Change Comes to Washington

Welcome Freshman Class

Also Inside: NCURA 52nd Annual Meeting Review
On the Cover  As 2010 rapidly comes to a close, it is appropriate to sit back and ponder what the year has meant to research administrators. It has been a year of rapid change, but research administrators have risen to the occasion by strengthening their partnerships with faculty and other institutions. With the results from the recent electoral cycle, it is clear that 2011 will be another year of rapid change in Washington and in our profession. The cover, illustrating newcomers coming to Congress, is one metaphor for this rapid change. The articles by Tom Roberts and Carol Blum help to illustrate some of the issues that will be addressed by elected officials and agency representatives this coming year.

As with all NCURA Magazine issues, this one provides our readers with a wide selection of timely and relevant articles. From university patents to grant writing, and everything in between, there is something for everyone.

It is important to recognize our colleagues who constantly worked hard to make this publication the fine one it has become: Kathleen Larmett, Sarah Aldemeyer, Jerry Pogatshnik, Debbie Smith, Tom Wilson, Carol Blum, Kristine Kulage, Robin Witherspoon, Jaynee Tolle, Rebecca Puig, Kerry Peluso, John Carfora, Beth Seaton, Cheryl Anderson and the LDI Class of 2009, and John Caruso. If I have missed anyone, know that you are highly appreciated as integral to our success.

Last, but not least, a special thanks is extended to authors who wrote for us in 2010 and shared their expertise and experience for the benefit of our readership. You are the lifeblood of our success. Thank you.

Happy New Year!

James Casey
Senior Editor

Correction  Roseann Luongo was not credited as a co-author of “Leadership Tips: Navigating the Four Corners of Change Through Collaboration” with Greg Luttrell in the September/October issue of NCURA Magazine. Roseann Luongo has served as a research administrator at the Harvard School of Public Health since 2001. She is currently the Associate Director of Training and Compliance. She received a Masters of Management, with a concentration in Finance from Harvard University’s Division of Continuing Education in March 2009. Ms Luongo is a member of NCURA’s Leadership Development Institute and has presented and moderated at both the regional and annual NCURA meetings. She was also an NCURA Regional Mentor.
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 its 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.

* Winner will receive compensation for travel expenses up to $1500. Complete award rules available online at itworks-inc.com

919.232.5332 | sales@itworks-inc.com | itworks-inc.com
NCURA President
Dave Richardson's Year in Review

It has been my honor to serve as the NCURA President this past year. I feel extremely fortunate to have had the opportunity to momentarily influence such a great organization and to represent the membership here and abroad. Throughout the course of this year I discovered what I already knew: Successful research administrators are excellent at finding solutions to complex issues (even in finding creative ways to return to the United States in the midst of a global travel crisis)! The strength of NCURA as an organization lies with our outstanding volunteers and our excellent leadership at both the national and regional levels. As an organization of individual members, we are fortunate to have a board of directors who are extremely professional and who place the concerns and needs of the membership above all others. The NCURA National Staff are simply the best in the business at meeting the needs of its association’s membership.

During this past year the Professional Development Committee under the guidance of Pat Hawk initiated steps that will positively impact our delivery and management of our programs and volunteers for years to come. The creation of a separate Select Committee on Evaluation led by Bill Ploog has already generated improved assessment tools, guaranteeing that our professional development offerings will continue to be the best available. The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee steered by Pam Whitlock has worked diligently to evolve our internal leadership training program, ensuring that our organization will continue to enjoy the benefits of strong leadership both nationally and regionally. The Select Committee on Peer Review chaired by Bob Andresen developed administrative guidelines and tools to assure that this valuable service continues to operate both objectively and effectively. And finally, the Financial Management Committee led by Barbara Cole developed a financial analysis template that will allow us to make sure that NCURA continues to remain a financially viable organization for many years to come.

One of my primary goals during my presidency was to work to strengthen our alliances with our peer organizations and to broaden NCURA’s standing throughout the world. By all accounts we have achieved this goal. Representing this great organization at the 2010 International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) was a once-in-a-lifetime experience made even more memorable by the success of the North American delegation in landing the rights to host the 2014 INORMS conference in Washington D.C.

This year also saw the renewal of our relationship with our sister organization, the Canadian Association of University Research Administrators. In attending the CAURA annual meeting, I was reminded by my Canadian colleagues that we not only share the largest border between any two countries, but also share many of the same challenges in managing our research portfolios. I look forward to our renewed exchanges between our organizations and to future opportunities to collaborate.

This year has been made possible by the support of many, and I am sincerely grateful to my Penn State colleagues who have covered me when I was out of the office on “NCURA Time.” I wish to thank all of my NCURA program co-chairs for the outstanding job they did in delivering quality programming while maintaining the NCURA spirit of collegiality. As an organization as large as ours, it is not feasible to have a successful professional program offering without the help of the many individual members who so readily volunteer their time. While there are too many to single out, it is easy to say that all of our achievements this past year would have been impossible without the NCURA volunteers. To all of those who volunteered, I cannot thank you enough! In closing, I sincerely appreciate the wisdom and professionalism exhibited by both the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors, and I take great satisfaction in knowing that the decisions we made this past year will positively influence this organization for many years to come.
Can’t I say I didn’t warn you. In the December 2008/January 2009 (Vol. XL, No.5) issue of NCURA Magazine, I reminded you that President Obama was a key sponsor of the Federal Funding Transparency and Accountability Act (FFATA), and implementation of the FFATA provisions were imminent. And I talked about it here in April/May 2007 (Vol. XXXIX, No. 2). And I suspect we’ll all be talking about the implementation of the FFATA subrecipient reporting for awhile as the strengths and weaknesses of the web portal for the FFATA Subaward Reporting System at www.fsrs.gov are identified and the reporting elements are refined by the agencies.

And the FAPIIS reporting on your performance integrity? You know, the requirement in your federal grants and contracts implementing Section 872 (Clean Contracting Act of 2008) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2009? FAR clause 52.209-7 or 52.209-8? The review of Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information (FAPIIS) requires federal grant and contracting officers to determine whether a potential awardee is qualified to receive an award, taking into consideration information available in the FAPIIS. Federal officials contribute information to the system on terminations of prior awards, agreements to resolve suspensions and debarments, and any findings made by the officer that an entity is not qualified to receive awards of federal funds. Grant and contract awardees are required to report information on certain civil, criminal and administrative proceedings that reach a final disposition within the prior five years. As originally established in the statute, the information would be available only to federal agents and the entities themselves. In the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2010, the data is to be available on a publicly accessible website. No, huh?

The good news is that you may have already met your obligations for the FAPIIS integrity reporting, and the system designed for reporting of sub-recipients for FFATA may be (and I say “may be”) less onerous. The Central Contracting Registration (CCR) is the linchpin. The CCR has been updated to capture some of this data, and the FFATA reporting system at www.fsrs.gov is designed to take advantage of the CCR data and pre-populate some fields.

When you update your registration in the CCR (and you are asked to do that annually), you will be asked to complete information on Proceedings (added to CCR in March, 2010) and Executive Compensation (added in July, 2010). The Proceedings page asks if your contract includes FAR clause 52.209-8 requiring compliance with the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information (FAPIIS) provisions. If so, you are asked whether you have awards in excess of $10 million and, if so, you are asked about civil, criminal, and/or administrative proceedings with a finding of fault and fine greater than $5,000. It’s important to recognize that the proceeding is related to the performance of a federal award. Answer the questions and you’re done.

For FFATA reporting, you enter the FFATA Subaward Reporting System at www.fsrs.gov and register. When you register and enter your Dun & Bradstreet DUNS number, the information for you, the prime awardee, will be pre-populated. You search for the award that you want to report a subaward on using the award identification number, and it will appear. If your subawardee is registered in the CCR, you can enter its DUNS number to pre-populate the FFATA-required fields, including executive compensation data. You complete the report with any local data, e.g., the amount of the subaward. And your job here is done. Poof! Magic!

