strong bill that achieves a balanced compromise on a number of difficult issues, and addresses the major problems for universities identified by the associations. Accordingly, on May 7 the associations sent a joint letter to the Senate leadership encouraging them to bring the bill before the full Senate for a vote.

As you know, U.S. universities are the principal source of basic research that expands the frontiers of knowledge. Universities employ the patent system to transfer discoveries made through university research into the commercial sector for development into useful products and processes to the benefit of society. The role of universities was enhanced by enactment of the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-517), which created a uniform patent policy among the many federal agencies that fund research, enabling small businesses and non-profit organizations, including universities, to retain title to inventions made under federally-funded research programs. Many studies and reports have confirmed the success of the Bayh-Dole Act in enabling the transfer of university technologies.

The organizing principles and objectives of the higher education associations’ work included an affirmation that the Congressional patent reform effort was needed to adapt U.S. patent policy to changing domestic and international circumstances and to address problems that had arisen within the U.S. patent system. The associations developed an analysis of the initial legislation and have updated their statement as the legislation has evolved. These statements have been the product of broad consultation within and across the associations, with substantial input from a technical advisory group of university officials including provosts, senior research officers, technology transfer officials, general counsels, and faculty members. The statements can be found on the AAU website at http://www.aau.edu/policy/patent_policy.aspx?id=7372.

Our deliberations have sought to balance two perspectives. First, because universities typically do not develop or practice their patents but license them to the private sector for development, a key university interest in patent reform is the impact of legislative proposals on the ability of universities to license their patents. As patent owners, universities also have a vested interest in the impact of patent reform on their licensees.

Second, universities should incorporate these interests into the broader national goal of enhancing the capacity of the U.S. patent system to promote innovation. Indeed, the principal objective of the Bayh-Dole Act was to facilitate the flow of university discoveries into the private sector for development into useful products and processes that benefit society. Royalty income provides an incentive for universities to market their discoveries in the private sector in ways the federal government had failed to do, and helps offset expenses of university technology transfer and research operations. However, the goal of Bayh-Dole was never to generate university income but to benefit society through the further development of university discoveries.

Thus, the associations have been evaluating the legislative proposals based on balancing the immediate and longer-term interests of universities, the interests of various industry sectors — most of which universities collaborate with — and most importantly, the national interest in promoting a patent system that effectively advances innovation and enhances the nation’s economic competitiveness.

It is important to note that Congressional consideration of patent reform is a continuing process, and its outcome is uncertain. Currently the House appears in a “wait and see” mode for Senate action. We will remain engaged with Congress as these measures move through the legislative process, working to maintain the improvements included in the Senate bill and seeking opportunities to address remaining concerns.

Robert Hardy is Director of Contracts and Intellectual Property Management at the Council on Governmental Relations in Washington, D.C.
Interview with Representative Ciro Rodriguez (D-TX)

Q CONGRESSMAN RODRIGUEZ, WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND EDUCATION, PARTICULARLY IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009?

A The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) was intended to give a “shot in the arm” to our economy that has been ailing for some time. Providing and quickly disseminating funding would create and preserve jobs. University research has historically been underfunded and underutilized. The National Science Foundation (NSF) produced a report showing a $3.5 Billion decline in funding from FY07 to FY08 when adjusted for inflation. However, I believe there has been a recent noticeable change in attitude in Washington and that has been reflected in the increases in research funding in FY2009 and the ARRA.

Q WHAT ARE THE IMPORTANT ISSUES IN RESEARCH AND EDUCATION THAT YOU THINK ARE CRITICAL FOR HISPANICS IN THE UNITED STATES?

A I am a former university professor and have been involved in education my entire career. I believe the best thing we can do is help students with opportunities to go to school and stay in school. Years ago we instituted programs like Pell Grants and the Montgomery GI Bill. Those two programs alone were responsible for creating significant opportunities for Hispanics and all Americans. Most recently, Congress passed legislation modernizing the GI Bill to among other things allow the family of those who paid into the GI Bill to benefit from an education. The ARRA also increased the amount Pell Grant recipients can receive. This new focus on education will hopefully keep us progressing.

Q U.S. UNIVERSITIES DO AN INCREASING AMOUNT OF COLLABORATION WITH UNIVERSITIES, COMPANIES, AND GOVERNMENTS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES. WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES OF SUCH INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIONS?

A I believe the international exchange of methods, information and perspectives is necessary and can only benefit our understanding of critical issues. For example, my congressional district encompasses 785 miles of border with Mexico. There are very unique health problems that occur along the border. International collaboration is the only way we will be able to better understand and address these issues affecting both sides of the border. However, we have encountered challenges with funding and a lack of interest.

Q YOU HAVE TAKEN A KEEN INTEREST IN CYBER SECURITY. WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE CRITICAL ASPECTS OF THIS IMPORTANT AREA THAT NEED TO BE REMEMBERED BY RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY WORKING AT OUR UNIVERSITIES?

A I first gained an interest on cyber security issues when I served on the Terrorism Task Force of the House Armed Services Committee long before 9/11. We were briefed regularly about the thousands of daily attempts to hack into government networks. Ten years later those attempts have ballooned to millions per day. The Obama Administration is proposing a National Cyber Security Plan to prepare and defend against cyber attacks in our government and military networks. Universities can, and already are playing an important role in securing our networks. For example, The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) is taking the lead in developing and implementing a training model for local communities to be able to defend and respond to attacks. UTSA is currently working with the Department of Homeland Security to develop this model and have begun implementing training programs and simulations in three states.

Q WHAT IS THE ANTICIPATED IMPACT OF CYBER SECURITY ON THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF SAN ANTONIO IN SOUTH TEXAS?

A San Antonio was the first community in the country to conduct a cyber security defend-and-attack simulation (known as “Dark Screen exercises”). UTSA has attained the “Center for Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education” designation by the National Security Agency (NSA). The designation means UTSA’s curriculum and faculty meet or exceeds NSA standards to teach information-assurance security and makes the university eligible to apply for grants from NSA and the National Science Foundation. The graduate degrees in information assurance produced at UTSA have contributed to the emerging technology sector in the area. Additionally, the U.S. Air Force recently recommended that the new headquarters for their recently created Cyber command be located in San Antonio. This designation brings with it 400 new jobs and a $30 million economic impact.

Q WITH THE ELECTION OF PRESIDENT OBAMA, WHAT WILL BE THE BIGGEST DIFFERENCE IN THE SUBSTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL ISSUES IN CONGRESS?

A I think we have made significant strides in education. When I was first elected, we had members of Congress proposing to abolish the Department of Education. We don’t hear that sort of talk any longer. When new presidents take office there is an obvious shift in priorities. I believe President Obama has laid out some important priorities for education that will help narrow the achievement gap in meaningful ways.

Q DO YOU HAVE ANY FINAL SUGGESTIONS TO PASS ALONG TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ADMINISTRATORS?

A I think the National Council of University Research Administrators is an excellent resource for research administrators across the country. I would encourage NCURA to become more active with members of Congress and the federal government. I believe many of us can benefit from your knowledge and expertise.

Congressman Ciro Rodriguez (D-TX) represents the 23rd Congressional District in Texas. The 23rd Congressional District is the largest district in the state, covering most of west Texas from San Antonio to El Paso. Rep. Rodriguez earned his B.A. at St. Mary’s University and M.S.W from Our Lady of the Lake University in San Antonio.
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Accelerating University-Industry Research Collaborations: Corporate R&D at RIT
by Donald L. Boyd

Introduction
The fundamental mission of most universities is to educate and challenge their students and faculty to learn and conduct research leading to discoveries, innovations, and creations; we call this academic scholarship. Universities contribute to industrial research and development through their graduates, knowledge, discoveries, innovations and creations. By bringing the University and Industry together through research and development (R&D) collaborations, we accelerate and strengthen the process of technology transfer and the introduction of new products, services, and businesses while providing challenges and a real-world experience to students. At the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) we have introduced a new program for working with industry called Corporate R&D at RIT.

Corporate R&D at RIT
In July 2007, RIT's new president, Bill Destler, challenged the University to define a new way to partner with industry through a low-cost, efficient program where intellectual property (IP) does not become a roadblock to collaborative research. The program would allow industry to retain ownership of new discoveries while allowing the University to retain its rights to publish, conduct research and teach. President Destler observed that many University-Industry research partnerships are inhibited by unnecessary hurdles that if limited or reduced would be a major step toward improving University-Industry research partnerships and would increase U.S. technical leadership. President Destler's rationale is fully described in the June 2008 issue of Nature magazine ("A new relationship," Nature, Vol. 453/12, June 2008).

Like most universities, RIT has a standard Sponsored Research Agreement (SRA) where the project definition, pricing, timing, and IP rights are negotiated before the research begins. If the sponsor is a corporation, the negotiations are often held up by IP rights. Industry often wants full ownership or exclusive license to all of the IP resulting from the research. This can lead to long delays or, in the worst case, prevent partnerships entirely. RIT uses its standard SRA when government funding is involved or for large projects involving faculty and student research that is focused on furthering the development of core technology with RIT owned IP. For example, RIT requires the standard SRA when Ph.D. students are participating in the grant or contract because they are expected to conduct original research leading to new discoveries.

Many corporate projects, however, use RIT's knowledge, skills and IP to develop new products, processes, or services, while generating limited or no new patentable IP. We designed the Corporate R&D program for these types of projects to meet the challenge President Destler gave us. RIT declares up front any background IP required for a project and then commits to negotiate a fair corporate license for use of that IP. RIT corporate agreements often include a commitment to a non-exclusive, royalty-free (NERF) license for newly created IP, with an option to negotiate an exclusive license. This allows the company to use the IP developed without paying royalties.

The terms and conditions of the Corporate R&D program are defined through a new Corporate Sponsored Student R&D Agreement (CS-SRA), which is an alternative to the standard SRA. Corporate R&D is a low cost method for conducting industry sponsored research projects where much of the research is conducted by graduate students at the master level under the supervision of their faculty advisor. Small to medium-sized projects are jointly defined by University and company representatives to conduct research in an area that meets the interest and needs of the corporation. The university commits to best efforts. The company pays a small, up-front IP release fee that allows them to retain ownership of project results and any newly created IP. The company grants RIT the right to conduct research, teach, and publish following a negotiated delay to allow the company to protect any new IP. If necessary, RIT will sign a mutual non-disclosure agreement with the company. Since the ownership of new IP is given to the sponsor, the students, faculty, University, and company must all agree to the terms and conditions of the contract before the project is initiated. If no such agreement can be achieved, the standard SRA may be appropriate and licensing terms would be negotiated.

Projects are expected to provide benefit to the company and must involve research that is appropriate for a graduate student at the master's level. Ideally, these projects lead to a master's thesis and potential future employment following graduation. Examples of such projects may result in technical solutions to a corporate product or process problem, provide product differentiation, or add new discoveries to the companies' portfolio of key technologies. The project is expected to provide benefits to the students, faculty, and corporate sponsor.

The Corporate R&D program begins when RIT and a company negotiate and sign a master CS-SRA outlining the basic terms and conditions for all future projects. Each new project is defined by a project description that is appended to the master CS-SRA. We expect this approach to speed up the definition and initiation of new projects. The project description identifies the proposed research activity, timing, student and faculty investigators, and price. Most projects are expected to last one year to fit the schedule of a typical graduate student. The faculty advisor is identified as the principal investigator so that projects lasting longer than one year might involve a rotation set of students but would maintain the same faculty advisor throughout the project. Regularly scheduled reviews of progress are conducted with the company.

RIT has a 12 week quarter system, and this is the basis for the timing and pricing for Corporate R&D projects. The company sees a flat price, which includes quarterly support for each student involved, funding for the faculty advisor, finance and administration costs, and a small fee for releasing the IP. The pricing model applies to all units and all disciplines at RIT. The
company covers additional expenses such as materials, travel, or other costs. The company is responsible for all costs related to IP protection.

**Experience and Lessons Learned**

RIT has 1.5 years of experience with the Corporate R&D program. We have introduced the program through numerous discussions and face-to-face meetings with RIT faculty and staff and regional companies. At the time of this writing, RIT have defined agreements with seven companies involving 12 projects, each incorporating one to four graduate students. Project durations range from one quarter to five quarters. The program has resulted in a great deal of corporate enthusiasm but has created a few lessons-learned that require ongoing fine-tuning of the program.

Large and small companies are enthusiastic about the benefits of low cost projects that are easily defined; about access to University knowledge, skills, laboratories and equipment; and about the ability to own the results and newly created IP. Most companies also recognize the opportunity to evaluate graduate students as future employees. This is particularly attractive to the company given that the student is already conducting research in an area of interest. This program is very much like a cooperative education program for master level graduate students. The IP release fee does not appear to be a negotiating issue nor does the University requirement to future publications and internal use of the results following a delay for protection of the IP.

The most attractive feature to the company, the ceding of new IP ownership, has also created new issues for the partnership. When a company first learns of this feature, they often expect that all future research partnerships will follow the Corporate R&D model. As discussed earlier, the Corporate R&D program is not appropriate for all partnerships. We cannot use it when government funding is involved, when it limits future faculty research, or when the project includes Ph.D. students. We do not use the Corporate R&D program if the project includes undergraduates as many are not prepared to do research without major involvement of faculty. The challenge we face is marketing the program to either seed new partnerships or to expand an existing partnership involving fundamental research. We need to make it very clear to the company on day one that Corporate R&D at RIT is a tool that is restricted to applied research in a company-related technology involving master level graduate students under faculty supervision.

The Corporate R&D at RIT program is not expected to create great University wealth from IP royalties. The program, however, does provide many benefits to students and faculty and it helps RIT develop its technology leadership. The program brings new corporate partnerships to the University, provides real world research experiences and funded research for the faculty and graduate students, and gives the students opportunities for future employment following graduation. It is a form of technology transfer by licensing background technology to the sponsor.

RIT is currently investigating ways to market the program to avoid false expectations by companies. We are also fine tuning the pricing to ensure that overhead costs are covered and that faculty are compensated for the effort they devote to projects; granting faculty time and incentives from other duties for those who supervise large student teams on projects; and appropriately incentivizing faculty and students for giving up ownership, and therefore, potential income from IP that is given to the corporation. We will continue to hold feedback sessions with our faculty and students and listen to our current and potential corporate partners to make adjustments to make this a positive program for both the University and our corporate sponsors.

In conclusion, Corporate R&D at RIT is still a work in progress. We believe that the Corporate R&D program will help us increase and deepen corporate partnerships and that it could be a model for universities like RIT. The Corporate R&D program is a great benefit to students and faculty, and will ultimately increase U.S. leadership in innovation and technology for both corporations and universities. For more details, see www.rit.edu/research/corporate.

Donald L. Boyd is the Vice President for Research at the Rochester Institute of Technology.

**MILESTONES**

RODNEY GRANEC, previously at the University of Alabama, accepted the position of Grants Specialist at the University of West Alabama effective June 1, 2009.

JULIE GUGGINO, Central Washington University, is now the Associate Director of Research and Sponsored Programs.

JAN MADOLE accepted the position as Research Programs Manager at The Society of Exploration Geophysicists in Tulsa, Oklahoma, effective June 1, 2009.

DAVID NGO, University of Wisconsin-Madison, is now the UW Effort Administrator and ECRT Manager.

Have you or any of your colleagues made a career move? Please contact NCURA so our entire membership can help celebrate the change!
ACADEMIC MEDICAL CENTERS MUST EFFECTIVELY COLLABORATE WITH INDUSTRY IN ORDER TO IMPROVE HEALTHCARE. Industry access to the patients treated by Academic Medical Centers significantly enhances development of new drugs, devices and medical techniques. By partnering with industry, Academic Medical Centers can move innovation from the laboratory to the clinic and provide feedback to the next generation of medical technologies.

To effectively partner with industry, Academic Medical Centers must be receptive to opportunities to work with a variety of industries but manage those opportunities in a manner that maintains the Academic Medical Center's academic credibility and the trust of the patients it serves. Many authors have reviewed modes of collaboration (for example see Dusting et al., Finding Improved Medicines: the role of academic—industrial collaboration. NATURE REVIEWS DRUG DISCOVERY. November 2005). This article will look at four modes of Academic Medical Center-Industry collaboration, ways in which to take advantage of those opportunities and how an Academic Medical Center can maintain its credibility among its patients, the academic community and the public it serves.

Two themes will emerge from the following analysis of the modes of collaboration. First, Academic Medical Centers must be flexible in the arrangements they make to collaborate with industry. The conditions surrounding each specific collaboration must be the critical factor driving the terms of that collaboration. Second, the core means to maintain an Academic Medical Center's credibility in the academic community and among patients is complete disclosure of industrial collaboration.

Consulting Arrangements

In a recent survey, 94% of responding physicians reported some contact with industry. While most of that contact related to receiving drug samples or food in the workplace, 35% received some kind of payment, cost reimbursement or consulting fees (Eric G. Campbell et. al. A National Survey of Physician-Industry Relationships. THE NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL OF MEDICINE. April 2007). Academic Medical Centers need to evaluate consulting arrangements closely to make sure that the private consulting done by their staff and faculty does not compromise independent research and evidence-based patient care.

Consulting contracts are usually between industry and the consultant; the Academic Medical Center is not a party. Nonetheless, consulting arrangements play an important role in the collaboration between industry and Academic Medical Centers. By consulting with industry, faculty and staff can forge important relationships with industry that may be the basis of future collaboration.

Academic Medical Centers house world class researchers and experts in complex diagnoses and procedures and it is important that those experts can consult with companies that are striving to advance their fields. By implementing appropriate policies, Academic Medical Centers can enable the experts they employ to consult with industry without compromising their role as academics. Appropriate policies should allow faculty and staff from Academic Medical Centers to consult for industry, on the faculty or staff member's own time and on a limited basis. Consulting arrangements themselves should be limited to contain specific deliverables. They should focus on scientific issues and not on business concerns (see additional recommendations Brennan et. al. Health Industry Practices That Create Conflicts of Interest: A Policy Proposal for Academic Medical Centers. THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION. January 2006). Importantly, Academic Medical Centers should encourage faculty and staff to disclose the existence all consulting arrangements. Disclosure allows administrators to ask specific questions of the faculty or staff to determine if the consultancy compromises the consultant's academic credibility or if the consulting agreements create conflicts of interest regarding research and patient care.

Industry-Sponsored Research

Acknowledging the source of funding for research is a standard practice in all academic science but, given the wide variety of ways that an industrial partner can support research at Academic Medical Centers, acknowledgement must go beyond who funded the research. Industry can sponsor endowed chairs, postdoctoral fellowships, graduate students or otherwise provide material support to research at Academic Medical Centers.

At Academic Medical Centers, industrial sponsorship is especially important. "Very few of the major drugs that exist today would exist if it wasn't for relationships between companies and researchers" (Dr. Eric G. Campbell, quoted in Playing Well With Industry. SCIENCE. March 2008). Research at Academic Medical Centers often has immediate application and requires substantial resources to develop. Industrial sponsorship of research is often essential. Federal funding cannot be expected to fully support high-risk projects such as drug development.
Clinical Trial Agreements

Industry-sponsored clinical trials are a substantial portion of an Academic Medical Center's patient-oriented research (Paller et al. Clinical Trials at AHCs: The Perspective of an Academic Clinical Trials Office, ACADEMIC MEDICINE, December 2002). Clinical trials are invaluable for both industry and for Academic Medical Centers but often create conflict. In an article in the Lancet, (Montaner et al. Industry-sponsored clinical research: a double-edged sword. THE LANCET, December 2001), the authors identify a fundamental tension between industry emphasis on profit maximization and an Academic Medical Center's emphasis on scientific inquiry.

For example, publication is an essential end for research at Academic Medical Centers but less relevant or even contrary to the priorities of the industrial sponsor. The results of any clinical trial performed at an Academic Medical Center should be made public but the conditions surrounding publication are one means by which Academic Medical Centers can be flexible in their interactions with industry. An acceptable delay in publication, for example, is one means by which an Academic Medical Center can ensure data is appropriately published while still allowing industry appropriate protection of their proprietary information.

Another example is how the clinical trial handles the study results. Seeking FDA approval for new drugs and new medical devices is a long and costly process (Government Accountability Office. NEW DRUG DEVELOPMENT Science, Business, Regulatory, and Intellectual Property Issues Cited as Hampering Drug Development Efforts, November 2006). Academic Medical Centers' participation in industry-sponsored clinical trials makes them a part of that approval process. Generally, Academic Medical Centers that participate in clinical trials are accountable to deliver data within the sponsor's timeframe as laid out in the study plan. The need to deliver data within a set timeframe can conflict with an Academic Medical Center's research aims. Review of the data, for example, may not include certain analyses in order to meet data delivery milestones.

Commercialization Partnership

Academic Medical Centers own the intellectual property resulting from federally funded research occurring on their campuses and generally have policies to work with faculty and staff to commercialize intellectual property. Nearly all Academic Medical Centers maintain technology transfer offices to commercialize inventions, report to appropriate federal agencies, file intellectual property protection and find industrial partners to commercialize the resultant technology. Technology transfer offices have an essential role to facilitate collaboration with industry. In Academic Medical Centers, industrial collaboration is essential for technology transfer; industry partners have the expertise to engage in advanced development, navigate regulatory obstacles and distribute new products through the enormous and complicated healthcare industry.

A common means of technology commercialization of inventions is the outlicensing of intellectual property. When Academic Medical Centers license intellectual property to industrial partners, it creates a business relationship. Before executing the license, the Academic Medical Center must consider possible conflicts of interest created by that business relationship in light of existing obligations. Once executed, the Academic Medical Center must factor the business relationship with the licensee in other collaborations with industry.

The partnership with a licensee only begins with the execution of the license. The Academic Medical Center must work with the licensee to ensure that the licensee performs to the terms of the license. Licenses often contain a variety of obligations such as diligence milestones, periodic royalties and support for the licensed intellectual property. In addition, the license may contemplate clinical trials, sponsored research or other modes of collaboration. A license creates a long-term collaboration between the Academic Medical Center and an industrial partner. That relationship affects the Academic Medical Center's ability to engage in other collaborations. The Academic Medical Center should evaluate potential institutional conflicts of interest in light of the business arrangement with a licensee.

Conclusion

The four modes of industrial collaboration discussed above are by no means exclusive and rarely exist in a completely independent manner. If industry licenses a technology from an Academic Medical Center, then the same industrial partner may sponsor additional research to develop the technology. Industry may pay a physician as a consultant to help enroll patients in a clinical trial.

To effectively collaborate with industry, Academic Medical Centers must be able to work on Industry's terms: deliver data, propose relevant research and develop new technology all while remaining true to the principles of scientific inquiry and public service. There is nothing inherently incompatible with these two ideas. By carefully picking its industrial partners, being flexible as to the terms of the collaboration and working with faculty and staff through effective policies, Academic Medical Centers can work with industrial partners to improve healthcare.

Henry Joseph Runge is licensing specialist at UNeMed Corporation, the office that handles technology transfer for the University of Nebraska Medical Center. He received a Juris Doctorate and a Master of Science degree in Biology jointly from the University of Iowa in 2004.
Research administration is at a unique juncture since its establishment after World War II. The recent passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (a.k.a. Stimulus Bill) is providing significant increases in research funding to colleges and universities while at the same time attaching substantial strings (ropes?) to those funds. Of equal importance, and not fully ascertained, is what the funding picture will look like after the stimulus funds are exhausted. That picture, to a certain extent, is dependent upon economic and social conditions in the United States and abroad.

A critical dimension in this environment is the concept of “collaboration.” This can be made up of any number of combinations between universities, private companies, government, and other non-profit organizations. We all want more collaboration and, in fact, the worldwide economic climate suggests that we collaborate more. The International Research Collaborations project at the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR), as part of the National Academies, is implicitly predicated upon the fact that there should be more international collaboration, not less.

Despite all this talk of collaboration, however, the fact remains that universities compete against each other for research and sponsored project funding. We compete within the NIH and NSF panels, we compete for state funding, and we compete for foundation funding. That is the paradox: Collaboration and competition co-exist in the current funding environment. The key is to enhance collaboration while recognizing that competition exists. And perhaps increased competition, in certain circumstances, is not entirely a bad circumstance either?

It is useful to discuss a more concrete example, that of the State of Texas which is very different in culture from both the West (California) and East (Washington to Boston) coasts. From a cultural standpoint, Texas historically has been very competitive. This is a byproduct of a very independent history that exists to this day. Furthermore, this independence is equally political as it is cultural, and also manifests itself within the Texas systems of higher education. Texas boasts of over 40 universities as well as 10 independent health science centers. Efforts in the past to unify several of these different systems have failed, partially due to the historical culture of independence and competition. Currently, only three of the universities in Texas are recognized as Tier-1 institutions (The University of Texas at Austin, Texas A&M University, and Rice University). A competition is currently underway to determine which of seven “emerging research universities” will join the Tier-1 club. Such competition is good, stimulates individuals and institutions to aim higher and will undoubtedly raise the quality and quantity of research at all these institutions.

However, sometimes an imbalance arises where competition dominates collaboration. Adversarial cultures can hinder collaborations and become detrimental to all parties. For example, an established biotech/pharmaceutical company was considering moving from the West Coast to a metropolitan center in Texas. During their initial visit, they asked to meet with all the local academic centers to explore collaborations and workforce training. However, when all the players were assembled they proceeded to tell the prospective company why each of them was better than the other. This competitive atmosphere was further poisoned by similar presentations from the several chambers of commerce from the region. Needless to say, the company decided to look elsewhere—where collaboration trumped competition.

Another example comes from needless competition. As universities began to include intellectual property (IP) development as part of their mission, most developed technology transfer offices. In Texas this resulted in IP silos with many associated duplicative incubators. For many years Texas has been a leader in IP generation (e.g., patents awarded) but ranked far below average in licenses and spin out companies formed. Studies revealed that the basis for this disconnect was that investors, venture capitalists and industry bypassed Texas IP because there was no central database. Investors and potential partners were forced to meet individually with each institution to evaluate their IP portfolios (an unlikely event). Currently efforts are being made in Texas to create regional or statewide collaborative technology development centers to more effectively develop and promote academic-generated IP. Such an example is the South Texas Technology Management (STTM) Program (see Case Study #2).

Collaborative research is much more difficult to conduct than independent research. For an engineer and a physician to discuss a potential joint project requires time-consuming cross-training and learning each other’s language and capabilities. Add to such a collaboration faculty from other more diverse areas such as public policy, psychology, chemistry and law and this learning curve can be so challenging as to derail the project.

Yet, most faculty recognize that the problems facing society are so complex that they demand multidisciplinary teams. In industry, management can pull together teams and drive such collaborative efforts. In academia, this has often not been the norm with independent, highly focused projects often the case. However, collaboration with new colleagues outside of one’s inner circle can be exceedingly stimulating, demanding and sometimes conflicting. Usually they cause one to think both more deeply and broadly than one might otherwise. Collaboration
should in no way dilute one's own accomplishments but magnify the contribution to solving a bigger problem. Unfortunately, in the past academia has often rewarded the independent investigator more than the team researcher. Provosts and research offices should employ metrics and accounting procedures that reward collaborative research and give "credit" to co-authors, co-investigators, co-inventors, etc. In fact, one could argue that they should even get "extra credit" for these activities.

Clearly research is resource dependent, and changes are taking place. Over the past decade the Federal agencies have spelled out that their highest priorities are collaborative research programs addressing the bigger issues. These have been fueled by a variety of incentive funds to motivate academic researchers to opt for the more complex collaborative projects, and multidisciplinary research centers and institutes have evolved to pull together such teams.

Collaboration among different institutions is also essential but often even more difficult. An example is that between health science centers and universities. Although the stand-alone health science centers in Texas have become leaders in research and intellectual property, they do not have "in house" collaborations with colleagues in colleges of engineering, business, public policy, sciences, law, etc. However, this too can be overcome by developing resources aimed specifically at rewarding these collaborations. Such an example is the San Antonio Life Sciences Institute (SALSI), a collaborative partnership between The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) and The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio (UTHSCSA) (see Case Study #1).

Further collaborations between academia, industry and government are extremely important, but have challenges such as proprietary and confidentiality issues. Federal agencies (e.g., the NIH and NSF Roadmaps) promote these kinds of collaborations. Similarly, Texas established the Emerging Technology Fund to promote research and commercialization by linking industry, academia and the state government. The Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR), sponsored by the National Academies, provides a national platform for leaders in science and technology from government, academia and business to discuss critical issues of national importance. GUIRR is a great example of these three elements coming together to collaborate on issues of policy, guidance and best practices.

Case Studies

We present the following case studies from the "Texas Experience" in the hope that the reader gains a greater appreciation for collaboration, competition, and success:

**CASE STUDY #1** SALSI (San Antonio Life Science Institute): SALSI was established by the Texas Legislature in 2001 to catalyze collaborations between UTSA and UTHSCSA (located approximately 5 miles apart but completely independent components of the University of Texas System). A research fund of approximately $5.5 Million was established from the two entities and the UT-System. Only collaborative research projects were eligible to apply and review of the projects was by external peer groups. The purpose was to stimulate new collaborative programs in the Life Sciences between the faculty at the two institutions. Thus far the return on investment (i.e., extramural research funds obtained as a result of these collaborative seed grants) is almost 2:1. In addition, educational programs (e.g., bioengineering and health disparities) have resulted. These are accomplishments that neither institution would have been able to accomplish alone. This joint venture has also resulted in the co-development of intellectual property. This collaborative model involving the UTHSCSA and UTSA is now being replicated by other components of The University of Texas System.

**CASE STUDY #2** STTM (South Texas Technology Management): In contrast to the independent silo approach of developing intellectual property in Texas, STTM was founded on the concept that a more robust IP program would result from pooling resources and IP from the University and the Health Science Center into a single office with more resources for evaluating new invention disclosures, refining the invention, adding value, providing funds for proof of concept, protecting it and either linking it with existing companies, investors or spinning it off as a new entity. Initially, UTHSCSA, with a history of IP development in medical devices (e.g., the Palmaz arterial shunt), joined with UTSA (with active IP in its colleges of science, engineering and business) as the basis for STTM. The synergy was quickly apparent, STTM was then expanded to include the UT campuses at Brownsville and Pan American, and is currently adding other partners from outside the academic community. This approach not only provides an economy of scale with highly trained staffing to conduct the business of developing and promoting its IP, but results in a much more robust portfolio for examination by potential external partners. This strategy has also benefited from synergistically combining IP from divergent areas into much more valuable platform technologies.

Conclusions

Given the foregoing discussion and case studies, what conclusions can be drawn? Here are some, for starters:

1. Texas has benefited from being competitive, but sometimes has suffered by being overly competitive. It is essential to maintain a balance that promotes collaborative interactions within a competitive culture.

2. We are indeed at a unique time to examine the issues of collaboration vs. competition. Certainly the global economic issues have made us all aware of this.

3. The immediate issues of the ARRA/Stimulus Bill will have much competition and many "pigs at the trough" competing for resources.

4. High level institutional leadership is critical in ensuring collaborations between institutions with historically different cultures.

5. A robust IP portfolio containing bundled and diverse ideas, methods, and technologies can only be achieved by collaboration.

6. Regardless of the foregoing, the more important issues are to develop collaborations to provide new insight into solving the long-term issues such as health care, education and energy independence. These issues absolutely demand collaboration.

Given the present economic climate, perhaps this is a great opportunity for our academic institutions to step forward and rather than take the comfortable back seat, assume some responsibility and leadership in bringing our talents together to solve these issues—not as competitors—but as collaborators.

Dr. Robert Gracy is Vice President for Research at The University of Texas at San Antonio. He received a Ph.D. in Biochemistry from the University of California. James Casey is Director of Contracts and Industrial Agreements at The University of Texas at San Antonio and received his J.D. from the University of Dayton School of Law.
COMPLIANCE

As the person at my university who is tasked with the day to day oversight of the export compliance program and with training researchers, it seems that I’m always searching for information and training which will help me with this aspect of my job. Unfortunately, although there are some great programs out there for people who work in industry, there has been a virtual information vacuum with respect to how export control laws and regulations affect and apply to colleges and universities. Thanks to NCURA Annual Meeting Program Committee for that is about to change!

The 51st Annual Meeting program is now out and I’m pleased to report that there are a lot of offerings related to export controls. As in previous years, there will be some great sessions for people who need a basic introduction to export controls and some senior level policy discussions. However, this year in addition to those beginner and senior level sessions, there will also be sessions specifically intended for those of you, who like me, need and want some practical tools and tips for handling the issues that come up on our campuses; things like how to prepare different types of submissions to export control agencies and how to build an export compliance program, among other nuts and bolts topics. Highlights include:

- W12 - Export Licenses and Other Government Approvals (ITAR) (Program Level: Advanced) on 10/21
- W27 - The "How To’s" of Dual-Use and OFAC Export Licensing: A Hands-On Approach to Commerce and Treasury Export Controls and Embargoes (Program Level: Advanced) on 10/21
- Establishing A University-Wide Export Compliance Management System (Program Level: Advanced) on 10/24
- Congratulations, You're a University Export Compliance Officer! Now What? (Program Level: Intermediate) on 10/22
- The NSABB, Select Agents, and Export and Sanctions Laws (Program Level: Advanced) on 10/23
- Senior Advance Program: Export Controls (Program Level: Advanced) on 10/23

It should be a great Annual Meeting and I hope to see many of you at the export control sessions!

Kelly Hochstetler is a member of the Compliance Neighborhood subcommittee and serves as Senior Research Compliance Officer at the University of Alaska Fairbanks

DEPARTMENTAL

As I prepare for the beginning of another academic year, I find wisdom in the words of Clint Swindall, President & CEO Verbalocity, Inc. (http://www.verbalocity.com/). The following is adapted from his January 2009 newsletter.

In the midst of this economic crisis we have a simple choice to make; we can choose to be bitter or to be better. Anyone can point out the challenges that our institutions face as well as the world, but our success in the coming year will not be based on our ability to notice all that is wrong. Our success will be based largely on our ability to make our own “better.” The economy will eventually get better but in the meantime, we have a responsibility to make our world a little brighter. As we resolve to improve things at our institutions this year, consider doing the following three things to make your world “better.”

**Commit to learn something new**

Some of you reading this are concerned that you may lose your job. No one knows what will happen this year. But you can do something to improve your situation regardless of what happens out of your control. You can learn something new: enroll in a class, take an online course, or simply buy a book. If your situation improves this year despite the hours you spent worrying, then your world just improved and you have a new skill. If you lose your job, you’ll have another skill to offer a new employer.

**Commit to doing your best work ever**

It can be hard to stay engaged when you know you may be let go. Sometimes performance doesn’t matter if a company is eliminating a certain function, but often companies keep the best people. Turn the question around, if you were the boss and had to eliminate employees, would you keep the employee who shows up and does the bare minimum to get by while leading the daily Pity Party in the hallway, or would you keep the employee who is engaged, enthusiastic and willing to do what is necessary to succeed as an organization. If you want to have a better year, commit to doing your best work ever.

**Commit to being where you are**

With the amount of responsibility you carry, it can be hard to slow down and enjoy where you are. When you’re at work, you often think about being at home or on vacation. When you’re at home or on vacation, you think about everything you’re not doing at work. As you face the challenges of 2009, you must commit to being where you are. We may live in a “constant on” world with the myriad of technology clipped to our Bat Belt, but you can slow down long enough to be where you are.

Despite our best efforts, we will all have challenges throughout the next year. There will be many things we cannot control. But at this time next year, hopefully you’ll be able to look back at and identify something new you learned, that you will sleep well knowing you did your best regardless of the unknown, and that you took time to enjoy where you were. If you can do that, you’ll be ahead of most of the people in your world. And above all, you’ll know that in a world full of people who have chosen to be bitter, you chose to be better.