I know – it will take some time to figure out how to get this job done – who will be responsible for the reporting (by the end of the month following the month in which the obligation was made); who will add increments to the subaward information, if necessary, etc. Much of this will feel familiar because the reporting on Recovery Act (ARRA) awards included many of the same elements. Universities using batchfiles will lose all the pre-population advantages including the pre-population of the Federal agency prime award data. And the reporting under a federal contract is different from that required under a federal grant – for contracts you report procurements as subawards; under grants, you report subawards to entities that make a “substantive contribution” to the project and not procurements of supplies and services. Okay, maybe not exactly magic. The interim final rule for the FAR for contracts and interim final guidance for financial assistance (grants) – remember that “interim final” rules and guidance are effective when issued and any comments offered rarely have substantive affects – are available in the Federal Register for contracts, issued by the General Services Administration and others in the Federal Register on July 8, 2010 (75FR39414); for financial assistance, issued by the Office of Management and Budget in the Federal Register on September 14, 2010 (75FR5669).

Before departing for their home districts, members of Congress passed a Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011 to keep the government operating at the FY 2010 spending levels through the November elections; the Act expires December 3, 2010. When the House and Senate return after the elections, and depending on the outcome of those elections, Congress will likely pass another continuing resolution in the short lame-duck session before the end of the calendar year. So we wait, and report, and wait some more.
One of the rationales for the passage of the 1980 Bayh-Dole Act was the expectation that providing universities with blanket permission to patent would stimulate technology transfer by inducing the private sector to commercialize university inventions by providing intellectual property protections to safeguard companies’ investments in follow-on research and development.

The Bayh-Dole Act in general is considered a success story, although the evidence for its direct role in stimulating university patenting and technology transfer is mixed (Sampat 2006). Due to the lack of a counterfactual, empirically it is impossible to discern whether the high rates of commercialization observed at US universities over the last two decades wouldn’t have occurred even without the patenting and licensing activities that followed after the enactment of the Act. This lack of a counterfactual is an ongoing challenge to understanding the interaction between university patenting and the dynamics of the underlying scholarly research and commercialization activity by industry and universities.

One of the drawbacks of the rationales underlying Bayh-Dole is the implicit treatment of intellectual property as discrete and tangible “deliverables” to be transferred to the private sector. It seems quite plausible that, at the margins, intellectual property protections may provide incentive for further research and commercial development. But the question remains whether or not such marginal cases are the norm. What – beyond the idiosyncratic value of any specific invention – can explain the likelihood that it will be commercialized? Clearly, the answer lies not in the presence of intellectual property protections, because by definition it is a constant characteristic of all patented university inventions.

One of the promising factors advanced to date as an explanation for differential commercialization rates has been sustained university faculty involvement in follow-on research in collaboration with private companies (Thursby & Thursby 2004). Considering that about half of university patents represent merely “proofs of concept” at the time of license (Jensen & Thursby 2001), it is not surprising that oftentimes substantial follow-on research is needed, requiring the involvement of the university inventors. Indeed, faculty involvement in university inventions has been identified as “critical” (Thursby & Thursby 2004), weakening the “deliverables” approach to university patents. If a substantial follow-on collaboration is necessary for a patented invention to see commercial development, then it is unclear to what extent the act of patenting university research can be credited for such collaboration vis-à-vis the interactions between university scientists and private companies that could (and often do) take place outside of the contexts of patenting and licensing, and as we show below – often before the inventions are patented and licensed.

We do not seek to question the rationale for university patenting, but rather to further emphasize the importance of the collaborative processes and the actual research activities surrounding patenting. Here, we present a snapshot of the industry involvement and exposure to the research underlying university inventions based on a survey of university inventors granted patents in 2006.

The survey reports the findings from a national study of 1050 US university inventors listed on university patents granted in 2006. The study used existing patent records as a starting point to identify the university inventors. Each inventor listed on a university patent granted in 2006 was sent a survey containing both general questions and specific questions pertaining to the patent they were listed as an inventor for – a total of 2,895 inventors. Inventors who were listed on more than 1 patent in 2006 (about 20% of respondents) were first asked to identify which of the patents they were most involved with, and then were instructed to answer the remainder of the survey questions with this particular patent in mind. The response rate of the survey was 34%.

First, we examine the nature and extent of industry involvement in the university-based research underlying the patented invention. Table 1 suggests that industry interest and involvement...
in university patents can be substantial. While actual collaborative research with direct input from industry scientists appears to be not very common (in only 15% of inventions the respondents reported direct industry involvement in the research), more than half (53%) of respondents report some form of industry awareness and interest in the research underlying the patent. Not most common, but in some ways most intriguing, 37% of respondents report that industrial interest wasn’t triggered before publication of the findings in academic outlets.

These descriptive findings raise potentially important questions, such as: What is the relationship between the above interfaces with industry with licensing and commercialization activities? With the current data, we can provide an indirect answer to this question, by examining whether industry involvement with the research underlying the invention affects the likelihood that the invention will be licensed or that the faculty will continue collaborating with the company. According to respondents, a substantial number – but not the majority – of patents are subject to some form of follow up. About 43% of the patented inventions have been licensed. More interesting, 26% of university inventors report that they are personally and directly involved with a private company developing the invention.

Next, we address whether pre-existing industry involvement with the research underlying a patent affects the chances for future commercialization. Tables 3 and 4 suggest that the answer is affirmative. All forms of collaboration with or exposure to industry have positive impacts on the likelihood that the invention is being licensed and on the likelihood that the faculty member is working with a private company on commercializing the invention. Having received initial inquiries from industry after publication potentially has one of the strongest effect on the

---

**Table 1. Which of the following statements best reflect your relationship with industry on the research underlying the patent? N=967**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry scientists or engineers collaborated on the research underlying this patent</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone from industry showed interest in this research while it was underway</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received my first inquiries from industry after publishing one or more articles on this research</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 2. Commercialization of the invention( N=980)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has your patent been licensed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are YOU currently working with a company to further develop this invention for commercial use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 3. Effect of interactions with industry on the likelihood that a university scientist is working with a private company to commercialize the invention.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of interactions with industry</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry scientists or engineers collaborated on the research underlying this patent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are YOU currently working with company to further develop this invention for commercial use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone from industry showed interest in this research while it was underway</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I received my first inquiries from industry after publishing one or more articles on this research</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
likelihood of the university scientist directly working with a private company to commercialize the invention.

Last, we address the effect of working directly with a private company on the likelihood that a university invention will be licensed. Table 5 shows that working with a private company essentially doubles the likelihood that the patented invention is licensed. Equally, if not more important, 25% of the inventions whereby university scientists work with private companies do so without a licensing arrangement.

This last finding is important because it challenges the notion that licensing is essential for technology transfer to occur. Of course, with these data the causal direction is ambiguous; the presence of licensing arrangements could plausibly be the force behind collaborative work on commercialization. However, in light of the evidence of substantial involvement of industry in the research underlying the university patents, before the patents were even granted, this explanation seems unlikely.

The preliminary results presented here suggest that industry involvement in – and exposure to – the actual university research underlying university patents is common and substantial. Further, the findings show that industry involvement has a non-trivial effect on the likelihood of subsequent licensing or joint attempts to commercialize the invention. Last but not least, while joint work on commercialization increases the likelihood that a university invention is licensed, substantial collaborative activity does not involve any licensing. Combined, these preliminary findings suggest that the process of commercialization in universities is more organic, diffuse and involved than the conventional expectation of transfer and use of intellectual property suggests. In contrast, there is also evidence that much of the commercialization and licensing activity occurred as a result of information dissemination through traditional academic publication channels.

### References


### Table 4. Effect of interactions with industry on the likelihood that the invention is licensed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry scientists or engineers collaborated on the research underlying this patent</th>
<th>Has your patent been licensed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone from industry showed interest in this research while it was underway</th>
<th>Has your patent been licensed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I received my first inquiries from industry after publishing one or more articles on this research</th>
<th>Has your patent been licensed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Effect of university scientist’s direct involvement with private company on the likelihood that the invention is licensed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are YOU currently working with company to further develop this invention for commercial use?</th>
<th>Has your patent been licensed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Process, Advantages, and Pitfalls of Seeking and Receiving Federal Appropriations

By Thomas J. Roberts

Earmarks, plus-ups, pork, and bringing home the bacon are all terms used to describe direct federal appropriations—money specifically allocated by Congress to a federal agency to directly support a specific project or activity. The U.S. Constitution authorizes Congress to appropriate these funds. The congressional appropriation bill often identifies a recipient organization, such as a college or university. Over the years, U.S. colleges and universities have received billions of dollars in direct federal appropriations to fund thousands of projects ultimately administered through offices of research and sponsored programs.