Lisa Gentry is a member of the Departmental Administration Neighborhood Committee and serves as Assistant Dean, Finance & Administration, College of Education, University of Arizona.
FRA

It’s nearing the end of the fiscal year for most institutions – and that means preparing for an audit. Whether it’s your annual A-133 review or other type of engagement, here are some important things to consider:

- Know the purpose of the audit.
- Obtain a formal engagement letter discussing dates, times, scope of the audit, and what materials are expected.
- Request an entrance and exit conference.
- Keep all stakeholders informed (even the PI!). If an institutional core office is engaged, there are normally protocols to manage such. If you are a campus department, unit or center, inform your core sponsored programs financial office of the engagement.
- Also be sure to notify your institution’s internal auditors.

Visit the NCURA FRA Neighborhood site (hit the Audit link) for additional resources and “checklists” to utilize in preparing your audit, whether planned or unexpected - and Good Luck!

On August 26 (2-3PM Eastern), there will be an online chat with 2 expert panelists to discuss every financial auditor’s favorite topic - COST TRANSFERS. Be sure to participate in this timely and informative session and submit your questions to the experts. To sign up send an email to chat@ncura.edu with the subject “cost transfers.”

Brian J. Sevier is a member of the FRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Assistant Director - Post Award, IFAS Sponsored Programs (ISP), University of Florida

INTERNATIONAL

The next few months are exciting times for NCURA and international research administration. In late June, NCURA members attended the EARMAC conference in Copenhagen, Denmark. The upcoming October Annual Meeting theme is “One World Connected Through Research.” The conference has a number of excellent international-oriented sessions scheduled. In addition, the September/October issue of the Magazine has an international research administration theme; that issue will be released before the Annual Meeting.

The NCURA National Office is also tracking the number of foreign “hits” on the NCURA website. As of June 16, 2009, individuals from the following countries visited the NCURA website: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, China, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guam, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Taiwan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Vietnam, Virgin Islands, Yemen, and Zambia.

The world is indeed becoming a smaller place, and NCURA will remain at the forefront of the internationalization of research administration.

James Casey is Director of Contracts and Industrial Agreements at The University of Texas at San Antonio, and serves as Chair of the International Neighborhood and Senior co-Editor of the NCURA Magazine.

PRE-AWARD

Nearly every research administrator has been affected by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). In the last several months, many Pre-Award offices have encountered an unprecedented number of proposal submissions, which resulted in awards that contain more stringent, frequent reporting requirements. Simultaneously, many universities are reducing their operating budgets, resulting in slower or eliminated electronic systems implementations, reduction in staff members, and limited travel for training opportunities.

As everyone attempts to “catch up” with the ever-changing regulations, NCURA members must network virtually across the country and share our resources; join the NCURA neighborhood list serves by e-mailing info@ncura.edu, share information on other universities’ ARRA web sites, participate in podcasts and webinars, and distribute copies of prepared guidance documentation (proposal quick guides, checklists, internal procedures). Increased networking may generate creative processes we can apply to survive these changes. For instance, one university anticipated hundreds of proposal submissions for the same due date, so they developed a completely new review, submission, and monitoring process utilizing a team approach that aligned central and department administrators.

ARRA’s increased award requirements for financial, technical, job retention/creation, FFATA (Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act) reporting encouraged Pre-Award offices to increase up-front coordination with the Post-Award office, research departments, faculty, and information technology.

Stressful times warrant the need for essential soft skills such as improved written and verbal communication, management and team support, encouragement and motivation, and morale enhancement. Take the time to give a small word of thanks to those colleagues or staff members who have gone above and beyond the normal call of duty.

Denise Moody is a member of the Pre-Award Neighborhood Committee and serves as the Assistant Director of Grants and Contracts in the Office of Research and Project Administration, Princeton University.
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With the coming of summer in New England, we have a brief time to reflect on our 2009 regional activities thus far and to look forward to the fall, the annual meeting, and beyond.

This year’s Region I Spring Meeting at the Grand Summit Hotel at Mount Snow, Vermont from May 3-6, 2009 was a huge success, especially in light of the current economy. Congratulations and thanks to Susan Zipkin, Chair-Elect, Brigham & Women’s Hospital, Stacy Riseman, Co-Program Chair, Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering, Denise Rouleau, Co-Program Chair, New England College of Acupuncture, the entire Program Committee, and all of the many speakers and other volunteers who helped make this year’s meeting a wonderful experience.

On June 11, 2009, Region I held its third Research Administrators Discussion Group (RADG) meeting of the year for 250 attendees. The meeting focus was on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and how research administrators at a cross section of New England institutions are preparing for, meeting, and surviving the many challenges of responding to funding opportunities, complying with award terms and conditions, and dealing with the additional costs. We were very fortunate to be able to identify a terrific panel to share their experiences - Barbara Cole, Boston University Medical School, Mark Daniel, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Pat Fitzgerald, Harvard University FAS, Amy Miarecki, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Mary Mitchell, Partners Research Management, and Jill Mortali, Dartmouth College. Thank you to one and all!

Thanks to the efforts of Randi Wasik, Chair of the Volunteer and Membership Committee and her excellent committee, the Region I Mentor Program is now in its second year. The program provides an opportunity for research administrators with less than 5 years experience to "partner" for the year with more experienced research administrators and to grow in the profession.

As of the date of this article, the Region I Nominating Committee is hard at work identifying the slate of candidates for Chair-Elect, Treasurer, and regionally elected Member to the NCURA Board of Directors. These positions all begin on January 1, 2009.

Committee members include Vivian Holmes, Chair, Broad Institute of MIT & Harvard, Mark Daniel, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Ben Prince, University of Massachusetts Medical School, and Susan Zipkin, Chair-Elect, Brigham & Women’s Hospital.

Plans are underway to hold two one-day workshops in September 2009 – Essentials in Research Administration and Advanced Topics – and the remaining RADG meetings in the fall. Thanks to Gary Smith, Curriculum Committee Chair, Massachusetts General Hospital, and his committee members for organizing the workshops. Stay tuned for more on these events.

And last, but certainly not least, the Region I Website Redesign Committee has been continuing its great work making the next version of the Region I website more functional and user friendly. Karen Woodward Massey, Chair, Harvard University and her committee are still planning to roll out the new and improved website prior to the 51st Annual Meeting in DC.

I hope to see many of you October 21-24, 2009 at the Marriott Wardman Park in DC!

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

Happy Summer! Summer Solstice just passed, allowing us to experience our longest day and the shortest night of the year. During this time, we are reminded of the inherent contradictions that all research administrators face on a daily basis. On the one hand, we can thank our lucky stars for longer days, because there are never enough hours in a day to get everything done that we need to do. Having a few extra hours of daylight is helpful. However, the shorter nights mean that we have less time for doing those other things that make us well balanced individuals – including spending time with our friends and families. What I can say, however, is that research administrators are experts in striking that delicate balance of work and play and often we seek out our NCURA support network to get us through. In fact, the networking and support available through our friendships and intellectual pursuits was outstanding during our Region’s annual Spring Meeting. The Spring Meeting is exactly what we need to keep up on the current topics during our daily struggles to
balance our lives. Held in Annapolis, Maryland this past April and focused on the theme "Navigational Tools for Smooth Sailing in the Seas of Research Administration," our meeting was an amazing success by all accounts. In spite of the tight financial times, the Region met its attendance goals and received excellent feedback on the quality of both the session topics and the speakers. Thanks to all of the speakers, moderators and especially the volunteers who participated. I also want to extend my sincere gratitude to all of you who attended. In addition to having a great turnout and attentive audience during our sessions, the enthusiastic response to our Monday night dinner event demonstrated that our region is filled with many fun loving people! Plans are underway for next year's spring meeting, so be sure to contact us if you would like to participate in the program committee.

To keep the momentum going from the past six months, the officers of the Region will be assessing what is needed to meet the needs of our busy administrators, and to be more productive in our roles as officers of the Region. The Region will be updating its website to better archive regional materials, set out policies and procedures (including job descriptions for volunteer opportunities and time lines for activities of the Region) and to communicate information more easily and frequently. Also, we are forming an ad hoc strategic planning committee to assess the current plan and to look towards the next few years for our goals. We are still accepting volunteers for these short-term initiatives, so please contact me if you are interested in participating. In addition, in collaboration with the national organization and along with many of the regions who have expressed similar goals, we are determining what enhanced services can be provided to our members to aid in extending the quality of our regional programming and to enhance the networking and mentoring opportunities within the Region. In fact, two of our regional officers – Jeanne Galvin-Clarke and Holly Benze – met with the other regional and national leaders in June at the annual Leadership Conference in Washington, D.C. at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park Hotel to discuss these exact topics. The consensus is that all regions can work together to assure the greatest chance of success for each region, and that the national organization will do everything they can to support the regions. There was also a full tour of the facility given to the participants of the Leadership Conference. It appears that this new facility will be a magnificent site for NCURA's 51st Annual Meeting, which will be held from October 21 – 24, 2009. So, be sure to make your plans early and join us in DC. See you soon!

Amanda Green, University of New Orleans, is our new Nominations and Elections Committee Chair. Amanda reminds Region III members to expect an email soon calling for nomination to fill three positions on the Region III Executive Committee: Chairperson-Elect, Secretary, and Treasurer-Elect. The election for these positions must be completed by the end of the year, so now is the time to think about whom you would like to nominate to serve.

A special feature of the 2009 spring meeting was the beginning of a tradition of naming a State Fundraising Champion. This was in response to the national organization’s encouragement to all Regions to conduct fundraisers to give back to our communities. As most of you know, Region III selected ShelterBox, a non-profit organization that provides humanitarian aid worldwide in the form of shelter, warmth and comfort to people displaced by natural and other disasters. The Region III meeting offered members the opportunity to learn more about ShelterBox by visiting the ShelterBox tent in the Exhibitors area and by seeing the ShelterBox slideshow and presentation during Monday’s luncheon. Members had opportunities to contribute directly at the registration desk and also by participating in the Poker Run for Fun at the Cinco de Mayo Margarita celebration, where a portion of each $10 entry fee was counted toward the player's state’s contribution to ShelterBox. By the end of the meeting, Region III had raised $2,000 to allow for the purchase of two boxes containing survival essentials for a family of ten. Congratulations to our Georgia colleagues, who became the first ever State Cup Champions, raising the most state combined funds from Region III and taking home the Flamingo Cup! Thanks to everyone who participated in the fundraising events. Tracking information for the boxes we are sponsoring can be accessed on the Region III web site so that members can learn where and when the boxes are deployed.

Under the direction of our Chair-Elect, Jennifer Shambrook, St. Jude Children’s Hospital, the Program Committee is already at work securing speakers and planning the program for the 2010 Region III meeting at The Peabody Hotel, located in the heart of the blues district in Memphis, TN. Please note that the dates for the meeting have changed to April 25-28, 2010. The Keynote Plenary Address will be given by Dr. Robert Webster, a world renowned authority on the influenza virus. Dr. Webster will speak about the interesting history of influenza epidemics, to include the current pandemic. The Fundraising Committee has also been formed, and Maria Valero-Martinez, University of Miami, serves as our Fundraising Committee Chair. Discussions are beginning to take place for competitive activities in support of a local Memphis charitable organization. Since fundraising events will occur during the Region III meeting, Maria will work closely with Jennifer and the rest of the Program Committee to ensure that fundraising is an equally successful part of the 2010 meeting. More information will be forthcoming about this meeting as details are completed. In the meantime, please visit the Memphis Convention and Visitors Bureau (www.memphistravel.com) and Peabody Hotel (http://www.peabodymemphis.com/) websites to learn more about this wonderful historic location.

**Update on NCURA Region III Officers and Chairs:**

Region III is pleased to announce and welcome three new committee chairs:

**Amanda Green,** University of New Orleans, is our new Nominations and Elections Committee Chair. Amanda reminds Region III members to expect an email soon calling for nomination to fill three positions on the Region III Executive Committee: Chairperson-Elect, Secretary, and Treasurer-Elect. The election for these positions must be completed by the end of the year, so now is the time to think about whom you would like to nominate to serve.
Regional Corner continued

Stephanie Smotherman, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, now chairs our Membership and Awards Committee. Stephanie would like to remind Region III members that July 15 is the deadline to apply for a travel award to the national meeting, and that application information about the next competition for a travel award to the regional meeting will be available in mid to late February.

Rodney Granec, University of West Alabama, our new Hospitality Committee Chair, would like to encourage members to stop by the Region III hospitality suite at the upcoming annual meeting in Washington, D.C. (details below). The suite will be open from 8 pm to midnight, Wednesday, Oct. 21 through Friday, Oct. 23 for activities, games, and refreshments. Visiting the hospitality suite is a great place for new and returning members to network and relax.

Tony Ventimiglia, Auburn University, now serves as our Immediate Past Chair of Region III. Tony extends his heartfelt thanks to all the members of Region III for their support, commitment and efforts in making Region III such a great region! He also thanks all the officers, committee chairs, and committee members, and other volunteers who made his job so easy this past year. (We all appreciate you too, Tony!)

Riddick Smiley, East Carolina University, continues to serve as the Region III volunteer coordinator. Please contact Rick or Rodney to sign up to help in the hospitality suite at the upcoming Annual Meeting. Rick would like to remind us that the Region also needs volunteers to occupy the buffer rooms around the Hospitality Suite. Also, any NCURA member who is interested in volunteering on a committee is encouraged to contact the committee’s chair. The roles of the committees are described on the Region III web site. There are many opportunities to serve, even if you can afford only a small time commitment, and all contributions of time and energy are welcome.

Spotlight on Region III LDI Participants
Region III has two members who are in the Class of 2009 NCURA Leadership Development Institute, the year long program during which competitively selected NCURA members participate in assignments to develop leadership skills. The LDI Class of 2009 includes Charna Howson of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and Carolyn Elliott-Farino of Kennesaw State University. Below our Region III members share some reflections on their LDI experiences thus far:

Charna:
“Initially I hesitated to apply to the NCURA LDI program. Now, very glad that I did, I highly recommend it to all who are serious about pursuing or advancing a career in research administration.

Over the past few months, my colleagues and I have explored leadership, personal values, and management skills. We have learned a great deal about ourselves on both a personal and professional level and then explored how to maximize the interaction of those two worlds. An added bonus comes from the wisdom shared by a personal mentor and the LDI Leadership Team with whom we communicate each month.

Finally, of course, are 7 new friends and colleagues, who also offer new insights and wisdom as we rise each day to meet new challenges facing the profession. I look forward to seeing them again at the national meeting and to serving with them as we serve our profession.

When I think of the most wonderful experiences I have had this year, the LDI Program not only ranks among them, it has been one of the best.”

Carolyn:
“Our class is a great mix of students because we represent predominantly undergraduate and research institutions, state and private universities, and a non-profit institution and a medical school. Each of us has a different set of life and research administration experiences from which to draw upon as we learn what it means to be a leader.

We met virtually in February, March, April, and May, via conference calls and online chats, and completed monthly homework assignments that challenged us to review past experiences through the prism of leadership attributes. In June, we gathered at a conference center outside of Baltimore to build on the work undertaken thus far, exploring personality types and their influence on leadership, investigating the differences between leadership and management, fostering teamwork, and participating in change management role-playing.

Continuing to build on the leadership lessons we’ve learned so far, each of us will undertake a project at our respective institutions that will require us to lead a team not necessarily from our office/department. We learned at our retreat that leading a team of people that report to you is not the same as leading individuals over whom you have no authority; the difference is a bit like herding cows vs. herding cats.

So far it’s been a fantastic journey, one that has revealed treasures and secrets alike, and I look forward to the next few months as we develop and implement our projects, and then meet again in October before the annual meeting to bring this phase of our leadership journey to a close.”

We appreciate Charna and Carolyn’s willingness to share their thoughts with their colleagues, and we wish both of them the best as they complete the LDI experience.

National Meeting Reminder:
Right now, Region III looks forward to participation in the 51st Annual Meeting in Washington D.C. which will be held at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park Hotel this year, instead of the Washington Hilton. With the theme “ONE WORLD Connected Through Research,” the National meeting should be both educational and fun! The dates are earlier this year, October 21-24, so mark your calendar now and plan to join us!

Don’t forget to check the Region III website which has much more information.

Laura Letbetter and Sam Gannon serve as Region III’s Magazine team. Laura is the Director of Proposal Development for the Office of Sponsored Programs at Kennesaw State University. Sam Gannon is the Education and Training Manager for the Office of Grants and Contracts Management at Vanderbilt University Medical Center.
Greetings, all! We are glad to report on another successful Spring meeting, held April 26 – 29 at the University Radisson in beautiful Minneapolis, Minnesota. We welcomed 144 attendees.

In addition to the workshops on Sunday, there were more than 50 concurrent sessions to choose from, for all levels of experience and featuring a wide variety of tracks.

This year’s theme, “Bridging the Gap – A Year for Change in Research Administration”, highlighted the keynote speaker: Dr. Robert Ballarini, the James L. Record Professor and Head of the Department of Civil Engineering at the University of Minnesota. His current research includes the study of the collapse of the I-35W Bridge in Minneapolis. It was interesting to hear about the research done after this terrible event, trying to piece together the cause of the bridge failure. Dr. Ballarini also discussed the issue of the country’s aging infrastructure and the necessity of dollars in research and reconstruction that will be required in the immediate future and over the next few decades.

We offered a wide variety of sessions, including one titled “A Faculty’s Perspective on the Grants Management Process,” with Faith Murtru. This session featured a faculty member, Dr. Francisco Díez-Gonzalez. As the title implies, the ensuing discussion brought to mind how different parties in the same process can come from markedly different perspectives. Handouts for this session brought many knowing chuckles from the audience, and included bullet points of ‘myth’ or ‘fact’, such as: “faculty like to hibernate in their labs until the project is complete”; and, “administrators still require too much information and are barriers to the research.” This session highlighted the need to brush aside stereotypes, and to remember that faculty and administrators are working toward the same common goals. Indeed, this session represented our “bridging the gap” theme quite well!

These are only a sample of the many great sessions that featured expertise, tips, and tools to help us all fine-tune or add on to our research administrative skills.