A key factor in being awarded a federal appropriation is knowing how to obtain one. This can be a complicated process, with many pitfalls to consider but with many ultimate advantages.

First and foremost, obtaining a federal appropriation requires coordination and support within your college or university. Leadership, beginning with the president of your institution, must be aware and supportive of any appropriation request being made. They must be able to explain the requested project to other institutional leaders and staff who may become involved in the project’s promotion and administration, including legislators and congressional staffers. Institutional offices of government relations and research and sponsored programs must be included in the meetings with key legislators; they are vital in selecting and explaining the proposed project(s).

Second, know your representatives in Congress, their committees, their leadership positions, and their personal interests.

Third, clearly communicate the project in ongoing regular communication with congressional staffers and suggest specific appropriation bills that may fit your project. Any proposed project needs to reflect how it benefits the public good and how the project is a good use of tax payer dollars. If your project is being vetted within an appropriation committee, be certain to track the project through the process and be responsive to any requests made from committee members and/or staffers. If your project makes it into an appropriations bill, is approved by Congress, and then signed into law by the President, a direct federal appropriation is approved. Every step of the way, continually thank legislators and staffers for their consideration and support.

However, the process does not stop there. The funds have only been approved and assigned to a specific federal agency to administer the award. You must submit a full proposal to the funding agency holding the funds. Be certain to disclose within the proposal any lobbying that may have taken place to secure the project. Typically, a lobbying firm is used to assist with vetting a project. If so, this information must be disclosed on the “Disclosure of Lobbying Activity” form, part of the standard certifications for any federal proposal submission. The administration of the appropriated funds by an institution will be similar to any other federal award received.

There has been a great deal of debate surrounding direct federal appropriations. Critics contend that funding is often allocated without merit and is a waste of taxpayer dollars, while supporters argue that promising ideas deserve resources that will help jump-start important projects, that will be responsive to various needs of constituents, and that will meet both regional and national needs. An advocate of direct federal appropriations, the late Senator Robert C. Byrd (West Virginia), contended that Congress is “armed with the power of the purse to ensure that the federal government is responsive to their people’s needs” (see Chronicle of Higher Education, June 28, 2010, at http://chronicle.com/article/Sen-Robert-Byrd-Defenderof/66073/). Over the years, billions of dollars have been awarded to colleges and universities through the direct appropriation process, but the specific sponsor of projects and the tracking of awards have not always been abundantly clear. This lack of clarity, and presumably accountability concerns, has led to earmark reform.

Recent earmark reform includes no earmarks to for-profits and clear sponsor identification, meaning the member(s) of Congress supporting a specific project must be clearly identified. Project sponsors are now required to post on their Web sites any requests for a committee to consider appropriated funding. The web site must identify the recipient of the funds, the amount of requested funds, explanation of the project’s purpose, and a rationale for the use of taxpayer dollars. The sponsor must also certify that no financial interest exists.

Notwithstanding earmark reform efforts and the ongoing debate about the value of earmarks, many colleges and universities continue to pursue them as funding sources. The Chronicle of Higher Education created a database that tracks earmarks to colleges and universities. The database, located at, http://chronicle.com/stats/pork/?utm_source=at &utm_medium=en, illustrates that earmarks in higher education are alive and well despite recent earmark reform.

Regardless of one’s personal views and political philosophy pertaining to federal appropriations, they remain a legitimate source of funding for colleges and universities. Like most things, there are advantages and disadvantages to seeking and receiving federal appropriations. Both need to be carefully examined before beginning the pursuit of any federal appropriation.

The obvious advantage of pursuing and receiving a federal appropriation is the funding itself. An appropriation can greatly increase the dollar amount received for sponsored research by an institution—thereby enhancing the evaluation of...
Appropriations can initiate new areas of research, jumpstart new programs, purchase equipment, establish new laboratories, and even construct new buildings.

Despite the many advantages there are, without a doubt, disadvantages to consider. One negative connotation is the aforementioned perception that without a peer review process, such projects may be without merit and may undermine the scientific integrity of research. Determining what projects should be pursued and who should lead them can be a source of internal bickering. Consider how professional jealousy and resentment can cause faculty division: Faculty may attempt to downplay or even discredit a colleague who is the Principal Investigator (PI) on an appropriation, citing lack of peer review. And consider the case of a PI moving to a different institution and wanting to take the appropriated award with him/her? A variety of scenarios could play out depending on specific circumstances, but it is not impossible for an appropriated project to transition with the PI to the new institution. Timeliness in terms of proposal submissions can also cause problems. Lag time can be significant, as by the time an award is actually made, a proposal for continuation of the project may be due even before the initial research begins.

Another disadvantage is that the time and cost associated with pitching projects can quickly add up—trips to Washington to meet with legislators made by senior administration, scientists, and probably the President of the college or university. While not an absolute requirement, retaining a lobbyist is strongly recommended, but the cost of retaining a lobbying firm can be very high. Institutions, especially public institutions, need to be careful about the source of funds used to pay for lobbying efforts— as some funding, if used for lobbying, are illegal.

Finally, expending political capital on pet projects may be ill advised or even dangerous if other institutional priorities serve the greater good. Legislative sponsors may desire formal check presentations and/or press conferences for projects they’ve supported. Arranging such events can complex, costly, and embarrassing if all involved are not on the same page. The following case study is presented to give the reader a more complete understanding of the issues involved with federal appropriations.

In summary, direct federal appropriations are a legitimate source of funding for colleges and universities to pursue, but the old adage “be careful what you wish for because you just might get it” comes to mind. Seriously consider the advantages and pitfalls before deciding to pursue such funding. On the surface, receiving substantial funding for research and other sponsored projects through federal appropriations sounds great, but under the surface there may lurk disadvantages that are detrimental to the overall health of your institution. Bacon smells and tastes great to most, but bacon can be detrimental to one’s overall health. Consider this before bringing home the bacon.

A CASE STUDY

Appropriation Seeking University (ASU) made the institutional decision to seek federal appropriations. Investment was made in hiring a lobbying firm and institutional leaders selected a handful of projects to pursue and to discuss with legislators. Support for the establishment of a DNA testing facility to streamline physical evidence collection and forensic analysis became evident and legislators supported a $1.5 million dollar appropriation request from ASU. The request became reality and the U.S. Department of Justice (DoJ) was allocated the funds for this appropriation. For several months ASU attempted to identify what office within the DoJ they needed to work with to submit a proposal in support of the appropriation. Nearly eight months passed before an e-mail message was received from a DoJ Program Officer advising ASU that his office would be administering this congressionally-directed award and that application instructions would be provided to ASU shortly.

Despite repeated ASU requests to the identified program officer for proposal submission instructions, three more months passed before a response was received. Much to the surprise of ASU, the instructions indicated that the proposal would be due in five days! A proposal was prepared and submitted according to the instructions provided, but the DoJ rejected the proposal. This rejection led to several conversations between ASU administrators and scientists, the lobbying firm who assisted with the appropriation, and the legislators who supported the appropriation. Finally, a mutually acceptable project was negotiated and verbally approved between ASU and DoJ. Four months after the project was initially rejected, a new proposal was submitted based on the aforementioned conversations and verbal agreements between ASU and DoJ. Two more months passed. A new DoJ program officer was assigned to oversee this project, and the new program officer rejected the proposal that was previously verbally agreed upon. More discussions took place, another month passed, and yet another revised proposal was submitted. The proposal was finally accepted nearly two years after the appropriation was made by Congress. While the process was extremely frustrating to ASU, perseverance paid off as the laboratory was established and equipment purchased. The laboratory continues to operate and other funding has been leveraged as a result.

Tom Roberts is the Associate Vice President for Research at Florida Gulf Coast University in Fort Myers, Florida. He has been a professional research administrator for over twenty years and has worked at various types of institutions including comprehensive, doctoral granting, medical school, and major research university environments. He authored the first doctoral dissertation focusing specifically on the field of research administration. Dr. Roberts is an active member of NCURA and currently serves on its Board of Directors. He earned his doctorate in Educational Leadership from the University of Central Florida.
International Insight: 
An Interview with James Hearn, M.A., J.D., LL.M.