The region was also pleased to present its honors and awards. The Distinguished Service award was presented to Beth Seaton from Western Illinois University for her long-term contributions to the region. Natalie Goodwin-Frank from Washington University received the Kevin Reed Outstanding New Professional award for her involvement and enthusiasm. Regional Travel awardees included BonnieJean Zitske, University of Wisconsin, and Rifka Rosen, Adler Planetarium. We congratulate our honorees and thank them for their continued commitment and dedication!

New Officers and Board members were also announced: Diane Meyers, Iowa State University, Jeff Ritchie, Aurora Health Partners, and Kirsten Yehl, Northwestern University -- all Members at Large; Crystal Taylor-Nevils, University of Chicago, Awards Committee; Natalie Goodwin-Frank, Washington University, Communications Committee; Tricia Callahan, Miami University, Membership Committee; Sue Keehn, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Nomination Committee; Christa Johnson, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Program Committee; and Connie Motoki, Washington University, Site Selection Committee.

We are sincerely thankful to all of those who volunteered their time, presented information, assisted in organizing, or just participated in making our Spring Meeting a success!

This summer, the Region IV Board will be planning activities for the 51st Annual Meeting. We hope to see you at the new hotel in Washington DC this fall, and next year at the Region IV Spring meeting in Omaha, Nebraska.

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 Funding Resources Coordinator at Washington University. Sue Kelch is Co-Chair of the Region IV Communications Committee and serves as a Senior Financial Specialist at the University of Michigan.

Region V held its Spring Meeting at The Westin Riverwalk in San Antonio, TX on April 26-29. We had a very successful meeting with a record 162 in attendance. Dr. Sharon Brown of the University of Texas - Austin was our keynote speaker, and she shared her research on diabetes intervention programs for residents of Starr County, TX. In conjunction with this, we chose the Diabetes Association as the recipient of our fundraiser as part of NCURA gives back and raised $941 for their support. On Tuesday we heard from an Economic Development Panel who shared the importance of University Research and education in economic development. Several awards were given out at the meeting. The recipients of the travel awards were Anne Frey of Texas A&M International University and Nathaniel Jones of Langston University. A reception was held on Monday evening where Debbie Newton of University of Tulsa was presented with the Region V Distinguished Service Award. During the business meeting, the Region elected to hold the 2011 Spring Meeting in The Woodlands, Texas with Sam Houston State University, Texas Engineering Experiment Station at Texas A&M College Station, and MD Anderson Medical Center Houston as sponsoring Universities. I wish to again thank the Program Committee for their hard work in putting together this meeting and the many people who volunteered as presenters and moderators who provided us with excellent content to make the meeting such a success.

An election was held this Spring for the positions of Vice-Chair/Chair Elect, Secretary, two ad hoc members of the Executive Committee, and the Region V Elected Member to the National Board. The results were announced at the regional meeting: Dr. Marianne R. Woods, University of Texas at San Antonio was elected as Vice-Chair/Chair Elect and assumed her position at the end of the Spring meeting. Joanne Palmer, Texas State University -- San Marcos was elected Secretary and ad hoc Executive Committee members will be Trisha Allen, Sam Houston State University and Cheryl Anderson, UT Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas.
Regional Corner continued

Debbie Newton, University of Tulsa was elected as the Region V Elected Member to the National Board of Directors. Also, Kay Ellis was approved by the National Board to become the Region V member to the Nominating & Leadership Development Committee. All of these will assume their positions in January.

The region also has a new volunteer coordinator. Reggie Crim, University of Texas - Austin will assume the position when Joanne Palmer becomes Secretary in January. Our new webmaster is Thomas Spenser, UT Southwestern who replaced Cindy Schaefer, Oklahoma State University. We thank Cindy and Joanne for their work in these positions and Reggie and Thomas for their willingness to serve.

Site visits were made to South Padre Island, TX in early June for our Spring 2010 meeting. The selection will soon be posted on our website (http://www.ncuraregionv.com) and will also be announced at the National meeting.

The National meeting will be held October 21-24, 2009 at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park Hotel. This is a new date and hotel site. Also new at this years’ annual meeting is sharing a suite with Region II. Information about the annual meeting and regional activities will soon be posted to the Region V website.

I wish you all a safe and happy summer and look forward to seeing you in October at the annual meeting.

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

REGION VI

Summer has arrived in the western part of the United States and with it comes the opportunity to select Region VI leaders for 2010. Be sure to cast your vote for Chair-elect, Treasurer-elect, Secretary-elect, and one Regional Advisory Committee member. The Nominating Committee (Ted Mordhorst, University of Washington; Katherine Ho, Stanford University; and Richard Seligman, California Institute of Technology) created a terrific slate of prospective leaders from which to select.

This summer Region VI will fund four awards to support travel to the 51st Annual Meeting, October 21– 24, 2009 at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park Hotel in Washington DC. Each award will provide a research administrator from the Region VI geographic area with up to $750 for expenses associated with transportation, hotel and food costs associated with the meeting. The deadline for receipt of applications is July 15, 2009. Nominees do not have to be members of NCURA at the time of nomination and may nominate themselves. The nominees must be research administrators from the Region VI geographic area who have not previously attended either a regional or national NCURA meeting. Additional Information about the application process has been posted to the Region VI website.

The application form can be accessed at: http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/announce.asp. Nominations for the Region VI recognition awards are also being accepted at this time. Questions about the travel and recognition award program may be directed to Ann Pollack, Region VI Award Committee Chair at 310-794-0387 or by e-mail at apollack@research.ucla.edu.

Thank you to all of you who participated in the recent professional development survey developed and administered jointly by the Membership and Volunteer Committee and the Education and Professional Development Committee. This summer the two committees plan to analyze the data and engage in brainstorming to expand Region VI professional development opportunities beyond the spring regional meeting. In addition, the Education and Professional Development Committee, chaired by Linda Patton, University of California, Fullerton, is working hard to finalize an exciting new professional development opportunity for Region VI members. Watch for its unveiling at the 51st Annual Meeting!

The Membership and Volunteer Committee, chaired by Joseph McNicholas, Loyola Marymount University, is seeking volunteers for an ad hoc committee to advise the Regional Advisory Committee on the future of the Region VI website. Please watch for this opportunity to volunteer.

Speaking of volunteering, the April 2010 Region VI & VII Spring Meeting in Newport Beach, California, isn’t all that far off. Soon the 2010 Program Committee will begin developing next year’s program and will be looking for presenters and discussants who are willing to share their expertise and experiences in research administration with colleagues. I’d especially like to encourage members who have not presented before to consider volunteering to co-present with a more experienced presenter in order to draw out more of our two regions’ expertise. There are also many opportunities for volunteering at both the national and regional meetings for those of you not interested in presenting, such as helping with registration, evaluations, and preparing packets. Please don’t be shy about becoming involved in NCURA—after all, it is your organization! I look forward to seeing you at the October 21-24, 2009 at 51st Annual Meeting in DC.

Julie Guggino is Chair of Region VI and serves as Associate Director of Research and Sponsored Programs at Central Washington University in Ellensburg, Washington.
Summertime – and the livin’ is easy – or is that busy? Things have been busy for your Regional Officers. We kicked off our summer by attending the 2009 Leadership Convention on June 5 and 6 at the Washington Marriott Wardman Park Hotel. Deb Murphy, Chair-Elect, Kate Green, Secretary-Treasurer, and I joined officers from the other regions, national officers and national committee chairs, Board of Directors members, and national organization staff to brainstorm on the topics of Volunteerism, Programming, and Communication. It was a very stimulating and energizing meeting. We also enjoyed a tour of the Marriott Wardman Park, our home for the 51st Annual Meeting. Don’t forget – our annual meeting is a bit earlier this year – the dates are October 21-24, 2009. It’s not too soon to begin making plans for your trip to D.C.!

Work has begun to provide a new look to our regional web site. We are reformating and updating our site to improve the design, provide more information, add important links, etc. This project is being lead by our hard-working IT guru, Brian Christian of the University of New Mexico. If you have any ideas you’d like to share or information you’d like to see, please contact me at horrdian@isu.edu.

Summertime is not only a time to schedule relaxing vacations and catch up on projects both at work and at home, but it is also time for our regional elections. In early July we will be requesting nominations for Chair-Elect, Secretary-Treasurer, and Member-at-Large. Please consider running for one of these positions or ask a colleague to accept your nomination. We are fortunate to have many very talented, energetic members in our region – get involved – volunteer your time. Watch for regional eblasts and don’t forget to vote!

Have a great summer!

Dianne Horrocks is the Chair of Region VII and serves as the Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at Idaho State University.
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Software Solutions for the Business of Research
Innovation is the lifeblood of a technology company. A single research breakthrough can have more financial impact on a company than major acquisitions or cost-saving initiatives. Examples at HP include ink jet printers and RISC based computers. As the world’s largest technology company, HP recognizes that innovation is key to the company’s vitality.

In today’s globalized world, however, ideas and innovation can appear both inside and outside of the company walls, and the path to commercialization today can take many different routes. In order for a company to successfully bring new products to market, it can no longer remain “closed” to the larger innovation ecosystem to which it belongs.

In order to capitalize on the global wealth of knowledge and ideas, HP Labs works with partners in the international innovation network to advance our common technology vision. HP Labs’ Open Innovation goal is to amplify our research investments through partnerships with industry, government and academia. Open Innovation projects underway include joint research with universities worldwide, research programs co-funded by governments, and collaborations with customers.

HP Labs Innovation Research Program

Building upon HP Labs’ history of successful collaborations with university researchers and students, in 2008 HP Labs established an open innovation approach to transition from a potpourri of informal collaborations into a unified, strategic portfolio of investments. Consequently, the Innovation Research Program (IRP) was launched in April 2008, providing opportunities for university researchers from around the world to engage in collaborative research with HP Labs scientists.

The IRP is a bold statement for the IT industry: it presents a detailed overview of our current areas of research, and invites others to invent the future along with us. It is designed as a global, open, competitive, annual call for proposals. HP Labs publishes a series of research topics, and interested researchers are invited to submit proposals for a collaborative project that aligns with one of the solicited topics. Awards range from $50,000 - $100,000 USD per year, and may be renewed for up to a three year project duration.

Results from 2008 projects

In its inaugural year, Labs researchers reviewed more than 450 proposals from 200 universities in 28 countries, and selected 45 projects at 35 institutions in 14 countries to receive HP Labs Innovation Research Awards.

The results of these collaborations in just one year are extremely compelling: 82 graduate student researchers have collaborated full- or part-time on projects, and HP Labs internal reviews rated average project performance at 4.28 (max = 5.00). Among the 45 projects, 61 papers were accepted for publication in their first year, and 13 HP invention disclosures were accepted.

Table 1. Publications by 2008 IRP awardees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>In preparation</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (est)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Publication status as of March 2009)

Table 2. Invention Disclosures from 2008 IRP projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>In preparation</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (est)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Status as of March 2009)

Professors who are collaborating with HP Labs have also commented on the value the IRP has provided to them and to their students: “My students get the opportunity to work on problems with a practical application,” said Professor Kwan-Liu Ma of the University of California, Davis. “Furthermore, through our partners at HP Labs, we are able to obtain industry perspectives of each problem, leading to more comprehensive solutions.” The benefits are also tangible for HP: Professor Ma’s team is working with Kimberly Keeton, Senior Research Scientist in the Storage and Information Management Platforms Lab, on visually representing the complex relationships between documents and people, addressing the massive scale and overwhelming complexity of enterprise information. “Working with Professor Ma and his students has provided us with visualization expertise that we don’t currently have in our lab,” explains Keeton. “His world-class background isn’t just contributing to our research agenda, it’s helping us do things we wouldn’t have been able to do otherwise.”

The 2008 IRP included attraction of external funding as a key part of proposal evaluation. 2008 projects averaged a 1:1 match of external funding to HP Labs’ investment, considerably increasing the impact of the program, and enhancing their ability to contribute to HP’s research agenda through support of additional students and other project resources.
In June 2009, building on these successes, HP Labs announced its second annual Innovation Research Awards, funding more than 60 projects at 46 institutions in 12 countries, including 31 projects from 2008 that will continue with a second year of funding.

In addition to supporting multi-year projects, the IRP program has also helped provide “seed” funding to attract external investments, as in the case of Dr. Alan Bundy at the University of Edinburgh. Dr. Bundy’s project, in the field of Enterprise Information Management, will continue with funding from the UK Office of Naval Research (ONR), providing future returns after one year of HPL funding. Dr. Bundy states that the initial IRP funding helped “prime the pump” for his work to successfully attract significant funding from the ONR.

Comparison with other industry programs

Many of the faculty researchers who have applied to the IRP are well-acquainted with other, similar industry funding programs. They have told us they view the IRP as unique in the industry: “Unlike other programs, the HP Labs effort does not seem focused on a specific HP technology,” stated a 2008 applicant. “Other [industry] programs have thinly disguised goals of improving market share of their specific products.”

Some companies have philanthropic programs but do not support university research. Others aim to support research at universities, but sidestep key issues in developing collaborative frameworks by providing “hands-off” donations or sponsorships, effectively hampering their own researchers from openly collaborating with their colleagues in academia.

At HP Labs, we believe university collaborations can have a significant impact on the state of the art, and eventually on our research contributions to HP. Open Innovation investments by HP Labs are therefore specifically designed NOT to be purely philanthropic: we invest because we believe there is potential for a relationship and collaboration that can lead to mutual benefit.

Single Collaborative Framework

Many of the historical challenges in engaging in productive partnerships between universities and industry have revolved around varying viewpoints on the role of intellectual property and legal frameworks for collaboration. Over the years, HP Labs has developed numerous successful research partnerships with universities, and we have found that the start of the working relationship can sometimes be delayed by a lengthy review of the legal framework for the collaboration.

Due to the size of the program we were creating in 2008, we realized that we needed a way to quickly execute a large number of awards and agreements on a yearly basis, and began to devise a strategy for a single collaborative framework. Developing a legal framework that all potential partners could agree on (on a worldwide basis, no less) was a daunting task. A critical success factor was to work closely with several university research administrators as trusted partners, in order to develop a framework that could be acceptable both to universities and to HP, allowing each party to pursue its fundamental mission.

Our approach is that both parties must have mutual freedom of operation: the university partner must have freedom to advance the creation and dissemination of knowledge, as well as to freely publish the results of the research; HP must also have freedom to conduct future research and to pursue its own strategies for commercialization.

A single-project Collaborative Research Agreement (CRA) for the IRP was developed and made available online at the start of the call, providing university research administrators the opportunity to review it prior to submission of proposals. In order to ensure that faculty do not submit proposals without their institution’s review, proposals are required to include a signed letter from a university official that confirms that the university has reviewed the agreement. Only when the proposal is successful is the university required to sign the agreement with HP.

The reaction from our colleagues in academia has in general been positive: by engaging in an open and transparent process where all partners are equal, HP has managed to create the foundation for a systematic program that can truly support collaboration, and not simply “gifts” or donations.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

As the HP Labs Innovation Research Program heads into its third year in 2010, several key lessons have emerged:

**SHARED RISK.** A partnership where both parties share risk means both parties are invested in the collaboration and its ultimate results. Additionally, relationships are of critical importance in building trust and a collaborative environment.

**LOOK FOR COMPLEMENTARY EXPERTISE AND EXPERIENCE.** Work with partners who can enhance your own research capabilities, instead of looking to universities to “outsource” R&D.

**START SMALL.** When building a new relationship, start small and prove successes early and often so that stakeholders can clearly see the value of the partnership and will thus be more supportive of growing the collaboration over time.

**SET CLEAR GOALS.** Make sure that everyone involved with a project knows what is expected of them, including student researchers. This leads to a more predictable, productive, and positive collaboration.

**TEchnical Papers, Not PowerPoint.** Industry researchers are measured on many of the same outcomes as academics. Successful partnerships stem from concrete outcomes that are recognized as valuable by both parties.

**FLEXIBILITY.** Recognize that while partners may have similar research aims, their goals and approach may be different. Reasonable collaborative and IP terms allow both parties to pursue their fundamental mission. Similarly, partners should also evaluate each situation individually: research in IT differs greatly from, say, research in biotechnology, and each case has its own requirements and characteristics.

**LISTEN TO YOUR STAKEHOLDERS.** Ultimately, any open innovation program should be in service to its stakeholders; when designing a new program, ensure that all participants have what they need to be successful. Positive results will follow.

Martina Y. Trucco is Creative Lead in the Strategy and Innovation Office at HP Labs. Richard J. Friedrich is Director of the Strategy and Innovation Office at HP Labs.
Reflections on a Career in Research Administration - Industrial Relations and Technology Transfer

by Earl J. Freise

My professional training was in the field of Metallurgy and upon completing my graduate studies in 1962, I was offered a position as an Assistant Professor in Materials Science at Northwestern University. The initial employment also included a half time role for two years as Assistant Director of the newly formed Materials Research Center at Northwestern, one of the initial three centers funded by DARPA – The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. In the late 60’s, Northwestern established an Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP), separate from the business services operation, to handle proposal processing and compliance issues associated with grants and contracts from external sources, mainly the Federal Government.

In 1970 I was offered a half-time appointment in the Office as Assistant Director and, eventually, assumed a full time position. It was during this period that I joined NCURA and by the mid 1970s I was becoming involved in NCURA activities; first at the Region IV level and subsequently at the National level. One of the administrative responsibilities was to serve as University liaison between inventors, patent attorneys, technology evaluation firms and consultants, and the funding agency and potential licensees. Retention of invention ownership, relations with industry and technology transfer were topics of major discussion among many of the major research universities in the early 1970s. Many institutions had taken advantage of an Institutional Patent Agreement (IPA) developed by Norm Latker, then Patent Counsel of the DH E W. Basically, institutions were allowed to retain the patent rights to inventions developed on research projects funded with Federal funds if they could demonstrate that they had a procedure in place to identify, evaluate and, if deemed patentable, patent the inventions and subsequently transfer the technology to commercial organizations.

The interaction with individuals, the opportunities for further training, and the sharing of knowledge and experiences afforded by organizations such as NCURA and AUTM were invaluable to me in my 25+ years in the field.

One of the acceptable methods of demonstrating the viability of an institutional patent program was to have entered into an agreement with a firm such as Research Corporation or Battelle that had the manpower and expertise to evaluate and license inventions. While these organizations did not charge for their services, they did take a percentage of any revenue generated by inventions licensed through their efforts. Generally, they did not require that all invention disclosures be forwarded to them for evaluation so that an institution could pick and choose which inventions it would forward to them for evaluation. Well it soon became obvious that if the patent administrator at the university became skilled in assessing the value of invention disclosures he/she would retain the disclosures to the "sure fire hits" and forward the questionable invention disclosures to the firms for their evaluation. It was far easier to go to an inventor that had a questionable invention and inform him/her that while you personally thought the invention was the greatest advancement known to mankind, the patent evaluation firm just couldn’t justify investing funds and time in pursuing a patent. Therefore, the university was going to release the invention rights to the government (who generally didn't pursue further patent action).

Within NCURA the breadth of research administration problems relegate the concerns about inventions, patents and technology transfer to a small segment of the total research administrator community. While there might be sessions at regional meetings or even at the National meeting on this topic, there was a developing feeling that there had to be a more direct approach to handling the advocacy and education aspects desired by those administrators dealing with technology transfer issues. At the 1973 National NCURA meeting, the luncheon speaker was Betsy Johnson, the Deputy Secretary for Commerce who had oversight responsibilities for the Patent and Trademark Office. Her remarks reiterated what most in the university community already knew; namely that the government handling of university inventions was poorly done.

In 1974 Alan Moore at Case Western Reserve University was instrumental in organizing a National Conference on the Management of University Technology Resources. A number of research administrators that were handling patents and technology transfer for their institutions were in attendance and one of the identifiable problems facing many of the administrators was the lack of training resources and advocacy for the specialized circumstances that they faced in running their technology transfer programs. There was a professional organization for invention licensing known as the Licensing Executive Society (LES) but its primary emphasis was on technology transfer and licensing in the commercial sector and it had little concern for the problems facing the academic community. One of the outcomes from a group of the university research and patent administrators at the Case Western Reserve University meeting was a proposal to form a new organization to develop educational...
in the suburbs of Chicago and as the meeting was dragging on I excused myself to return home. The next day I learned that I was elected Secretary/Treasurer of SUPA. An important lesson was learned - never leave early if officers are being elected.

Membership gradually grew over the next few years. The initial membership fee was $10 with annual dues of $30. In the first few years SUPA did not bill for annual membership dues as we had few expenses and were not providing any educational materials to the membership. Any meeting costs were minimal since Dvorkovitz covered the underlying costs of the meeting facilities and, consequently, lodging and travel expense was the only cost incurred by an attendee. As the 1970s drew to a close, Larry Gilbert produced some rudimentary training materials on invention evaluation, strategies for obtaining patent protection and fundamentals of licensing. Training sessions were beginning to be offered at the annual meetings. Mary Spores at Northwestern took on the role of Secretary/Treasurer and the finances of the organization were put in order.

In the same time period SUPA members as well as some NCURA members were called upon to support the Bayh-Dole legislation that was introduced in Congress to authorize Federal agencies to allow small businesses and universities to retain the rights to inventions that may have been developed with Federal funding. Many SUPA and NCURA members were instrumental in getting Congress to pass Bayh-Dole in 1980. Some individuals particularly influential in providing information and testimony to Congress were Howard Bremer, Patent Counsel at WARF, Ed MacCordy from the University of California, and Roger Ditzel from the University of California. In 1989 the governing board of SUPA recommended that the name of the organization be changed to the Association of University Technology Managers - AUTM. At the 30th Anniversary meeting of AUTM in 2004, the membership was quoted as being over 3000 - quite a remarkable growth from the original seven members in 1975!

One other remarkable event in which I was involved in the area of technology transfer was helping Ed MacCordy (Washington University), a past president of NCURA (1984), with its 25th Anniversary celebration to organize an NCURA-sponsored national conference entitled "The Private Sector/University Technology Alliance: Making it Work" that was held in Dallas, TX in 1984. I volunteered to oversee the assembling and editing of the proceedings of the conference. Ed contracted with a group of court reporters who dutifully recorded the presentations and subsequent question/answer sessions. The problem was that the court reporters were not familiar with the jargon involved in discussing university - industry interactions. Consequently, many of the transcribed sessions were completely unintelligible and I would have lost my sanity in trying to get the Proceedings published if it had not been for the help of the NCURA office staff and the willingness of the presenters to review what I could decipher from the court reporters’ writings.

This conference was significant because it was the first national conference NCURA held outside the annual meeting. Coopers and Lybrand, now part of PriceWaterhouseCoopers, underwrote the publication costs of the proceedings.

The preceding paragraphs contain a few examples of the opportunities and variability that a career in research administration may afford an individual that is seeking challenges in their occupation. The interaction with individuals, the opportunities for further training, and the sharing of knowledge and experiences afforded by organizations such as NCURA and AUTM were invaluable to me in my 25+ years in the field. In my opinion one only benefits from what an organization such as NCURA has to offer if one is willing to be an active participant in the organization’s programs. Not only does one have to attend sessions and participate in exchanges of information but, to truly master the subject matter, one has to lead panel discussions and be willing to teach subject material. I look forward to seeing the organization continuing to grow, not only in numbers, but also in stature.

Earl J. Freise served as President of NCURA in 1985 when he was with the University of Nebraska-Lincoln as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research.
C ollaborative research between academic medical centers (AMCs) and industry have become increasingly more important to both entities. AMCs require the support of industry research to develop scientific innovations and bring cutting edge treatment to patients. Industry requires the innovation, scientific knowledge and the credibility of AMCs. Problems occur, however, due to the competing demands on each entity. Time increases the cost of research; each additional day it takes to market a product increases the cost significantly. At the same time, the regulatory burden to conduct any type of research for AMCs has increased to the point that timely IRB and contract approvals are difficult to achieve.

Rush University Medical Center (Rush, RUMC) has a history rich with examples of research that led to the development of innovative treatments that improved the quality of life and the saving of lives. The history of Rush began two days before the city of Chicago was incorporated. Today Rush researchers continue this rich tradition, yet the research systems and infrastructure of the organization had not remained current with the needs of the Rush research community, sponsors, nor the increasing requirements of the regulatory agencies. The process of regulatory and contract review was so complex that at times it could take almost a year to complete. Researchers, staff, executive leadership and sponsors were challenged and research was being impeded to the point that some sponsors threatened to stop supporting research at Rush.

To meet these challenges, a commitment was made by Rush senior leadership to shorten the timeline for processing industry agreements to three months or less. A process assessment was conducted that included surveys, focus groups and individual interviews. The need to facilitate submissions and decrease the time from application to approval for IRB, contracts, legal review and contract execution was identified as the primary issue; as well as the data management and productivity management of the research. A need for post-approval invoicing and tracking receivables for active contracts was also considered important. It was determined that the data system used at that time was largely ineffective and prior to addressing any other issues, it was decided that Rush would enter the world of electronic research administration.

There are many vendors that provide systems that allow users to track research data in an effective manner. The process of evaluating these vendors, although always important, had an additional importance for Rush. They had previously purchased a system that was not successfully implemented. Shortly after this application was purchased the company had declared bankruptcy. The source code for the application had been purchased, but due to the inability to customize the application, enhancements could not be made to meet the needs of Rush. Workflow changes necessary to manage new review requirements were not possible in this application. It was therefore necessary to identify vendor requirements to avoid making a similar mistake.

Multiple vendors were reviewed and evaluated for this project. Many systems only included IRB administration packages, and some of those only included portions of IRB management. Our decision was to improve all of the research processes, thus we needed a vendor that:

- Had a proven track record with other universities and AMCs.
- Had financial stability.
- Was able to use the current information systems of RUMC to facilitate organizational adaptation and acceptance of the new system.
- Was able to provide a system that could be integrated with other software products utilized at Rush, allowing for growth and adaptation as needs required.
- Was able to provide a system which allowed Rush staff to implement system changes.
- Had other related products that were able to address other research administrative needs.
- Agreed to partner with Rush to develop new related programs utilizing Rush content knowledge.
- Had a product that is a portal environment, allowing access wherever the internet was available.

A number of “off the shelf” solutions were examined and after a thorough review, using the above criteria, the decision was made to partner with Click Commerce to build the Rush Research Portal (RRP). The contract between Click Commerce, Inc. and Rush University Medical Center was executed on June 16, 2006.

The first module to be built in the RRP was the electronic submission, review and approval of protocols involving the use of Human Subjects (IRB Module). The installation of the IRB Module took four months. After immediate acceptance by a large number of early adopters, many users voluntarily moved to using electronic submissions. Mandatory electronic submissions were required just after the beginning of the next academic year, within nine months of the “go live” date. Resistance to the electronic submission was non-existent. Soon all protocols were being processed electronically and all legacy protocols had also been entered into the system. Installation of the IRB Module shortened many of the required processes, thus the...
average review time for a full board review decreased from at least three months to approximately thirty days. The IRB Module alone increased the satisfaction of faculty and research administrators by 14.3 percent. This increase in researcher satisfaction was a good beginning and as they were increasingly satisfied, so were the sponsors. Sponsors were able to receive real time information about the status of the study review from the research staff.

The first phase was successful, but it was very important to remain focused and continue to find electronic solutions to improve the approval process timeline. Research Affairs had already centralized research administration into one physical location; however, each process used by Research Affairs still needed to be addressed and improved in a separate fashion. These separate processes or systems often led to confusion and frustration for both internal and external customers. In order to decrease these frustrations, as well as the approval timeline, it was decided to decrease as many system redundancies as possible. To this end the RRP Team developed Study-Centered Research Management™.

This concept uses the plasticity of the Click Commerce product and the research experience of research administrators. The RRP Team created the Master Project* concept, connecting the current installation of the IRB Module with modules planned for the future. The Master Project* allows certain key information fields of a project to be completed and retained for all other modules; self-populating required fields where appropriate. This eliminates the need for data to be entered repetitiously. Most importantly the Master Project* allows one administrative entry point for the entire research project, and provides a space for monitoring the progress, or lack of progress, of each project.

With the Master Project* successfully implemented, it was decided to plan the installation of the Grants and Contacts Module. Two years prior to the initial planning for the RRP, Rush had developed a coverage analysis process which outlined all items and services required to conduct a clinical research project following Medicare's Clinical Trial Policy and National Coverage Determination. All studies conducted at Rush require a Coverage Analysis prior to any other review. Thus all other modules, including the IRB, are dependent on this particular process. Early in the planning of the Click implementation it was decided to proceed with the IRB module first since this was already developed by Click. We would continue coverage analysis on paper until the Grants and Contracts Module implementation was initiated and completed. At the time Click Commerce did not have a coverage analysis process and utilized the Rush format to design their system. The Grants and Contracts Module also provides a system-to-system application for the electronic submission of federal grant applications through grants.gov. The installation of the Grants and Contracts Module, including the Coverage Analysis Module, was completed earlier this year and has allowed Rush to process compliant industry contracts more quickly and efficiently, as well as provide a transparent permanent electronic record.

Determining an accurate price for research procedures and services was an issue causing a delay in initiating an industry sponsored clinical trial. The RRP Team decided to create a new integrated pricing structure for all studies conducted at Rush. The negotiated Medicare rates were used as the ground floor for the integrated pricing and were increased based on the competitive market values for these procedures and services. The integrated price includes both the price for the procedure or service along with the applicable professional fee. The integrated pricing schedule has been posted in the RRP by CPT code and is readily available to Principal Investigators and research administrators when drafting a budget for an industry sponsored trial. The integrated pricing strategy not only allows clinical departments to draft budgets more quickly, thereby opening enrollment on studies faster, but also creates a margin in the research fund which can be used to cover costs which are incurred yet may not be billable to the sponsor.

Presently we are actively involved in the build out of the Clinical Trials Participant Tracking Module (CTPT Module). This new module will allow Rush to track each study participant as they progress from screening to completion of the clinical trial within the RRP. The grid that is created for each participant is coded not only to record the cost of each service and procedure provided under the protocol, but also records whether the industry sponsor, a third party insurer or the subject should be billed for the item and the amount they should be billed. This billing information for each study is taken from the grid in the Coverage Analysis Module. The CTPT Module will allow the user to produce billings to send to industry sponsors and track outstanding invoices through an accounts receivable system. The CTPT Module is expected to go live at the end of September, 2009.

Once the CTPT Module is installed, we plan to develop integration between the RRP and the Rush EPIC electronic medical records system. This connection will allow an automatic feed of medical data for each study participant and research details to the clinical setting. This data sharing will also facilitate the rapid execution of sponsored agreements, increase study and billing compliance and improve the ability to conduct Phase I and II studies. Future plans also include implementation of the Conflict of Interest Module and an Effort Reporting Module.

Future plans also include the ongoing improvement and evaluation of the new research systems while keeping the maximum three month study implementation target in view. As Rush meets this target, it is anticipated that many of the issues of industry sponsored research will have been resolved.
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Mary Jane Welch, DNP, APRN, BC, is Director, Human Subjects Protection at Rush University Medical Center. Tom Wilson, MBA, is Senior Research Administrator and Assistant Vice President at RI.
As the economy tanks, University endowments diminish, and charities and their donors struggle, scientists are focusing on where the next grant or sponsor of research may be found. Funding sources are suffering too, so grants or contracts may be smaller, and yet the costs of research continue to rise, and the need for support grows.

In the past, industry represented a key opportunity for funding even when other parts of the system, grants, philanthropic gifts, the universities themselves, have faltered in their support. Over the years, as industry has partnered with the research community, many great developments have resulted. Good industry partners are committed to openness in research and to the absence of bias. Through industry support, young scientists have had the opportunity to go to meetings, to speak about their research and thus become known in their fields. As these scientists mature, they may form relationships with industry that result in new avenues of research and support for investigations that play an important role in understanding human health. In turn, the synergy of such long-term relationships may stimulate new developments in drugs and devices.

Major symposia, opportunities for researchers from many parts of the world to meet and exchange information, have traditionally been supported by industry. Funding for Continuing Medical Education and other scientific symposia, grants for trainees, even pizza for medical residents, all have been routinely provided by industry in the past.

One fundamental engine of the industry/academia partnership, the Bayh-Dole Act, specifically requires that academic discoveries be extended beyond the university and into the marketplace. The focus on translational medicine demands that science consider how discoveries can move from the bench to the bedside, and plan for that transition. The pressure and the opportunity to take scientific discovery outside the ivory towers is very real and very constant—and requires partnership with industry to make that happen. In addition, the greatest champion for a new technology, drug or device is most likely its inventor, and sometimes that may demand the commitment to start the company that will ultimately take the discovery to the bedside.

Despite these many real benefits, there is clearly a dark side to the industry/academia relationship, potentially subverting the scientist’s primary allegiance to the university and to the integrity of the research with a slippery slope of commitments rewarded by financial opportunities. As part of the effort to make sure that the industry/scientist relationship operates within proper boundaries, academic institutions have set standards for handling research conflicts of interest, standards that have continually evolved to reflect the growing concern over the extent and effect of such relationships. Universities have required reporting of conflicts. Situations where human subject’s research is involved or where trainees or junior faculty may be subject to undue influence have required management. Data safety monitoring boards examine and review data for bias. Scientific journals require disclosure of relationships that might influence research results. All of these efforts have been intended to provide all the information needed to weigh the words and the work of scientists who have conflicts.

Nonetheless, the potentially positive partnerships with industry have been overshadowed by discoveries of the extent of the dark side of this scientist/industry relationship – discoveries that seem to appear in the press on a daily basis. The public perception of conflict of interest has changed, and the relationships between companies and the investigators whose research they support have become increasingly suspect. The uncovering of significant financial support not reported or disclosed, the timing of payments and support in conjunction with reporting of positive data, the intermixture of medicine and marketing with former cheerleaders depositing pizza, pads and pens in the doctor’s office to maintain constant product awareness -- all of these conjunctions have led to questions about the integrity of the scientific community as a whole.

Today’s challenge for every institution is to establish a conflict of interest (COI) program that is grounded in reality, offers transparency for every conflict, and has sufficient clarity and definition to make the program meaningful. Attitudes change, but the fundamental requirements of a good COI program should enable the institution and its faculty to avoid embarrassment even when the reports of COI are shaded in a very negative direction.

Culture counts. The principal of transparency must be part of the culture of the institution, embraced and endorsed by the leadership of the organization. That term, “embraced”, is important because unless the senior leadership

---

1 This article is based on reports of experiences at many different academic medical centers, and reflects a distillation of the author’s understanding of COI programs in general, and should not be read as reflective of issues with any one institution’s program. The author does not speak for or as a representative of her institution.
believes that the policies and reporting and management of COI is essential to credible scientific research, then the community is not likely to take it seriously.

What makes a good COI program? The best way to learn to do it right is to make mistakes, and certainly there have been some across all academic institutions. But, these mistakes are an opportunity to use painful experiences for the good of the community, and that is the purpose of the following outline of practical principles for COI programs.

1. IDENTIFY ALL KEY PLAYERS AND OFFICES. Conflict of interest touches on many areas of any institution; just figuring out who’s on first for these responsibilities across the institution is a challenge. Here is a typical list of required reports researchers may be required to provide:
   a. conflicts of interest or commitment reports to the University, and the committees that oversee management, mitigation or elimination of these conflicts
   b. reports to the NIH and other funders concerning conflicts that relate to externally funded programs
   c. for clinical researchers, clinical conflict reports to the hospital and, if the university is separate from the hospital, also to the university
   d. disclosures in publications and presentations
   e. disclosures in didactic teaching sessions
   f. disclosures in informed consent documents
   g. disclosures to the Institutional Review Board, IACUC, and Stem Cell Research Oversight Committee

Making sure these reports and disclosures are all consistent can be a challenge for even the most organized researcher. Moreover, at most of our decentralized research institutions, it is likely that the bodies receiving many of these reports are not only physically distant from each other, but in some cases may not even be aware of the others’ existence, much less who the key individuals are.