By John M. Carfora

Brief Biographical Sketch
James Hearn is a Los Angeles based attorney and educator with extensive academic and practical experience working with communication theory, the formulation of negotiation strategies and with facilitative, evaluative and transformative forms of mediation and dispute resolution, including the resolution of disputes between parties possessing differing cultural orientations and in those disputes arising in the international context. Attorney Hearn is author of Interpersonal Deception Theory: Ten Lessons for Negotiators and regularly lectures on mediation and negotiation strategies. He can be reached at: jdhearn@hotmail.com (please reference NCURA interview).

(1) Question: James, what can you tell us about some of the themes you covered in Interpersonal Deception Theory: Ten Lessons for Negotiators?

The premise of the article stated simply is that everybody lies. All of us engage in the telling of untruths or in deceptive communication to some extent at various times. The term “deception” is simply employed to avoid the use of the more accurate term – “lying.” However, this fact does not mean that the person engaging in such communication is necessarily possessed of a malignant heart. Rather, this simply serves as proof of their humanity since lying is a component of our human nature.

I wrote this article at the time I was considering communication theory and the manner in which such theory could be applied to enhance the skills of negotiators. Specifically, I was interested in the ability to detect deception in the negotiation context. Much had been written regarding “lie detection” which deals with the ability to detect deception in unidirectional communication (i.e., a person makes a statement and the recipient’s ability to determine the veracity of that single statement is evaluated.) While interesting, this research was not of any great assistance in the negotiation context which involves a complex, fluid communicative process.

I came to focus on the work of two communication professors, David B. Buller and Judee K. Burgoon, who coined the term “Interpersonal Deception Theory (“IDT”)” in their seminal 1996 article. IDT is employed to explain the manner in which individuals while engaging in face-to-face communication deal with, on the conscious and subconscious levels, actual or perceived deception. This work represented a shift in the study of deception by viewing deception as a communicative activity. One of the major keys of this article is the fact that most people overestimate their ability to detect deception which can be costly in the negotiation context. My article focuses on improving the negotiator’s deception detection abilities.

(2) Question: What advice would you give our readers about negotiating or mediating international agreements?

Negotiation and mediation are two different processes. However, both involve the process of communication – one direct and the other facilitated. Wiggins and Lowery define negotiation as a “communication process that people use to plan transactions and to resolve conflict.”

Negotiation ordinarily commences prior to the drafting of any agreement and continues during the process until a mutually acceptable document is produced. This is the “planning aspect of negotiation.” Thus, the key to a successful negotiation is the ability to communicate in a way that the interests and concerns of the parties to an agreement are addressed. This contemplates and necessitates the ability not just to express your interests and concerns but also to hear and comprehend the interests and concerns of the other party in a meaningful manner. Listening, processing and understanding messages as intended are an often overlooked portion of the communicative process. However, this skill is vital to forging meaningful relationships and to drafting clear and effective agreements, be they international or domestic.

(3) Question: Great overview. Can you speak more about the international context?

In the international context most often individuals or institutions of differing cultures come together for a common purpose. What is shared between the individuals or institutions is the language of the field in which each is engaged. Ob- viously, the negotiation will be made considerably easier if the parties have also entered into prior agreements with one another or if either party has had prior dealings with people or institutions with the cultural orientation of those with whom they are now dealing. However, if neither is the case, the negotiation, to be truly successful, will require each participant to have or acquire a knowledge and sensitivity to any cultural differences in the communication and negotiation styles of the other.

Drafting an agreement which will address all possible eventualities is impossible. Situations always arise which neither party contemplated and which are not clearly covered by the agreement. Thus, the manner for addressing such situations must be discussed. If there is a difference as to how a given situation should be addressed this will require the negotiation of a mutually acceptable resolution. This is the “conflict resolution aspect of negotiation.” Again, this process contemplates that the parties are able to continue successful communication. When the line of communication is severed the need for mediation arises.

Negotiation is communication between two or more parties to reach an agreement or understanding. If the parties are not capable of continuing to communicate then they may turn to mediation. Mediation is simply negotiation facilitated by a third party. The mediator bridges the gap in the line of communication between the parties. Mediation is an extremely useful dispute resolution tool. However, the provision for the use of this mechanism should be expressly included, and the process defined, in the agreement. Essentially, the parties should, while they are able to communicate/negotiate, agree upon a method for addressing the situation when this is no longer the case.

(4) Can you share some tips for breaking through an impasse?

Various techniques with universal applicability may be employed to overcome impasse. The only caveat regarding their use in the international context is that one must always remain sensitive to the cross-cultural context so that
techniques will be understood and have their intended effect. These techniques include:

- **Employ Leverage** – leverage refers to the power each party to the negotiation possesses. This is often difficult to determine and changes during the course of the negotiation. The theory is that the greater the power, the greater the leverage and the greater the ability to dictate the terms on which the conflict will be resolved. Leverage should never be employed to threaten. This aggressive use often results in the return of aggression and the total breakdown of communication.

- **Use Objective Standards and Procedures** – here the parties agree upon a neutral, objective standard that can be employed to evaluate each party’s positions and to prevent a mere test-of-wills. To be useful the standard chosen must be neutral, reliable and relevant. An example could be the prevailing practices or standards in the international research community.

- **Exchange Further Information** – the key to a successful negotiation is the mutual exchange of information. Sometimes impasse results from the parties having not exchanged sufficient information to comprehend the respective positions. In this case attempt to understand the interests underlying the positions of the other party.

- **Carve Out What Can Be Agreed Upon** – when negotiations reach impasse one commonly attributes the cause to the other party. This may or may not actually be the case. Thus, considering one’s own position and how it may be viewed from the other side’s perspective is productive. This is often difficult. We tend to view things in our favor and to overvalue our positions and the chances of success if the matter were decided on its merits. This leads to a reluctance to make concessions or to engage in compromise.

(5) One last question: Do you have a few final thoughts to share with our readers?

Archimedes said: “If you give me a lever and a place to stand, I can move the world.” Quite an ambitious statement. However, I tend to feel about mediation the way Archimedes did about the lever. Given the opportunity I feel that there are relatively few conflicts which cannot be resolved through the use of skillful mediation. Negotiation is communication. Once communication stops, negotiation stops. Bringing in a skillful mediator not only restores the broken lines of communication but also brings to the dynamic one able to direct the parties to a meaningful and mutually beneficial resolution.

In the case of your readers the establishment of a procedure for the resolution of conflict could result in the maintenance and preservation of important research relationships and in the reduction of the loss of valuable research time to protracted negotiation to resolve ambiguity and conflict.

Dr. John M. Carfora is Associate Vice President for Research Advancement and Compliance at Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles.
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Strategies for Promoting Researcher Compliance with Internal Grant Deadlines

By Kristine M. Kulage

Although grant applications come in many shapes and sizes and are submitted to a wide array of agencies, a universal reality for all parties involved is the dreaded deadline. Therefore, it’s not surprising that one of the most common challenges administrators face during the grant preparation process is ensuring compliance with deadlines. Researchers know that there is usually no flexibility with an agency’s set deadline for receipt of applications. This is particularly true in the biomedical research field as federal agencies like the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation have receipt deadlines that are hardly negotiable. On the other hand, internal deadlines established by departmental and central grants administration offices are typically viewed as soft deadlines that are “up for debate.” Because research administrators understand the critical role these internal deadlines play in assuring successful, timely grant submissions, enforcing them is a constant source of conflict between faculty and staff. This article offers an overview of the strategies for promoting researcher compliance with internal grant deadlines that we have implemented in the Office of Research Resources (ORR) at Columbia University School of Nursing’s administrative office that works directly with the medical center’s central sponsored projects office on grant submissions. While we have experienced varying levels of success depending on the situation and researcher, overall these tactics have helped ease some of the inevitable tension surrounding internal grant deadlines.