Without links between these groups, there may be major gaps in reporting, or worse, inconsistencies among the various reports. Where once interest from the media, the public, the NIH, and even Congress seemed unlikely, in today’s world it is more likely than not that at some point, someone is going to ask. To be able to respond clearly and fully if required demands that these groups (and any others that touch COI at your institution) be aware of and in contact with one another so the reporting results are not in conflict, the data has been accurately submitted and reports are available.

2. ESTABLISH CLEAR ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES. As part of the program to decipher the COI process at any institution, the roles and responsibilities must be clear. If it is everyone’s job, it’s no one’s job—and everyone should be committed to playing on the same team. COI is no place for turf, because the collaboration among all the bodies is the only way to assure that the system works. When an inquiry arrives for which “no, thanks” is not an answer, then the need for such cooperation, and the holes created if it hasn’t happened, can be agonizingly evident.

These roles and responsibilities must be clear not just for those who have the job, but also for those whose COI is at issue. Assuring that the faculty know whom to call and which office to ask for help is another important element of a program that works.

3. THINK THROUGH THE PROCESS. Once you’ve identified the various reports and who is responsible for what, it’s time to think about the disclosure process. What happens when a new scientist joins the faculty? When do the conflicts of that scientist become formally known to the institution—upon arrival or a year later for the first annual disclosure? Such a gap in the knowledge of the institution can lead to embarrassment—or worse.

And, how often are these materials updated? Regular updates are necessary—not only an annual update but also an update when the conflict situation changes. The scientist may start consulting, join a scientific advisory board, or purchase stock—but is there an effective reminder, a workable process for reporting (and acting on) such conflict?

4. COMMUNICATE, COMMUNICATE, AND COMMUNICATE. Sharing information on what is working, what is not, what has confused everyone and what sounded a lot better on paper than it turned out to be is the avenue to a successful program. The intertwining of reporting on conflicts in research for funding agencies, for institutional records, and for publications requires close and regular communication among all involved.

5. ONLY A WELL-EDUCATED COMMUNITY CAN FOLLOW COI RULES. If the policies and processes are not well-explained, then there is an opportunity to assume that “it doesn’t apply to me.” So, educate with every possible means: on-line training, seminars, speakers for departmental meetings or other gatherings, reminders, good FAQs online for common questions. Use every tool possible, so that there is help for the faculty member who needs to understand both the forest and the trees. COI reporting requires a trust relationship, and faculty and staff must understand the rules and the requirements in order to follow them.

6. LEAVE NO AVENUES FOR FAILURE. The constant discussions of COI will uncover new concerns, and raise new questions. Given the external focus on COI today, there will be new issues constantly developing. As the stories hit the press, there is a good opportunity for learning from others—how would our system work in this situation? Would we have identified that conflict? Would we have managed, mitigated or removed the COI? Whose responsibility is it to respond? How might we collaborate more to close such a loop?

The chasm in front of us is clinical conflict of interest. The extent to which such conflicts are or should be regulated is an unknown. Just as research COI was often managed by disclosure in the past, so now is clinical COI—but it is likely that there will be new requirements and new players in that field. If CMS and the Medicare program establish regulations, that will require new and expanded interactions between the hospitals and the academic institutions that partner. Imagine a faculty member who has a clinical relationship with a hospital, an academic relationship with a university, and holds NIH grants—
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The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) also known as the Recovery Act has been a blessing and a nightmare for many of us working as departmental research administrators. The ARRA has provided a wealth of new funding opportunities in the hopes of stimulating research and the economy. Seemingly, life couldn’t be better in the research sector with new and ample funding sources, a higher likelihood of award for those well-scored proposals in the queue, an increased feeling of job security, as well as many other potential benefits. But, there always seems to be a downside when something this good comes along. For many of us and our faculty colleagues, that downside included increased stress levels and long hours. It is yet to be seen if our hard work and dedication will pay off in the end, but chances are this hasn’t been in vain. At least that’s what I keep telling myself.

The excitement was palpable when we first caught wind of the new stimulus funding. We didn’t know what it entailed or any particulars for that matter, but we did know we were going to go for as much ARRA funding as possible. The initial enthusiasm wore off quickly once we realized how rapidly deadlines were approaching and how competitive applications would be. That didn’t stop my investigators or the incessant slew of applications that kept coming across my desk. My workload effectively doubled maybe even tripled over the months of March, April and May. I didn’t think it would ever end or that I could possibly get all the applications out the door and on time.

How did I make it through the barrage of applications? It wasn’t easy. But the lessons we learn in periods of high stress can help us to better manage our everyday responsibilities. Here are some of the strategies I found to be most effective in coping with the ARRA onslaught.

**PRIORITY:** In stressful times, focus on those things that are most important. For me, that meant not much else got accomplished unless it was grant related. Applications had to be prioritized by deadlines. The first to go out were the first to be worked on. Oftentimes, I didn’t even look at an upcoming submission until it was absolutely necessary. Setting priorities not only helped me cope, it gave me a sense of accomplishment when I could look back and realize that my highest priority projects somehow made it out the door.

**COMMUNICATION:** Consistent and clear communication became a part of my life. Countless hours were spent in face-to-face meetings and on email with investigators gathering details for upcoming submissions, which were in constant flux. I couldn’t stress enough how much more important “early” submission was as compared to the standard deadlines, or lack thereof, that are part of our “normal” lives. Past experiences have made us all comfortable with hitting the send button hours or maybe even minutes before the 5 pm deadline. Not this time! Ensuring that my investigators truly understood the importance of early submission was crucial. Even with prioritization, constant contact with the investigators, centralized research office and funding institutions and early submissions, problems still arose and stress levels were through the roof.

**PERSISTENCE:** During those first few weeks, it seemed like information changed by the minute as various Federal agencies launched their ARRA programs. The Federal government and associated funding agencies worked and continue to work diligently to anticipate and correct the problems associated with the tidal wave of applications being submitted to a myriad of institutions. Even with such foresight and quick fixes, we all experienced one problem or another from increased processing times and delays to incorrect error notices. Our worlds have been consumed by confirmation tracking numbers, time-stamps, help desk ticket numbers and error correction windows. Not to mention the frantic investigators struggling to meet the impending deadlines. Persistence and attention to detail can be challenging during periods of when there are so many demands on our time. But they are essential characteristics of every effective departmental administrator.

**CREATIVITY:** Unexpected problems require creative solutions. My own personal nightmare occurred when I submitted a competitive revision to the NIMH. The parent grant was due to end in three and a half months, just days before a no-cost extension (NCE) could be awarded. Well, for a competitive revision an NCE must be in place prior to submission. Since we were only days away from being able to request an NCE we incorrectly assumed the application would slide right through the system. Wrong! After all my hard work and the hard work of the investigator, the NIH refused to accept the application. So it looked like we had wasted a tremendous amount of time. Like most of us in the world of research administration, I juggle many responsibilities in my day-to-day job and wasting precious hours on an application to have it thrown away was downright frustrating. We decided to submit the application as an administrative supplement to make sure that our time spent on the application wasn’t completely futile.
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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) 880-3010
gedell@huronconsultinggroup.com

**Mary Beth Rudofski**
(312) 880-0534
mrudofski@huronconsultinggroup.com
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Grants.gov’s New Adobe Forms: Improvement or Impediment?

by Terri Hall

Grants.gov has required the use of Adobe forms in applications since February 2009. Before then, applicants used the PureEdge software and forms. One big test of the new forms occurred in April with an opportunity from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). It was the first big submission deadline for funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA).

Unfortunately, users reported significant trouble with submissions and the NIH described it as “far from business as usual.” While the NIH did what it could to keep the user community informed of the submission overload, erroneous error messages, known issues, and a generous extension of the correction window, there was still much confusion and concern in the user community.

On April 28, the day after the deadline, the Grants.gov blog reported that between April 20 – 27 more than 28,000 applications were received. This “surpassed the total monthly submissions for each month in FY 09,” according to Grants.gov, “with the exception of March, when we processed 36,253 submissions.” On Monday, April 27, the day of the deadline, Grants.gov processed nearly 8,400 applications which are the most ever submitted on one day. The previous one-day submission record was on Friday, April 24 when nearly 6,000 applications were received. The Grants.gov helpdesk, also called the Contact Center, received 2,065 calls on April 27, “which was the third highest volume of calls we have received to date,” a Grants.gov representative stated.

Any benefits of the new Adobe forms were overshadowed by the challenges the new forms presented to the user community. But there are some benefits: submissions are still electronic rather than paper; several agencies are using the forms in the same way; and users can scroll through the application rather than having to open each form on its own.

The new forms were touted as an improvement over the PureEdge forms. Now that the forms have been in use for several deadlines, what do users have to say? Are there improvements, or do they impede the process? This article will attempt to answer those questions by summarizing some of the challenges with the Adobe forms. These “trouble-spots” were gathered from conversations the author has had with users and through comments on the various listervs. Please note that these comments do not necessarily relate to the applications submitted system-to-system.

The research administration community is not shy and offered dozens of desired improvements to the Adobe forms. Among them, administrators offered the following:

TO BE CONSIDERED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW FORMS OR CHANGES TO OLD ONES. The user community wants the opportunity to provide some input to the developers and finds it difficult to understand why no input has been requested. The oft-asked question is: since we’re required to use the forms and have experience with various sponsor systems and their forms, wouldn’t we be a valuable resource to the developers on desired features and those that have not worked in the past?

REQUIRING THAT ALL AGENCIES USE THE FORMS IN THE SAME WAY. Some agencies require the use of all fields. Others want some fields left blank. Some want files uploaded into each section listed. Others want the complete application uploaded into one field. It’s quite a burden to stay educated on these differences.

ALLOWING MULTIPLE USERS TO WORK ON VARIOUS PARTS OF THE SUBMISSION SIMULTANEOUSLY. This can be accomplished through a web-based application or by the ability to separate the forms from the application and send them to those who will complete them. The applications can then be re-assembled prior to submission. A huge step in this direction is the sub-recipient budget form that can now be exported.

OPENING A FORM BY DOUBLE-CLICKING ON IT. Currently users must move the form to another area of the application and then click Open Form. This is considered cumbersome.

BEING ABLE TO WORK ON ANY GIVEN BUDGET YEAR, AT ANY TIME WITHOUT HAVING TO COMPLETE THE PREVIOUS YEAR. Currently, users must complete the prior year before the next year is visible. Proposal information arrives in bits and pieces and administrators are frequently working on several proposals at a time. It is helpful to be able to enter that information as soon as it arrives rather than ‘parking’ it somewhere because something else has not arrived yet.

ALLOWING FOR THE ADDITION OF ANY NUMBER OF BUDGET PERIODS AND SUBAWARDS. Right now, there are limits that do not always meet the needs of the projects being proposed; especially in light of the initiative for more collaborative proposals.

AUTO-FILLING SUCCEEDING BUDGET PERIODS WITH DATA ENTERED FROM PREVIOUS YEARS. Currently, only the PI’s name is carried from year to year. The user must re-enter names and numbers of any co-PI, postdoctoral associate, grad student, etc. Users say it is easier and less time-consuming to remove or edit those items rather than re-enter them.
THE ABILITY TO REMOVE KEY PERSONNEL WITHOUT CONSEQUENCE. Frequently, key personnel will work in some, but not all proposal periods. Current Grants.gov applications allow the removal of a key person from the middle of the project; however, the application still expects salary data and prevents the user from saving the file.

THE OPTION TO VIEW/PRINT ENTIRE APPLICATION IN ONE COMPLETE FORM. Users can print the forms, but the attachments must be printed separately. In addition, there are three pages to each budget period. Only one page of one period can be printed at a time. The desire is to click one button and print the entire application with all budget periods and all attachments as is currently possible with the “Print entire application” feature of the National Science Foundation’s FastLane system.

THE ABILITY TO SEE ALL OF THE ERRORS IN THE APPLICATION WHEN THE “CHECK FOR ERRORS” FEATURE IS USED. Users prefer the errors to be listed in the order of the forms on which they occur, and that a link to the named form or page with the error be provided for quick and easy resolution.

THE USE OF LAYMAN’S TERMS IN ERROR MESSAGES POST-SUBMISSION. The current messages received after submissions are technical in nature and users understand neither what the error is, nor how to correct it to re-submit the application. Another question is whether there is truly an error. Many in the user community prefer that erroneous error messages stop, that the text of the message explain what needs to be fixed in non-technical language, and that the notice specifically list where the error is.

RE-USE APPLICATIONS. Administrators often have several investigators submitting to the same program yet all of the institutional data needed in each application must be entered in each new application. Allowing applications to be copied and retaining that information would be a time-saver. One suggested enhancement is to have the institution’s data appear automatically once the DUNS number is entered into the application.

THE USER COMMUNITY IS EXTREMELY SUPPORTIVE OF ONE ANOTHER DESPITE BEING COMPETITORS FOR THE SAME FUNDING. Users often share solutions and workarounds for issues found or debunk myths about Adobe submissions. Here are four lessons learned:

1. Special characters - curly vs. straight apostrophes, hyphens, colons, superscripted numbers, etc.: Typing an apostrophe, dash or colon directly into a form is fine, but when you cut and paste from Word these can change to a “?” , squares or circles. One solution found is to turn off this feature in Word. Go to Tools, Auto Correct Options, and then Auto Format As You Type. Turn off the curly quotes, as well as, two hyphens into a dash, superscripted ordinal numbers, and other formatting Word does automatically that can show as a “?” in your pdf-printed and/or converted text.

2. Multiple versions of Adobe can be used to download, fill in and submit the proposal. Those compatible versions are listed on the Grants.gov website at http://www.grants.gov/help/download_software.jsp#adobe811 and are updated as new editions are released.

3. Browsers other than Internet Explorer have been used successfully by institutions to submit proposals.

4. Avoid spaces in filenames. Rather than “Hall_Biosketch.pdf”, use a dash or underscore in this way: “Hall_Biosketch.pdf”, so there are no spaces in the filename.

In addition to easier forms, the research community is most interested in a well-designed system that is stable on deadline days to send the expected email confirmations and able to withstand a heavy submission volume without crashing.

Research administrators are in the middle of the investigators they serve and the systems they are required to use. They are under pressure from investigators expecting an on-time submission no matter how late the needed information is provided and need to be confident that the system can withstand the volume of submissions arriving within minutes (sometimes seconds) of the stated deadline. The last thing administrators need is to wonder, “Did it go through?”

Overall, the Adobe forms offer some improvement over their predecessors (PureEdge), and the research community is looking forward to the continued efforts of Grants.gov to improve the user experience.

Terri Hall is the Director of Electronic Research Administration and Associate Director of Pre-award Administration in the Office of Research at the University of Notre Dame in Notre Dame, Indiana.

---

International Partnerships: Guidelines for Colleges and Universities

*Book Review* by John Carfora

*International Partnerships: Guidelines for Colleges and Universities*


ACE Member Price: $32.00
Non-Member Price: $35.00

This timely and valuable primer—the fourth edition published since first appearing in 1984 as Guidelines for College and University Linkages Abroad—provides valuable insight into the institutional context for planning, developing and implementing international partnerships. The book further describes how to meaningfully situate them into an institution’s overall international strategy along with their importance in supporting core academic goals and programs (pp. v-vi).

The book consists of four chapters on:

1. Developing an Institutional Strategy;
2. Types of Partnerships and Agreements;
3. Developing Partnerships; and
4. Implementing and Sustaining Partnerships. Finally, the work’s appendices—available online at www.acenet.edu/programs/international/partnerships—contain many (free) samples of institutional documents and resources available to colleges and universities. For example, there are: (1) models of university partnership programs; (2) examples of friendship and cooperation agreements; and (3) examples of broad institutional partnerships.

Now that I have somewhat outlined the book and hopefully have stimulated an interest, I hesitate to say more; instead, I encourage you to read this invaluable work and add it to your library on international research collaborations. It’s truly a “must read.”

John Carfora is Executive Director of the Office for Research and Sponsored Projects at Loyola Marymount University, and Chair of NCURA’s Commission on International Research Administration.
Technology Transfer: Building and Maintaining Relations with Industry

by Arundeep S. Pradhan

The definition of technology transfer is fairly broad. It is usually defined by the needs of the institution and the region, ranging from offices that only engage in licensing intellectual property to offices that encompass a broader set of activities. It is therefore possible to have a “technology transfer” office engaged in activities such as licensing, economic development (start up companies), industry research and collaborations and materials transfers. The common thread in these activities is that they are focused on the interactions related to the creation and commercialization of assets (including various forms of intellectual property) developed from research activities and ensuring that those assets are developed further and commercialized. The technology transfer process is not therefore just one mechanism, but an approach to transferring these assets. It is a small subset of how the university transfers knowledge and the purpose for which this transfer takes place. It is therefore important to know what the role of the institution is in the Innovation Ecosystem, and more importantly, what the role of technology transfer is in the Innovation Ecosystem.

As academic institutions, the core purpose and mission is to expand our knowledge and disseminate this knowledge through various mechanisms. The most traditional and effective mechanisms are educating students and publishing research. Based on a model initially proposed by Dr. Kevin Cullen, Director of Research & Enterprise, University of Glasgow, and further refined with my colleagues Dana Bostrom, Charles William, Brian Wall and Charles Triplett, we are attempting to define what the Innovation Ecosystem is in context of a university. This assumes that there are four major quadrants: Research & Education, Knowledge Use & Application, Product Development & Manufacturing, and Growth & Maturity. The role of a university in each of these quadrants is quite different and decreases as is reflected in the samples of activities and stakeholders. (Fig 1). For example, the role of the university in the research and education stage can be a source of innovations and the knowledge to exploit those innovations. As that innovation is further developed, the role of a university is greatly reduced and by the time that the innovation is considered mature, the role of the university is minimal and is usually focused on the next generation of innovations in collaboration with industry.

Technology Transfer focuses primarily on transfer of innovations from a university though a commercialization mechanism and is a small part of the Innovation Ecosystem. At this point, it is important to first acknowledge that the research conducted at universities is basic in nature, i.e. to understanding the fundamentals of the science for the purpose of expanding and disseminating knowledge and not the commercial development of products.