Support from Up Above

At the school or departmental level, I have found unwavering support from higher authorities to be the most effective strategy in promoting researcher compliance with internal deadlines set by a central sponsored projects office. The ORR’s greatest ally in the battle to meet deadlines is our school’s Associate Dean for Research, who also happens to be my direct supervisor. Since joining the School of Nursing seven years ago as Director of the ORR, we have implemented successful initiatives to promote compliance with deadlines. This proactive approach, which helps avoid the problem of last minute submissions all together, is fully supported by our Associate Dean for Research. Her support goes beyond just enforcing a rule; because she truly believes in it, she helps “market” the message by vocally promoting it at faculty meetings and ORR researcher seminars. This has helped create a culture of compliance in our school and an atmosphere of little tolerance for subverting these deadlines. In an ideal world, every departmental research administration office would have a faculty member in a high-level administrative position to back them up in support of enforcing internal grant deadlines. I encourage research administrators to engage in discussions with superiors, Assistant/Associate Deans, and even the Dean or Chairperson regarding the need for compliance with internal grant deadlines and how they might partner with you to not only establish guidelines and policies, but also enforce them. Be prepared to face resistance, as it will take convincing arguments, even from higher authorities, to facilitate change. But let’s face it – we all know that faculty members are more likely to comply with mandates that come from “up above.”

Presentation is Key

When a new research faculty member joins our school, they attend a mandatory orientation to the ORR. Within the context of presenting the myriad of services we offer to assist researchers in submitting applications and administering funded grants, we gently but firmly review our deadline policies. We not only inform them that our medical center’s sponsored projects administration office (SPA) has established a mandatory internal grant deadline of 5 business days prior to agency due date, but we also explain why our school chooses to vehemently adhere to this deadline. We emphasize that our office works in tandem with SPA as well as researchers as one unified team with a common goal: the timely submission of flawless grant applications. I have found Principal Investigators (PIs) to be much more receptive to deadline policies when they are given an explanation of the legitimate rationale behind them.

What’s in it for Me?

Following this line of thought, rather than presenting the internal deadline to PIs as something SPA has cruelly imposed upon already time-constrained researchers in some secret effort to inhibit their scientific endeavors, we highlight the significant advantages of compliance. Applications submitted on or before internal deadlines are unquestionably given earlier and more meticulous administrative reviews. When a sponsored projects officer is not pressed for time, their reviews can be more thoughtful and thorough rather than just skimming through the application verifying the most basic mandatory information. For example, time is available to give careful consideration to compliance requirements (e.g., conflict of interest, training in research involving human subjects) in order to ensure a smooth, error-free review of the application by the agency’s scientific review panel. This additional set of eyes beyond the departmental grants administration office can only improve the quality of the
final application and increase its odds for eventual funding. In addition, if our school’s recognized gold standard is to meet or exceed all deadlines, our good reputation can be used to more easily buy researchers exceptions to the deadlines when unfortunate situations arise that unintentionally cause an application to be late.

Benefits to researchers who comply with internal deadlines go beyond those provided by a sponsored projects office. As a grants manager in a medical center, the majority of our applications are submitted to the NIH through grants.gov and land in the Electronic Research Administration (eRA) Commons. The earlier a grant is submitted to SPA, the sooner it is reviewed and submitted electronically to grants.gov and the eRA Commons. This then allows for a larger window of time in which necessary revisions can be made and fatal errors can be corrected. In addition, the NIH has recently announced via NOT-OD-10-123 that effective January 25, 2011 it will eliminate its error correction window that extends two business days past the due date (e.g., if the application was submitted on the deadline date of June 5, it could still be rejected, corrected, and re-submitted up to June 7; this will no longer be the case). The good news is that PIs can still take advantage of the two-business-day window prior to the submission deadline (e.g., if the application is submitted on June 3 for the June 5 deadline, it can be rejected, corrected, and resubmitted up until June 5). “NIH, AHRQ, and NIOSH encourage applicants to submit in advance of the due date to take advantage of the opportunity to correct errors and warnings and to review the application in eRA Commons before the deadline.” This upcoming change makes compliance with internal deadlines even more important.

When logical arguments such as these fail to sway researchers, grants administrators can always play the fear factor card. We all have examples to share which illustrate worst-case scenarios that have come true despite our best efforts: the finalized Adobe grant file that suddenly became corrupt; the computer that crashed at the 11th hour; the Internet server that failed to transmit; the FedEx delivery truck that missed the last pick-up of the day.

Help Facilitate Compliance

In addition to constant communication with faculty members and promotion of policies, there are ways in which grants administrators can take an active role in helping facilitate researcher compliance with internal grant deadlines. Our office maintains a schedule of both confirmed and potential future grant submissions, and we frequently initiate dialogue with our PIs by sending gentle reminders to nudge them along in their grant preparation and writing. As internal deadlines approach, we let them know we are ready to assist; we inquire about their progress in confirming their research team; we suggest dates and times for budget meetings; and occasionally we simply check in with our researchers via e-mail to encourage their continued work on the application. Efforts such as these prevent applications from falling through the cracks. By not sitting idly by and waiting for faculty members to approach us with their needs at various phases of the process, we exert what little control we can over compliance with timelines and deadlines. Again, our facilitation of progress in grant preparation is presented as teamwork toward the common goal of an on-time, fundable grant submission.

No matter how much your school or department strives for compliance with internal grant deadlines, there will always be faculty members who feel they are the exception to the rule or who insist, “Department X isn’t compliant, so why do we have to be?” Implementing some strategies for promoting researcher compliance with internal grant deadlines can minimize the conflict between administrators and faculty members and help make situations of noncompliance the exception rather than the norm.

Kristine M. Kulage is Director, Office of Research Resources, Columbia University School of Nursing and Biomed Corner Contributing Editor of NCURA Magazine.

By Joyce Ferland and Jeff Ritchie

The field of research administration deals with crises, deadlines, paperwork, bureaucratic red tape and, more recently, the pressure to do more with less. With the high pace of the research administration field, promoting effective working relationships is essential to organizational success. By gaining awareness and appreciation of the different ways you and your team can build relationships within your environment, you can learn to work more effectively and become a better leader. To assist with this, we have outlined 7 paradoxes:

1. Leaders who are strong ask for help.
   
   Increased scrutiny imposed upon institutions has forced many universities to tighten their business processes. One question research administration leadership should ask is “who can help?”" One option would be to get stakeholders (central accountants, department administrators, other leaders, etc.) involved with the process. This can be accomplished by asking for advice, for input and recommendations in addition to delegating, trusting and training...in other words fostering teamwork. When research administration leaders ask for help from a position of strength, accompanied by proven ability and trust, it has an immeasurable effect.

   The paradox involved here is that there are some who believe that asking for help is a sign of weakness. In reality, research administration leaders must be strong and self-confident to ask for help; paradoxically, it is when they ask for help that leaders gain increased stature, respect and gratitude.

   Successful teams and teamwork fuel the accomplishment of your institutional goals. Fostering teamwork is creating a work culture that values collaboration. In a teamwork environment, people understand and believe that thinking, planning, decisions and actions are better when done cooperatively.

2. Leaders who share power gain power.
   
   Leaders who share power gain power. If we use our power to empower others, our influence will extend far beyond our grasp.

   The paradox is that leaders who share power assume heavier responsibilities because they are still accountable. Leaders make their subordinates feel stronger through sharing their power. When retaining responsibility, power is delegated; when delegating a task, delegating the authority is also necessary to carry out the task. Failure to do this negates the purpose of delegation. Withholding power results in less confident followers who are afraid to attempt projects for fear of failure.

3. Leaders who give more receive more.
   
   The old axiom is true “the more you give, the more you receive.” A perfect example of this is volunteering for NCURA.

   What do NCURA volunteers receive in return? Volunteers gain the opportunity to help guide the future of NCURA, to establish a strong network of peers, to acquire new skills and experiences, and to help advance the field of research administration.

   This is paradoxical because some could perceive that research administration leaders share their knowledge with others could create competition and then could be displaced. However, leaders who are secure and possess inspired visions realize that training people strengthens teams.

4. Leaders who take the blame avoid the blame
   
   As a manager and a leader, you need to be prepared to accept your legitimate share of the blame for this situation, but at the same time, you need to be prepared to go to the mat for your staff. If your people were not prepared to handle Dr. Jones’s application, you need to own that, but you need to make it clear to Dr. Jones that he plays a role in this process and the need to be available.

   To really understand this paradox, look both up and down the chain of command. If you studiously avoid accepting the blame for ANY situation, you are exhibiting a lack of judgment to your superiors and a lack of accountability to your subordinates. When there are legitimate complaints with service that your people provide, accept responsibility for it and work with Dr. Jones and your staff to fix the problem.