The function of technology transfer in the academic setting therefore is to identify those research projects that may have commercial potential and foster the development of such projects. The traditional way in which this is done is through licensing. However, especially in the Pharma and biotechnology sectors, companies recognize the potential for synergy of academic and industry collaboration. In addition, there is an increased desire on the part of universities and faculty to work with industry. Research collaboration and strategic alliances, which are more than industry sponsored research projects that are conducted by university faculty, are being used with greater frequency. The focus of these agreements is not just the creation of new intellectual property, but also a sharing of knowledge and resources that enables the entire field to advance thereby resulting in improved outcomes that benefit companies as well as the university.

Another tool being increasingly utilized by universities is internal “technology development funds.” These usually provide modest amounts of funding per project ($15,000 to $50,000) to advance the technology over what is commonly referred to as gap or “valley of death”. For example, building prototypes, in-vivo efficacy data etc., are often not funded through traditional federal grant mechanisms but are sometimes expected by companies or investors in the case of a start up opportunity seeking to develop the technology further.

Material transfer agreements constitute yet another area. These are agreements that cover the transfer of materials between academic institutions and also between academic institutions and companies. The primary purpose of these agreements is to ensure that proprietary, unpublished or published materials can be transferred between universities, be used for research and preserve IPR associated with those materials. There are generally no monetary terms, but as you can imagine the IPR terms can be fairly significant, especially for material coming in to a university from a company, and are often negotiated to ensure that academic freedom is not compromised.

The transfer of IPR through licensing can take many forms, ranging from the sale of copyright subject matter to complex licensing deals for the further development of potential therapeutics; it remains a core function of the technology transfer process. Licensing however does not ensure that a technology will be incorporated in to a product that will reach the public. This is the one area of
activity that is governed by the Bayh-Dole Act. It also encompasses the activities that are highly visible and get the most attention from all stakeholders. These activities also generate the most debate ranging from if these are appropriate activities in which to engage to how much financial returns are appropriate.

In conclusion, the role of the university in the innovation ecosystem varies greatly depending on the nature of activities. While universities can play a role in a number of areas, they can only make significant impacts in a small area of commercializing innovations. Even then, universities cannot do it solely by themselves. They rely on support and partnerships with industry, and federal, state and local governments. Because the mission of the university is to expand and disseminate knowledge for the well being of the public, the commercialization of technologies that result from university research is part of that social contract.

Arundeept S. Pradhan serves as the Director of Technology & Research Collaborations at Oregon Health & Science University.
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Life has finally calmed down now that the majority of the ARRA funding deadlines have passed and I can catch up on my other work that has been neglected for these hectic few months. I can finally sit back, take a deep breath and feel the sense of accomplishment that comes after successfully submitting so many applications. This resting easy won’t last too much longer though since notifications of funding will soon be released. While post-award specifics are still being determined, we do know that most or all agencies will institute special terms and conditions. The mechanisms for tracking awards under the ARRA will definitely be different than with traditional awards. It is yet to be seen what the full effect this funding will have on our post-award lives, but chances are we will continue to feel the effects of the ARRA long after the pre-award proposal deadlines have passed.

Kati Elfers serves as Financial Administrator at the University of Cincinnati
With all the news regarding budget-cuts across campus, and hearing of colleagues in other departments either being let go or taking early retirement, I find that at times like these it can be challenging to consistently be a positive leader.

Change is inevitable and with the economic situation, many of us have greater challenges in our lives or know of friends, family or co-workers having troubles and more stress. Albert Einstein said “In the middle of every difficulty lies opportunity.” As leaders, how do we turn difficulties into opportunities and consistently manage the stress in our environment? In NCURA’s LDI Program, we learned that successful leadership involves encouraging the hearts of ourselves as well as others. This involves finding authentic ways to counteract negative feelings and situations that exhaust, frustrate and even make people want to give up. The good news is that several practical and inspirational approaches to managing stress and encouraging the heart are quick, easy and inexpensive to implement.

“Encouraging the heart” often happens when you read and share uplifting articles or books with colleagues. In his article, “Leadership Techniques: Five Leadership Secrets for Challenging Times,” Ed Sykes discusses five leadership techniques for difficult times: Integrity, Knowledge, Decisiveness, Vision, and Unselfishness. Acting unselfishly is important, but especially so during these times. In tighter economic times, resources, including people resources, are usually spread thin. Remind yourself that faculty, staff or others are scrambling to find reliable and timely information and help. Taking the time to listen and provide support and guidance are great ways to help reduce stress for others while promoting trust and good leadership.

In his article, “Use Stress to Your Advantage” Peter Bergman, uses the term “Stress Reaction” to describe what we do to manage ourselves through ongoing stressful periods versus a single stressful event. Stress reactions can be constructive or destructive. Bergman describes a variety of approaches one can take to maintain focus and provide a sense of control when we lack real control. Constructive approaches could include cleaning and organizing one’s environment, reading and thinking about different viewpoints in order to gain insight, eating healthy foods, getting plenty of rest, meditating, and connecting authentically with others. Common destructive stress reactions are withdrawal, competitiveness or micromanagement. As leaders, being aware of these reactions is important.

After reading Bergman’s article, I asked myself what my stress reactions generally are. Two things I commonly do to relieve the stress are: 1) I find ways to resolve the problem at hand; and 2) I go shoe shopping. I may not get the problem resolved, but I know I will always find that great pair of shoes to make me happy. Levity aside, Bergman encourages these steps:

Stop – Become aware of how you are handling the stress. Continuing to think of the problem can intensify the stress reaction.

Take a few deep breaths to clear your mind and to become more focused.

Reassess the situation – with time, or after talking with others, solutions may become apparent.

In my role in research administration, I have found many options to help deal with day-to-day process challenges and difficulties. One option might be to review office practices for possible efficiencies or improvements. Consider requesting a group effort where the team comes up with better practices. Other options might be re-assessing workload, delegating for greater efficiency, or implementing a cross-training program for those employees who want to advance or learn more.

Encouraging the heart also involves recognizing people for extra and thoughtful things they do and thanking them for jobs well done. It is amazing to see how practicing these simple courtesies can motivate and effect positive relationships. For example, when I worked at a part-time job many years ago, the company required all employees watch a video on behavior and the ripple affect either positive or negative behavior has on customer service and on relationships in the workplace. The lessons learned from that video remain with me to this day.
Other important ways to help encourage the heart and help manage stressful times include taking time to laugh and celebrate. In a book by Matt Weinstein “Managing to Have Fun”, he states, “The intentional use of fun at work can be a positive force in team building, in customer service and boosting employee morale”. Because of the busy environment we work in, we sometimes forget to stop and take a break. Recently, I shared Edward M. Hallowell’s article “Overloaded Circuits – Why Smart People Underperform” with colleagues, which gives helpful information on why at times we need to shut off the constant stimulation to our brains. This article inspired my office to have lunch sessions called “Reboot Your Mind”. Each session has a theme and participants bring a dish to share based on the theme. We reserve a conference room, and block out time to get away from our desks, have lunch together and talk about non-work related topics. Our office recently invited our Financial Services office to join these sessions, which has further increased collegiality.

No matter what your role is at your institution, just remember that you can always succeed in setting a leadership example by better managing your stress and looking for ways to implement practical ways to decrease stress in your environment. Consider the ideas discussed in this article, brainstorm with friends and colleagues, and you, too, can turn your challenges into opportunities.

Tammy Custer is a Grant and Contract Officer/eRA Specialist for the Office of Sponsored Programs at Cornell University and a graduate of the 2008 LDL, whose class is writing Leadership Tips this year. Managing Editor: Ty Lane.
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how many different reports for how many different groups on what occasions is one scientist/physician required to report COI? Coordination and collaboration can reduce the possibility that COI oversight is lost in the gap between the partners, and that faculty are not decimated by a barrage of different reporting obligations. Fundamentally, COI policies and their implementation should reflect the values and culture of the institution. Some faculty experience the current emphasis on COI today as a basic distrust of the researcher’s scientific integrity, an alienation that will assure failure of any COI program. On the other hand, the risk that COI may diminish the objectivity of research threatens the credibility of the research enterprise as a whole. The way in which institutions and their faculty address this issue can be one of collaboration and coordination on the one hand, or antagonism and discord on the other. This is an opportunity to build trust and respect within the academic community. The result will be a robust and successful COI program in which everyone wins.

Ann N. James serves as Senior University Counsel in the Office of General Counsel at Stanford University.

* The author wishes to thank contributing editor Naomi Schrag for helping generate ideas for this piece and shepherd it to conclusion.
Volunteers can, and do, make a lasting difference to NCURA through the sharing of their time and expertise in order to further the goals and values of the organization, both regionally and nationally. Why do members volunteer with NCURA and what is their advice to members about volunteering with NCURA? To learn the answer to these questions, we asked regional and national member volunteers, and here’s what they shared with us – first, the reasons why they continue to volunteer with NCURA and second, their advice to others.

BOB STEMPLE, Associate Manager, Research Finance, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute:

- Volunteering with NCURA is a wonderful opportunity to meet people and to get to know them on a first name basis
- I feel a part of the NCURA family
- I make new friends

“My advice to anyone considering volunteering with NCURA?—Try it, you’ll like it!”

DEBRA MURPHY, Director, Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, Arizona State University:

- Expanded job knowledge
- Opportunity to build peer relationships both regionally and nationally
- Mentorship and collaboration become a normal part of everyday business
- Adds tremendous value to professional development
- I’ve made career-long friends

“Volunteering will help you to develop invaluable peer relationships, increase your professional experience with public speaking, preparing presentations, team work, making new friends, and having lots of fun. If you are unsure about volunteering, call one of the more experienced regional members or a regional officer and ask for a reference for a member to ‘buddy’ with or shadow at a regional conference.”

WILLIAM “BILL” PLOOG, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Projects, Dartmouth College:

- Expands my contacts within the profession
- Volunteering enables me to contribute in other areas of personal expertise
- I’m able to give back to NCURA

“The camaraderie among volunteers is the glue that keeps one engaged.”

BRENDA KAVANAUGH, Senior Research Administrator, Office of Research and Project Administration, University of Rochester:

- It enables me to give back to the organization and its members
- Volunteering for NCURA magnifies the opportunities for self-growth and for sharing and learning skills
- Countless friendships

“For anyone considering volunteering, I recommend that you start at the regional level. Before you know it, you will have made countless friends and will be invited to serve in several capacities. Make your desire to help known and don’t be intimidated by anything or anyone! If at first you don’t succeed, keep trying. It’s worth it!!! “

DAVE RICHARDSON, Assistant Vice President for Research and Director of Sponsored Programs, Pennsylvania State University:

- The opportunity to engage fellow members and to assess and share ideas
- Volunteering enables me to develop professional contacts that have greatly assisted my career and my success in my job

“I challenge you to say ‘YES’ without hesitation when asked to participate in an NCURA volunteer activity. Regardless of the volunteer task, you never know who you may meet and what you can learn. Take advantage of a free opportunity that will pay dividends for years to come!”

Want to read more about NCURA’s volunteers?
Check out NCURA’s VOLUNTEERS OF THE MONTH website at http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/volunteer_of_the_month.php.
CATHY SNYDER, Associate Director, Office of Contract and Grant Accounting, Vanderbilt University:

✓ Increased knowledge and growth both personally and professionally
✓ Great friendships

“Volunteering with N CURA provides you so much more than you could ever imagine. The benefits you receive far outweigh the contributions. There are many different opportunities from behind the scenes to in front of the classroom. Talk with your regional officers, volunteer coordinator or others that volunteer to help you get started. Find a role that you are comfortable with and enjoy the ride!”

ROSEMARY MADNICK, Director of Grants, Contracts and Compliance, Charles Drew University of Medicine and Science:

✓ Volunteering enables me to give back to N CURA
✓ It has given me the opportunity to say thank you and to represent the next generation
✓ It’s a rewarding personal experience and it presents me with challenges and opportunities to grow

“My advice to an individual considering volunteering with N CURA is to first, consider what you want to get out of volunteering and to be honest. Second, is to choose your volunteer commitment accordingly. Third, be open minded and you just might discover the ideal fit. In the words of Maya Angelou, I’ve learned that you shouldn’t go through life with a catcher’s mitt on both hands. You need to be able to throw something back.”

TONY VENTIMIGLIA, Contract Administrator III, Office of Sponsored Programs, Auburn University:

✓ I’m able to contribute to the success of N CURA and its programming
✓ I give back to an organization that has invested in me
✓ It’s a great opportunity to work closely with colleagues from all regions and with the N CURA staff

“My advice to those interested in volunteering is to start by assisting at the registration/information desk or in the hospitality suite at either a regional or national meeting. Volunteers at the registration desk provide the first impressions of N CURA and/or a specific region, but even better, when you volunteer at the national meeting, it provides a great opportunity to work closely with colleagues from all N CURA regions, as well as with staff of the N CURA national organization. Volunteering in your regional hospitality suite allows you to go to know your N CURA colleagues in a relaxed setting, while also getting you started on your volunteering path with N CURA! The best thing about volunteering for N CURA – if neither opportunity mentioned above is of interest to you, there are many more to choose from (presenting, regional/national committees, session evaluator, etc). The possibilities are endless, so take the leap – you will not regret it!”

DEB NEWTON, Director, Pre-Award Services, University of Tulsa:

✓ Volunteering helps me to better understand how the organization works
✓ I meet more members and develop long-lasting professional and personal relationships
✓ The experience enables me to encourage others to volunteer

“My advice to anyone considering volunteering in N CURA? DO IT! You will gain so much more (personally and professionally) than you will ever give. Not only will you expand your knowledge base quickly and make contacts that can serve you in your profession, you will meet the most interesting people and form lifelong friendships. The members are the lifeblood of this organization and once you take ownership by becoming an active member, the rewards are immeasurable.”

DENISE WALLEN, Director, Faculty Research Support Services, University of New Mexico:

✓ I volunteer because I care about the organization, the membership and the profession
✓ It’s an enriching and rewarding experience

“My advice to anyone considering volunteering with N CURA is to go for it!!!

Let your colleagues and regional officers know that you want to help -- you will be warmly embraced. Come forth and identify yourself for activities and positions that you are interested in -- there are so many opportunities at both the regional and national level. I am confident that you will find this to be a wonderful experience.”

continued on next page ➤
DAVID NGO, Effort Administrator and ECRT Manager, University of Wisconsin-Madison:

✓ It’s a great way to meet people
✓ Allows me to give back
✓ Great way to participate in collaborative efforts

“My advice to anyone considering volunteering with NCURA is to just get involved. There are two ways of spreading light. One is to be the candle. The other is to be the mirror that reflects it. Take the first step and contact someone and try out a committee to see if you like it. Most volunteer opportunities will be welcoming and you can gain experience about the organization itself before finding a spot that fits you best.”

JULIE GUGGINO, Associate Director, Research and Sponsored Programs, Central Washington University:

✓ Volunteer participation is a good investment for my university
✓ It’s personally and professionally rewarding
✓ It’s a great way to meet people who do what you do and to share best practices

“NCURA is a dynamic organization fueled by committed volunteers. I believe volunteering enables one to meet terrific people and get the most out of one’s membership. It also provides challenging, rewarding professional development opportunities while working with others in one’s profession.”

GIL HAROOTUNIAN, Director, Office of Academic and Government Grants, McDaniel College:

✓ Volunteering is a great way to meet and collaborate with other people
✓ It enables me to learn more on the newest areas in the field

“It is critical for grants administrators at smaller institutions to attend NCURA conferences and network with colleagues, especially in their own regions, so that we can gain information and make connections with colleagues, and as a result thrive at our home institutions.”

BO BOGDANSKI, Assistant Director, Sponsored Programs, Colorado State University:

✓ You develop, and expand, a network of like-minded people
✓ Volunteering builds confidence
✓ It builds close friendships
✓ It’s the reward of working with motivated people

“I encourage everyone to volunteer. First, find an opportunity to volunteer preferably working with a member who is already recognized as a NCURA volunteer. The experienced volunteer can become a mentor and someone to recommend you for further and more responsible positions. Secondly, be reliable, responsive and eager; you only have one opportunity to make a first impression. Third, volunteer at a variety of levels; there is no rule that says you need to start at the regional level. Take what comes your way. Fourth, make a plan: determine what sort of things you enjoy and more importantly where do you have ability. This will give you a direction in pursuing volunteer opportunities. Fifth, don’t be too busy to volunteer; there are always opportunities, sometimes they take your personal time, but make time. Remember if you are looking toward career enhancement, the long-term will provide the improved opportunities. Finally don’t get discouraged. If at first you don’t succeed…”

It’s time to get involved!

We encourage you to contact one of the following volunteer coordinators to learn more about NCURA opportunities at the regional and national levels and how you, too, may volunteer!

Randi Wasik, Region I, at randi.wasik@umassmed.edu
Joe Sullivan, Region II, at joseph4@andrew.cmu.edu
Rick Smiley, Region III, at smileyr@ecu.edu
Mindy Weaver, Region IV, at weavermm@ucmail.uc.edu
Joanne Palmer, Region V, at jp57@txstate.edu
Joseph McNicholas, Region VI, at joseph.mcnicholas@lmu.edu
Christine Pacheco, Region VII, at cppacheco@salud.unm.edu
Myrta Stager, NCURA Office at stager@ncura.edu
EFFORT CERTIFICATION AND REPORTING JUST GOT AFFORDABLE.

It’s Web based. It’s compatible with your pre-award, accounting and payroll systems. It’s powerful and easy to use. But what makes Effort Administrator™ truly unique is it’s price.

Effort Administrator™ makes it easy for faculty and research scientists to certify their own effort for sponsored research and hard money. Reports compare budget to actual effort, cost sharing, and more. And it’s a fraction of the cost of any comparable system on the market today.

Thanks to IT Works innovation, Effort Certification and Reporting is practically effortless. And very, very affordable.

See it now at itworks-inc.com.
Broadcast Workshop Series
Live Via Digital Satellite or on DVD

Next ‘09 Broadcast!