5. Leaders who take time, save time

   “I can do this faster by myself” is the familiar refrain from the overworked and stressed out...
involved, another key component of “training” is establishing basic professional values within your organization. Quite often, the important decisions are not driven by the demands of policies and procedures. They are driven by what your staff perceives to be the values of your department, so make sure that you clearly communicate – by words and by actions – what those values are.

6. Leaders are not technicians

To be an effective research administrator, one needs to master a daunting body of technical knowledge. We have to be able to review a research contract just as efficiently as we order supplies from the procurement office. The degree of technical expertise required for our profession is ridiculously high, which is why we often can’t see the leadership forest for the technical trees.

The paradox here is that to be an effective leader in research administration, one needs to lay aside the emphasis on those technical skills. Of course we know how to write a budget for a training grant, but we have to be comfortable with allowing our subordinates to do the technical tasks while we handle the oversight and managerial duties that come along with leadership.

Nobody likes being micromanaged, and I suspect that even leaders would admit that looking over the shoulder of their staff doesn’t make for a professionally satisfying workplace. You still need the body of technical knowledge that you gained while rising in this profession, because new professionals are entering research administration every day. Your role now is not to be a technician, but to be a teacher and a mentor to your staff. For years, you were willing to learn everything you could about being an effective research administrator, now is the time for you to be willing to share.

7. Leaders do not Lead

When we think of the traditional view of leadership, we think of one person out in front of a large group, leading the way into an uncertain future. The captain of a ship or the general at the head of a vast army. But the study of leadership in recent years has shown that this view is largely unrealistic.

Leaders provide vision and inspiration, and while they may sometimes find themselves out in front, they’re just as likely to be in the background. Leaders are effective when they provide encouragement to others and the opportunity for others to achieve great things. Ultimately the most important elements of true leadership are what occur out of the spotlight.

Inspiring a shared vision for the institution is part of being a leader, but so is mentoring your employees and coaching them in their development as research administrators. Equally important are providing your employees with opportunities to grow, both personally and professionally, and celebrating their success along the way. These are all what we used to call the “soft skills” of management, but nothing proves to be harder.

Perhaps that’s the ultimate paradox of leadership.
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DECEMBER 2010
Financial Research Administration 12 Conference
March 4-6 San Diego, California

Mark your calendar now for the FRA 12 Conference to be held March 4-6, 2011 at the beautiful Manchester Grand Hyatt in San Diego, California. Please join us as we strategically plan, problem-solve, and collaborate on how to balance work-related issues while maintaining accountability.

The program committee has done an excellent job in offering a full array of workshops, concurrent sessions, and small group discussions ranging from overviews to basic, intermediate, and advanced levels. This year's conference will include 20 workshops plus a free workshop on how to enhance your presentation skills. In addition, the number of concurrent sessions has been increased to optimize the time spent away from your institution.

And, if that isn't enough to keep you busy, San Diego offers plenty of things to see and do: the world famous San Diego Zoo, Sea World, the USS Midway Museum, and the Gas-lamp Quarter. Not to mention plenty of shopping and nearby beaches. All of this in one of the Top 10 Best Weather Cities! We're looking forward to seeing you at FRA 12.

Be sure to visit the FRA 12 website to view the preliminary program and access registration information at http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/sites/fra12.

FRA 12 Workshop Sampling
• Post Award Basics
• Financial Compliance Issues in Research Administration
• Risk Assessment: From Theory to Practice
• Setting up a Post-Award Office (PUI)
• Starting a Clinical Office
• What Every Departmental Administrator Needs to Know about the OMB Circulars
• Effort Reporting – Why is it so Complicated?
• Administering Subawards through their Life Cycle
• Service Centers – Developing, Managing, and Monitoring Service Centers
• A-21 and A-110: An Overview of Federal Circulars for the Central Administrator
• University F&A Proposals—Federal Review and Complex Negotiation Issues (Senior)
• Issues in Financial Research Administration Compliance—Problems, Perception and Potential Solutions (Senior)

Concurrent Session Sampling
• Clinical Research Management Systems
• Non-A21 Federal Cost Principles
• Post-Award Best Practices from Proposal to Closeout
• Advanced Topics in Effort Reporting
• Developing and Negotiating Contracts (Advanced)
• Wrap-Up of ARRA
• NSF, NIH, COGR, and OIG ARRA Audit Updates
• Federal Representatives Roundtable
• Sizzling Topics: All the Latest News and More (Advanced)
• Developing Leaders and Motivating Staff in Uncertain Times (Advanced)
• Monitoring Foreign Subawards: Good Practices
• Financial Issues in Clinical Trials
• Good Management Practices: Doing More with Less
• Research vs. Clinical Trials: Strategies for Managing Complex Programs
• Accounts Receivables—How do you manage to minimize deficits and bad debt?
• Strategic Planning with the F&A Proposal (Advanced)
• Costing from the Federal Perspective
• Operating a Large Service Center (Advanced)
• The FDA Review: A Real Life Story
• ARRA Audit Experience: A Retrospective Look
• Compliance at a PUI
• Cost Transfers (discussion group)
• Pre-Award Best Practices (discussion group)
• P-Card Monitoring and Management (discussion group)
Comments by Jerry Fife upon Receiving the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award

Jerry Fife received the NCURA Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award at NCURA’s Annual Meeting on Monday, November 1, 2010. This is NCURA’s most prestigious award, given each year to a member who has made a significant contribution to the research administration profession and demonstrated noteworthy service to NCURA. The following is his acceptance speech.

Thank you Jane, Gunta, and Rob. Three people I am fortunate to count as my friends and colleagues and who have taught me far more than they will ever know.

I want to acknowledge my wife, Mary Ann, my son Taylor, my daughter-in-law Hava and my grandson Emerson who join me today. Mary Ann has been my voice of reason for over 38 years. Taylor (and my two other sons who were not able to be here) have taught me plenty as they grew up, but most noteworthy, is that “no” is not a final answer but merely an interim step.

The list of those who deserve thanks is long and I would undoubtedly leave someone off but I am fortunate to have many of those friends and colleagues in the audience today. Like most of you, I didn’t set out to be a research administrator. Until the age of 35, I dreamed of taking over the family farm in rural Indiana. (Can you imagine me in bib overalls?) For many reasons, that dream was not realized, but it left me with a great work ethic which has helped me throughout my career.

NCURA is a professional development organization, and as I think about this honor I have received, there is no doubt that it contributed heavily to any success I have experienced. Through NCURA, I improved my ability to speak in front of people, make presentations, work with others and, oh yeah, it allowed me to live out my rock and roll fantasy for the last 21 years and enrich my friendship with the band members. Soul Source will be doing our final NCURA performance tomorrow night. Hope to see you there!

As I reflect on the honor bestowed upon me, I thought it might be useful to share a few things that have helped me survive and succeed over the last 36 years. These are my hints for success:

1. Have the highest levels of Integrity, Honesty, Accountability and Loyalty – Those who’ve worked closely with me know that I will always admit mistakes, no matter what the cost, in order to preserve my integrity.

2. Learn to Work in Teams - Teams, working together, accomplish far more than an individual. Or, to quote my colleague Shandy Hussman, “More brains are better.”

3. Volunteer for New Opportunities – Broadening your skills will increase your knowledge and value to the organization. When I first started in research administration I held almost all the administrative positions in the office by moving around. It was really scary for me when I first accepted a position doing the F&A study, given that accounting is not one of my strengths (Don’t laugh, Cathy Snyder).

4. Build on Your Talents/Manage Your Weaknesses – It is critical to be aware of your talents and to work to get even better in these areas. It is equally important to be aware of your weaknesses and to figure out ways to fill these gaps. For example, I am fairly decent at facilitating meetings and groups of people around solving a problem. I’m not so good at developing a long term strategic plan and monitoring the plan. The way in which I’ve worked around this in my current position is to find a person in my organization to assist me in managing my weakness. We don’t all have this luxury, but there are still ways to manage through your weaknesses.

5. Accept that Change is a Constant – As I think about change from when I started in 1974 in research administration until today, it is dramatic. In 1974, there were no computers, fax machines, cell phones or Fed-Ex. In 1985 I had an Apple 2 E and shared a 5 meg. hard drive with two others. In 1990, we started to use email. The pace of change is accelerating, and to retain value in the workplace, we must keep up in both technology and management practices. Two cautionary notes about changes in management practices (things like policy, procedures, organizational structure):

a. Don’t expect change to be perfect; it’s not. Change is a work in progress and requires tweaking to get it right.

b. Don’t resist change based on the exceptions (things which occur rarely). It destroys your credibility.

6. Assume the Best in People – It’s my assumption that greater than 95% of all people want to do the right thing. It’s up to us as leaders to bring this out in them.

7. Accept Compromise – So much of our work is not black and white. In seeking solutions be flexible and get comfortable working in those grey areas.

8. Leave Everything You Touch a Little Bit Better – I heard this in a talk recently given by David Cutchliffe, head football coach for Duke University, and I really identified with it. In our work, we often do not see major strides (although we’d like to) so if we leave everything we touch a little bit better I believe we can declare success.

9. Have fun! Many of us spend more time at work than we do with our families, and if we can’t have fun it makes work, WORK!

During the course of my 36 years in research administration, NCURA has grown from 1300 members to 7000 members and I am proud to have been a part of it, and I thank you for this honor.

Jerry Fife is the Vice Chancellor for Administration at Vanderbilt University. He is a past President of NCURA, has served on the faculty of Fundamentals, SPA II, the Peer Review team and has presented at numerous NCURA meetings. He is a former Board member of COGR and served as the Chair of the Costing Committee.
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Implementing Financial Compliance Requirements by Focusing on the “How”

By Ann Meehan Saputelli and Martin Smith
Introduction

Financial compliance has evolved as the regulatory environment has changed over the years. What started as proactive initiatives with monitoring programs and internal audits has manifested into strict, reactive requirements mandated oftentimes with little time to implement and inconsistent guidance. Anyone who submitted ARRA reports this past quarter can attest to the overly dynamic nature of today’s compliance requirements. We are taking this opportunity to share our experiences that come from auditing sponsored awards and managing post-award transactions. These experiences have led us to general best practices that can be implemented from varying perspectives—a central sponsored programs office down to the department or project level. Our recommendations are not “blue sky” ideas, rather they are practical ways to implement the spirit of financial compliance requirements by focusing on the “how” when conducting the day-to-day business of financial research administration.

Brief Overview of Fundamental Elements of a Compliance Program

The Health and Human Services (HHS), Office of the Inspector General (OIG) published draft guidance in the Federal Register that outlined eight (8) elements considered to be fundamental to an effective compliance program:

1. Implementing written policies and procedures,
2. Designating a compliance officer and compliance committee,
3. Conducting effective training and education,
4. Developing effective lines of communication,
5. Conducting internal monitoring and auditing,
6. Enforcing standards through well publicized disciplinary guidelines,
7. Responding promptly to detected problems and undertaking corrective action, and
8. Defining roles and responsibilities and assigning oversight responsibility.

Research institutions have adopted this guidance by writing policies and procedures, hiring compliance officers or staff to work in a compliance capacity, intensified training and education programs geared towards financial compliance, and reinforced roles and responsibilities documented in policies or in a formal responsibility matrix. Many research institutions have compliance hotlines, websites with links to OMB Circulars, agency policy statements, etc. All of these efforts are very well intentioned—but research administrators still post questions to listserv groups, still attend conferences, still watch webinars, and still seek out assistance in meeting financial compliance requirements—why? Mostly because the field of research administration is ever changing, but partly because compliance requirements are not accompanied by instructions on how to implement them.

Research institutions have addressed most of the pertinent questions—who is responsible for adhering to compliance requirements, what are the rules we have to follow, when do rules need to be implemented and adhered to, where do we conduct training, look for problems, find information and go for help; and why do we want to be compliant—to avoid fines and penalties and to preserve the reputation of the institution. However, the answer may lay in the “How.”

Identifying your Institution’s Financial Compliance Model

Many people reading this article may be thinking right about now: “we don’t have a formal financial compliance program”—but we ask you to think about it again. When you go to New Hire Orientation and get a pencil with a compliance hotline phone number printed on it, someone in your institution made a decision to make this the “How” to communicate your institution’s approach to the Developing effective lines of communication element of OIG compliance guidance. When internal audit shows up unannounced to audit a list of transactions recently charged to the sponsored program you manage at a department level, this is your institution’s solution to the “How” to achieve the Conducting internal monitoring and auditing element of OIG compliance guidance. When you go through the list you can probably think of a number of initiatives attempted or ongoing at your institution which are intended to meet one or all of the suggested fundamental compliance elements.

The problem may be that your institution may have only incorporated a small number of the recommendations. For example, one institution may have decided to use existing resources in internal audit to focus on auditing financial transactions charged to sponsored awards. This may have resulted in new findings and disallowed expenditures, along with increased tension between the researchers and administration. Maybe even after a few new policies have been written, faculty and staff have been trained on the new policies, and the policies have been posted on a new website, when they were tested through auditing, the non-compliant behavior still exists.

Implementing Compliance Requirements Considering your Institution’s Existing Structure

You know a well written policy when you see one—it has sections covering who should know the policy, the office responsible for the policy, the date it was implemented, the date it was last reviewed, sections pointing to the applicable regulations, the office responsible for the policy and so on. Many institutions leave the implementation, and subsequent compliance, to the procedures—which may be documented or word of mouth. This is where the best intentioned policy simply does not translate into compliance best practices. How to write a good policy requires it to be written considering your institution’s existing structure. For example, let’s assume your institution drafts a policy on Allowable Costs and requires all costs to be approved by the PI. If your procurement process does not have a step in the workflow process that requires the PI’s approval, then your institution has hamstrung itself from ever being compliant with this well intentioned policy.

Another example would be an institution that writes a Cost Transfer policy that requires the department administrator to provide sufficient back-up documentation to support why the costs are allowable and necessary for the award being charged—yet if this is an electronic request, does not provide the means for someone to attach this documentation to the request. The list could go on and on as to how well intentioned policies prove difficult to comply with because of system, process or human limitations—a Record Retention policy where there may not be a solution for departments to actually keep documentation (be it online storage or physical stor-

Continued on page 25

1Federal Register Vol. 70, No. 227, Monday, November 28, 2005, found online at http://oig.hhs.gov/fraud/docs/complianceguidance/PHS%20Research%20Awards%20Draf%20CFG.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Elements</th>
<th>Central Sponsored Programs Office Staff</th>
<th>Department Administrator</th>
<th>Principal Investigator (PI)</th>
<th>Research Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Implementing written policies and procedures</td>
<td>Formal policies and procedures should exist for all areas of compliance, dated, assigning roles and responsibilities, referencing applicable sponsored regulations, while accurately representing what the institution is capable of achieving today.</td>
<td>Needs to keep aware of new policies, consider the impact on day-to-day operations, and incorporate the new or revised policies into their desktop procedures to assure compliance—while also communicating to the research staff.</td>
<td>The PI as the technical and financial director of the sponsored award; is the champion of financial compliance at the project / lab level; without their buy-in, the institution will not fare well.</td>
<td>These are the people who initiate transactions and ultimately make the initial decisions about the reasonableness, allocability, allowability, and consistent treatment of costs; therefore need to understand how to incorporate policies into their day-to-day operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Designating a compliance officer and compliance committee</td>
<td>Many institutions have assigned compliance staff to central sponsored programs offices, while others have created dedicated groups in internal audit, stand-alone compliance offices, or in the VP for Research areas.</td>
<td>The department administrator is the compliance official for their designated area; as the responsible person closest to the financial transactions.</td>
<td>The PI is the leader who fosters and environment of compliance and tolerates nothing less than complete adherence to policies and procedures.</td>
<td>The responsibility here is to send information back up the chain of command about the efficacy of compliance initiatives and the practicality of their implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Conducting effective training and education</td>
<td>Develop meaningful training programs in a collaborative way to get the best compliance outcomes.</td>
<td>Participate in the development of training programs, attend training, implement to the department procedures, and train end users.</td>
<td>Conform to objectives of training initiatives by supporting institutional training goals.</td>
<td>Implement guidance into day to day operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Developing effective lines of communication</td>
<td>Provide websites with good content with easy to navigate layout, publish contact information for the office, and most importantly—answer your phone and emails within a reasonable time frame.</td>
<td>Listen, communicate, and collaborate.</td>
<td>Be engaged, accountable, and interested in resolving potential non-compliance issues.</td>
<td>Speak up when something is wrong or doesn’t feel right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Conducting internal monitoring and auditing</td>
<td>Frequently monitor award transactions (i.e. not just at close-out); and develop formal monitoring programs using audit techniques.</td>
<td>Review detail expenditure transaction reports on a regular (i.e. monthly) basis.</td>
<td>Meet with their department administrator at least on a quarterly basis to monitor award expenditures.</td>
<td>“Do it right the first time” by only engaging in compliant transactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Enforcing standards through well publicized disciplinary guidelines</td>
<td>The institution across the board needs to have a commitment to compliance and a code of conduct followed by all of its faculty, staff, and students engaged in research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Responding promptly to detected problems and undertaking corrective action</td>
<td>Be fair and consistent in identifying and mediating issues—regardless of faculty prestige, dollar value of the award, or history of good or bad interactions with the parties responsible for the potential non-compliance.</td>
<td>Follow-up, follow-up, follow… when overwhelmed with numerous responsibilities, the department administrator must be diligent in following up on detected problems and correcting those issues promptly.</td>
<td>Encourage research staff to openly report issues and cooperate with department or central administration when issues are communicated from the top down.</td>
<td>Tell people when something might have been done wrong and see through it to make sure it will be been fixed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Defining roles and responsibilities assigning oversight responsibility</td>
<td>Everyone involved in the financial administration of sponsored awards needs to be accountable for their role in each process and take personal ownership of their responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
age for paper transactions) an Effort Reporting policy that defines an appropriate certifier as someone with suitable means to ensure the work was performed, yet does not clarify the OMB Circular A-21 guidance of that requirement.