September 15, 2009

SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING: ASSESSING RISK
Moderator: Rob Barbret, Director of Sponsored Programs, Controller’s Office, University of Michigan
Panel: Pamela Webb, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, Sponsored Projects Administration, University of Minnesota; Bruce Morgan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research, Office of Research, University of California, Riverside; Samantha Westcott, Grant Manager, Division of Biology, California Institute of Technology

Order your DVDs today!

aired March 10, 2009

COST SHARING: WHY NO GOOD DEED GOES UNPUNISHED
Moderator: Kim Moreland, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Administration, University of Wisconsin - Madison
Panel: Richard Seligman, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, California Institute of Technology; Stephen Hansen, Associate Provost for Research and Dean, Graduate School, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville; Tracey Fraser, Senior Director of Cost Studies and Financial Compliance, California Institute of Technology

aired January 13, 2009

AUDITS AND THE AUDIT PROCESS
Moderator: David Mayo, Director of Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology
Panel: Denise Clark, Assistant Vice President for Research Administration and Advancement, University of Maryland, College Park; Thomas Cooley, Chief Financial Officer and Director, Office of Budget, Finance, and Award Management, National Science Foundation; Lillie Ryans-Culclager, Director, Engineering Research Administration, School of Engineering, Stanford University

aired June 9, 2009

F&A RATES FOR THE NON-ACCOUNTANT
Moderator: Gunta Liders, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, University of Rochester
Panel: Jerry Fife, Associate Vice Chancellor for Business Services and Research Finance, Vanderbilt University; Ann Holmes, Assistant Dean, Finance & Administration, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, University of Maryland, College Park; Jane Youngers, Assistant Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio

Please note: As of 2009, Live NCURATV programs are broadcast exclusively via digital satellite. Analog is no longer available. Please see our website for more details.
The key to maximizing your award chances

SciVal Funding is the most comprehensive online funding intelligence source available. It supports you through every stage of the pre-award process by identifying the most worthwhile funding opportunities based on pre-populated profiles. It also gives you access to award history information and the hard facts you need to help shape and strengthen your proposals.

SciVal Funding is launching in August 2009.

Find focus, create impact and open up new opportunities by being one of the first to pre-register.

It makes sense, whichever way you look at it.
Graduate Certificate in Research Administration

An Innovative Online Program for Sponsored Research Professionals

- Earn 18 graduate credits in one year in a specialized academic program.
- Learn from faculty experts in research administration.
- Engage with a cohort of professionals in six 7-week accelerated courses delivered fully online.
- Share knowledge and learning while expanding your network across the country.

The Graduate Certificate in Research Administration is an academic opportunity for professionals currently working in sponsored programs. The innovative curriculum addresses critical knowledge areas including finance and accounting, compliance, legal issues and organizational behavior. Online, instructor-led, asynchronous learning extends the reach of this program beyond the research and health care hub of Boston.

The Faculty

Gretchen Brodnicki  
Dean for Faculty and Research Integrity  
Harvard Medical School

Daniel Dangler  
Founder and Principal  
Authenticity, Inc.

Mark Daniel  
Vice President for Research Administration and Finance  
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

Patrick Fitzgerald  
Associate Dean of Research Administration  
Harvard University

Kathleen Mercier  
Director of Sponsored Programs Administration  
Harvard School of Public Health

Jill Mortali  
Director of Sponsored Projects  
Dartmouth College

Jennifer Puccetti  
Director of Administration  
Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School

Tim Reuter  
Executive Director of Cost Compliance  
Boston University

Jeff Seo  
Director of Research Compliance  
Harvard Medical School

Chris Vericker  
Associate Vice President  
Middlesex Savings Bank

Stephanie Wasserman  
Director of Sponsored Programs  
Harvard Medical School
Mark your Calendar!

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION CONFERENCE XI

March 3 – 5, 2010

Marriott Rivercenter ★ San Antonio, TX

FRA XI Co-Chairs: Tracey Fraser, Senior Director of Cost Studies and Financial Compliance, California Institute of Technology; Cindy Hope, Director, Office for Sponsored Programs, The University of Alabama

Advertisement

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

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

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

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

RACS
RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION CONSULTING SERVICES

216-403-8176 · grantsresearch@yahoo.com
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Donald Boyd received his Ph.D in computer science from the University of Iowa and has more than 30 years experience in both education and industry. He served five years as an assistant professor at the University of Minnesota, before spending 13 years in research and development at Honeywell. Dr. Boyd then worked for eight years at Eastman Kodak Company in software development and business unit management positions. Before joining RIT in 2000 as associate provost for outreach programs, Dr. Boyd served for two years as president of the RIT Research Corporation. He was appointed Vice President for Research at RIT in 2005.

James Casey is Director of Contracts and Industrial Agreements at The University of Texas at San Antonio and Senior Co-Editor of the NCURA Magazine. He holds a B.A., cum laude, in political science from the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater; M.A., international affairs, from Marquette University; M.P.A., urban administration, from the University of Dayton; and J.D., University of Dayton School of Law.

Tammie Custer is Grant and Contract Officer/eRA Specialist in the Office of Sponsored Programs at Cornell University. Tammy began her career at Cornell 19 years ago as an Administrative Assistant and has since served Cornell and OSP in various positions. In addition to guiding faculty and staff on pre-award functions, she is responsible for training the Cornell community on navigating agency electronic systems, as well as, troubleshooting problems with those systems as they arise. Tammy is a graduate of the 2008 class of NCURA's Leadership Development Institute and is a former member of NCURA's eRA Neighborhood. Tammy is also active in the Federal Demonstration Partnership, currently serving on the eRA Standing Committee. Outside of Cornell, Tammy enjoys spending time with her Boxer dogs and going shoe shopping.
WOODWORKING, steam engines, and traveling with Lenore, his wife of 50 years, Bob Gracy earned his B.A. in Spanish from the University of Cincinnati in 2002 and her MBA in 2008. She began her career in research administration in 2004 and attended NCURA Fundamentals.

EARL FREISE began his professional career as a faculty member in Materials Science and in various research administrative roles at Northwestern University in 1962. He became a member of NCURA in 1971 and was active in the regional and national executive Committees serving as President in 1985. He was one of the seven founding members of the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM) in 1974. From Northwestern he went to the University of North Dakota to establish the Office of Research and Program Development in 1977 and subsequently on to the University of Nebraska – Lincoln as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research in 1982. In 1987 he assumed the position of Director of the Office of Sponsored Research at the California Institute of Technology. Towards the end of his professional career he was appointed Assistant Vice President for Administrative Process Engineering at Caltech to manage the implementation of new administrative computing systems for the entire Institute to avoid a major year-2000 problem. Throughout his career he has served as a panel member, moderator or instructor for various NCURA and COGR meetings and programs. He also served in committee roles for the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE), the American Society for Metals (ASM), the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers (AIME), the Society of Research Administrators (SRA) and the Executive Committee of the Federal Demonstration Project (FDP).

RICHARD J. FRIEDRICH is Director of the Strategy and Innovation Office at HP Labs. He leads a multi-disciplinary team focused on executing research strategy, implementing Open Innovation partnerships with academia, government and the commercial sector; and completing technology transfer on behalf of HP Labs. HP’s corporate research arm. Friedrich previously directed the Enterprise Systems and Software Lab at HP Labs, and his accomplishments span his 20-plus-year career at HP. He has participated on many scientific program committees, published extensively and is a co-inventor on 15 patents. He is a graduate of Northwestern University.

ROBERT W. GRACY is Vice President for Research at The University of Texas at San Antonio. Dr. Gracy received his B.S. in Chemistry and Biological Sciences from California Polytechnic University and his Ph.D. in Biochemistry from the University of California. He was a Fellow of the Damon Runyon Cancer Foundation at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York City and a Fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation of Germany. In addition to his academic appointments as Professor of Biology and Chemistry, he has served as Chairman of Biochemistry and Dean of Research. He has held Visiting Professor positions in Germany, China, Thailand and Puerto Rico. Dr. Gracy’s research focuses on aging and chronic diseases resulting from oxidative damage. These include age-related damage to skin, the cornea, lens and chronic neuropathies including Alzheimer’s disease.

TERRI HALL is the Director of Electronic Research Administration and Associate Director of Pre-Award Administration in the Office of Research at the University of Notre Dame in Notre Dame, Indiana. Building on its strong tradition of undergraduate teaching and graduate studies, Notre Dame is now strengthening its research enterprise with dramatically increased resources and new state-of-the-art facilities. External funding has doubled since 2000, now standing at $83 million annually. This is a rare achievement for a university without a medical school but the growth trend continues. Terri is responsible for electronic research administration and proposal review/approval. She received her B.A. in American Studies and became a Certified Research Administrator in 2006. She has been a member of NCURA since 2003 and has served on the eRA Neighborhood the past two years.

ROBERT B. HARDY is Director of Contracts and Intellectual Property Management at the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR; www.cogr.edu), an association of over 175 research universities and several affiliated hospitals and research institutes. Mr. Hardy has lead COGR responsibility for university issues pertaining to federal contracting and technology transfer policies and regulations. Prior to coming to COGR in April 2001, Mr. Hardy was with the National Science Foundation (NSF) for over 30 years, serving in a variety of capacities. Mr. Hardy holds a B.A. degree from Gettysburg College and J.D. from Catholic University, and has authored a number of publications and made numerous presentations on issues related to research administration, intellectual property and government regulations affecting universities.

ANN N. JAMES serves as Senior University Counsel at Stanford University. She is a member of the Stanford University Medical Center legal team, providing counsel primarily to the School of Medicine, but also to its affiliated hospitals and a diverse array of health-related University offices and groups. Her current responsibilities at the College of Medicine include clinical research issues, conflict of interest in all its forms, faculty compensation, medical practice issues, and development of outreach relationships for provision of specialty services. She also provides counsel to the Stanford University Medical Center Graduate Medical Education Program. She holds a B.A. in Biology from Radford College, a Ph.D. in Medical Microbiology and Immunology from Baylor College of Medicine, and a J.D. from the University of Houston. She has published numerous articles on healthcare law, and has one article and a book on corporate governance issues. Most recently, she has been appointed as a member of the National Advisory Child Health and Human Development Council of the National Institutes of Health.

ARUNDEEP S. PRADHAN currently serves as the Director of Technology & Research Collaborations at OHSU. From 1999 to 2004, he was the Director for Technology Transfer at the Colorado State University Research Foundation and was at University of Utah’s Technology Transfer Office from 1987 to 1999. Arundeep received a Bachelor in Pharmacy from the Birla Institute of Technology & Science (India) in 1985 and MS in Pharmacy Administration from the University of Utah in 1989. He is currently on the Board of the Oregon Bioscience Association and is President Elect of the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM). He also serves on the AUTM Board of Trustees.

REBECCA PUIG is Assistant Director of the Division of Sponsored Research at the University of South Florida (USF) in Tampa, where she is responsible for electronic research administration, proposal development, and editing of the Office of Research & Innovations’ newsletter and magazine. Rebecca is currently pursuing a master’s degree in Entrepreneurship in Applied Technologies at the University of South Florida, where she received her B.S. in Business Management. She has been a member of NCURA since 2001 and has served as both a committee member and now chair of the ERA Neighborhood. She is an active member in Region III, where she served as editor for the Region’s newsletter, webmaster, and a member of the Membership & Awards committee. Rebecca will be serving as contributing editor and author for NCURA Magazine’s eRA Corner.
CONGRESSMAN CIRO RODRIGUEZ represents the 23rd Congressional District in Texas. The 23rd is the largest district in the state, covering most of west Texas from San Antonio to El Paso. With 785 miles of border and 7 National Park sites, the 23rd District is renowned for both its beauty and diversity. He serves on the House Committee on Appropriations where he sits on the Homeland Security, Transportation, Housing & Urban Development & Related Agencies; and Legislative Branch Subcommittees. He also sits on the House Committee on Veterans Affairs where he is a member of the Subcommittee on Health and the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance & Memorial Affairs. Rep. Rodriguez is a member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus (CHC) where he serves as Chair of the Taskforce on Agriculture and Rural Communities. He earned his B.A. at St. Mary’s University and M.S.W from Our Lady of the Lake University in San Antonio.

HENRY JOSEPH RUNGE is a licensing specialist at UNeMed Corporation, the office that handles technology transfer for the University of Nebraska Medical Center. He received a Juris Doctorate and a Master of Science degree in Biology jointly from the University of Iowa in 2004. He interned in the Office of General Counsel at Integrated DNA Technologies prior to joining the University of Nebraska Medical Center’s Intellectual Property Office in 2005. After its expansion in 2006, he joined UNeMed and is actively involved in working with industry to commercialize a wide variety of technologies.

JAYNE TOLLE is the Sr. Grant Administrator for the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Cincinnati for the past year. She has been involved with research administration for 11 years and worked in private sector for 9 years. In her position as Sr. Grant Administrator, Ms. Tolle manages $30 million in a clinical department encompassing grants, contracts, endowments, gifts, state, local, and other miscellaneous funds. Ms. Tolle currently serves as a committee member and as a faculty of the University of Cincinnati’s institutional research training program, titled, “Training in Research Administration and the Institutional Network (TRAIN).” She is also a member of the Academic Administrative and Professional Women (AAPW) and has served on several committees.

JANIE WELCH is the Director of the Human Subjects Protection Program and an Assistant Professor in the College of Nursing at Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois. She has 25 years experience of conducting and managing human subject research at Rush and at Illinois State Psychiatric Institute, Northwestern Memorial Hospital and the University of Illinois at Chicago. Jane received her B.S. in Nursing and her M.S. in Psychiatric Nursing and Healthcare Management from St. Xavier University, Chicago, and her DNP from Rush University.

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 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, Executive Committee, as member and Chair of the Nominations Committee, Chair of the Program 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. Tom received a B.S. in Accounting from Rutgers University, and a M.B.A. from the University of Arizona.

MARTINA Y. TRUCCO is Creative Lead in the Strategy and Innovation Office at HP Labs. She has played a lead role in developing key initiatives like the Innovation Research Program at HP Labs, and manages the development of research-related articles and content that highlight the many accomplishments of the scientists at HP Labs, as well as those of their partners. She previously led Open Innovation activities in Latin America, and serves on the Board of Directors of the Ibero-American Science and Technology Education Consortium (ISTEC). She received her Master’s in Digital Business Management cum laude from HEC Business School, Paris, France in 2004, and her Bachelor of Science in Economics from the Wharton School of Business, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA in 2002.

# Previous NCURATV Series DVDs are now available: Best of 2007 and 2008.

- Buy 4 DVDs for the price of 3
- Buy 8 DVDs for the price of 6

For more information and to download the discount order form, please visit [www.ncura.edu](http://www.ncura.edu) and click on “bookstore.”
ONLINE TUTORIALS
A Primer on Clinical Trials, 7 week program Next session: August 3 – September 18, 2009
A Primer On Federal Contracting, 8 week program Next session: August 3 – September 25, 2009
NEW AND IMPROVED! A Primer on Subawards, 7 week program Next session: August 17 – October 2, 2009
(other dates available for all Online Tutorials, visit the website for details.)

FUNDAMENTALS OF SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION
Philadelphia, PA August 3 – 5, 2009

SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION II WORKSHOPS
New York, NY (NYU) September 14 – 16, 2009

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOPS
Philadelphia, PA SESSION FULL August 3 – 5, 2009

2009 N CURA TV Satellite Broadcast Series
Audits and the Audit Process (DVD Available) aired January 13, 2009
Cost Sharing: Why No Good Deed Goes Unpunished (DVD Available) aired March 10, 2009
F&A Rates for the Non-Accountant (DVD Available) aired June 9, 2009
Subrecipient Monitoring: Assessing Risk September 15, 2009

ONLINE CHATS
Cost Transfer Issues August 26, 2009, 2-3 pm EDT
Hot Topics in Export Compliance September 23, 2009, 2-3 pm EDT

NCURA ANNUAL MEETING
51st Annual Meeting, Marriott Wardman Park, Washington, DC October 21 – 24, 2009

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

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

NEXT ISSUE: SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 2009
DEADLINES:
Submission of Articles: August 24, 2009
Space Reservation for Ads: August 24, 2009
Submission of Ads: August 31, 2009

The NCURA Magazine accepts advertisements for products and services pertinent to university research administration. In addition, display advertisements (including those for position openings) only will be published. The minimum rate is $450. Advertisements should not be construed as official endorsements by NCURA. For additional information, please contact:
Alicia Waldt, Executive Assistant and Publications Coordinator Phone: (202) 466-3894 Fax: (202) 223-5573 Email: waldtt@ncura.edu Website: www.ncura.edu

Changes of address should be reported to NCURA, 1225 19th Street, NW, Suite 850, Washington, DC 20036
To request permission to reprint material from the NCURA Magazine, please send your inquiry to Kathleen Larmett at larrett@ncura.edu and include the issue, name of article and where you are looking to reprint it.
© 2009 National Council of University Research Administrators

NCURA Magazine is printed on recycled paper, using Agri-based inks.
2009 Polls Are Now Open!

VOTE FOR VICE PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT-ELECT, SECRETARY, TREASURER-ELECT AND TWO AT-LARGE BOARD MEMBERS TO SERVE BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2010.

Voters received the call to enter the electronic “polling booth” on July 14, 2009. Please check your email in order to access the electronic notification and place your vote. Voters will be able to view the candidates for each position, along with their CV/biographical sketches and a statement of their goals and objectives.

The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee had a pool of highly qualified individuals, and we thank each of them for their willingness to step forward and serve NCURA.

THE 2009 NOMINATING AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Chair
Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana

Vice Chair
Pamela Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Retired)

Region I
Vivian Holmes, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Region II
Ann Holmes, University of Maryland, College Park

Region III
Cathy Snyder, Vanderbilt University

Region IV
Glenda Luecke-Bullock, Washington University

Region V
Debbie Newton, University of Tulsa

Region VI
John Carfora, Loyola Marymount University

Region VII
Winnie Ennenga, Northern Arizona University

Ex Officio
David Mayo, California Institute of Technology

THE ELECTIONS WILL BE OPEN FOR 30 DAYS. YOUR VOTE COUNTS! THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THESE IMPORTANT ELECTIONS!