Just because your institution may not have considered the practicality of the policies or procedures does not make you exempt from being compliant with the fundamental requirements of those policies—it can be done. Borrowing a philosophy from the for-profit world, Hewlett-Packard operates under the motto of the HP Way, which is based on the belief that people want to do a good job and will do so if given the right environment and tools. Financial compliance can be achieved with the right tools, including guidance to implement compliance requirements into day-to-day operations.

On the left is a chart showing the fundamental elements of a compliance program along with suggestions as to how a central sponsored program office, department administrator, principal investigator and the research staff can comply regardless of any limitations your institution may have.

**Conclusion—Be Positive, Take Ownership, and Succeed!**

You are reading this article and belong to NCURA because you care about your role in research administration. Your commitment to staying informed is a critical requirement for the compliance success of your institution. No policy is perfect, no system is absent of flaws, all humans will make mistakes. Keep good intentions, stay positive and continue to take ownership of your role in financial compliance.

---

*Continued from page 23*
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**Ann Meehan Saputelli, CHFP, CPA, Director of Financial Compliance, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.** Ann has over 20 years of diversified research administration and healthcare financial management experience. Ann currently serves as the Director of Financial Compliance in the Office of Research Compliance and Integrity at the University of Pennsylvania, School of Medicine (SOM). Prior to joining the University in December 2001, Ann worked in the Health Care Consulting Practice of PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP for over four years.

One of Ann’s current responsibilities as Director is providing guidance to the SOM community on the application and interpretation of University Policy. Ann has extensive experience in clinical trials financial operations: budgeting, recording of revenue and expenditures, cash receipts and the development of research patient care rate agreements.

Ann obtained her Bachelor’s degree in Accounting from La Salle University and is also a Certified Healthcare Financial Professional (CHFP) and a member of both the American and Pennsylvania Institutes of Certified Public Accountants.

**Martin Smith** recently joined The George Washington University as the Associate Director for Strategy and Compliance, in the Office of Grant and Contract Accounting Services. Martin earned an M.B.A. in Finance from La Salle University, and a B.B.A. in Accounting from Temple University. Martin has 9 years of research administration experience working directly for higher education institutions in financial compliance, finance, and post-award roles; and as a consultant performing compliance risk assessments and effort reporting system implementations.

---


---

**Q.** If a train leaves Boston at 7:04 p.m. traveling west at 80 mph...and a second train departs Kansas City heading east at 4:07 a.m...at what time should you consider obtaining external expert advice for your research support needs? (50 points – answer below)

**A.** The time is now! Richards and Associates can make your research enterprise train stay on track and run with timely precision. Call us to collect your points!

Richards & Associates

John Richards, Principal

www.richardsandassociates.com
reach.us@richardsandassociates.com

909-214-1523
Is NCURA a Part of Your Training?

Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop

Make NCURA a part of your on-boarding program. Send your new staff members to our Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration workshop to learn the basics of research administration from seasoned research administrators.

Benefits:
- Learn the basics
- Interactive discussions
- Meet others in the field of research administration
- Apply knowledge to case studies

Learn more at:
www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/workshops/fundamentals/

“I try to get all new staff to Fundamentals within the first year. They come back with great enthusiasm about what they are doing and the new things they’ve learned. The experts in the field are the ones doing the teaching, and the quality of presenters is always strong. Fundamentals brings people out of their own cubicles and gives them an understanding of how different institutions address common problems.” - Kim Moreland, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Strategic Due Diligence: The Export Control Management and Compliance Program

By M. Robin Witherspoon

When I implemented our Export Control Management and Compliance Program at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, six years ago, we were among the few U.S. universities with an established Export Control compliance program in place. However, in the last five years, research universities have been especially impacted by an even closer scrutiny of research activities and increasingly aggressive enforcement of export controls by U.S. government agencies. Failure to comply with U.S. export controls can result in severe civil and criminal penalties (which can be assessed against both the institution and/or chargeable individuals). In addition to serious administrative, civil, and criminal consequences for violations of the export control laws, penalties may include the denial of research funding by federal agencies and negative publicity for the institution. Although many research institutions have now developed export control compliance programs, the challenge remains for other colleges and universities to establish strong programs that will not only guide and educate the institutions, but also manage export-related decisions and transactions to ensure compliance (May and MacNally, 2010).

What Are the Elements of a Good Export Control Compliance Program?

1. Senior Management Commitment: Securing the commitment of institutional leadership is critical by providing a cogent, high-level briefing on potential exposure and enforcement penalties. Focus on what export control issues and procedures are particularly relevant, the level of risk, how to manage compliance proactively, and internal resources (Commerce, 2010).

2. Centralize Export Control Compliance: Designate a centralized Export Control compliance officer tasked with the development of a compliance plan that ensures application of a uniform policy. It is important that this person have a good general knowledge of the three regulatory bodies of law: ITAR, EAR and OFAC and have experience communicating with all levels of faculty, staff, and government officials.

3. Export Control Risk Assessment: A high-level export risk assessment and resulting report enables the Export Control Officer to:
   - Methodically evaluate key points of exposure throughout the university,
   - Develop the level of procedural safeguards appropriate to the circumstances, and
   - Make recommendations for best practices to upper management.

4. Written Manual: A manual of policies and procedures with a sufficient level of operational detail to ensure effective implementation and day-to-day compliance.

5. Ongoing Campus-wide Compliance Training and Awareness:
   - Emphasize what faculty and staff can know without being export experts:
     - How to qualify for exclusions
     - When to get advice from the central office
     - The risks and penalties of non-compliance
   - Tailor presentations to departments.

6. A Dedicated Web Site: The site should include general export control information, a short summary of the regulations, controlled technologies and sanctioned countries. On our website, we’ve included a Decision Tree, special sections for faculty and staff; and online training will be offered this year.

The purpose of an Export Management Compliance Program is to ensure that the right export decisions are consistently being made, that employees know their export control responsibilities, that the right procedures are being followed, and that the right questions are being asked (May and MacNally, 2010). The existence of an effective internal compliance program not only is a factor in preventing export violations, but also enables university staff to identify potential problems and take the necessary remedial action. In addition, internal compliance programs may also serve as a great mitigating factor when violations do occur. In view of the potentially severe consequences of export non-compliance, it is critical that U.S. institutions of higher education that do not have an export control compliance program closely examine their possible vulnerabilities and consider implementing export control compliance policies and procedures.

References


Robin Witherspoon is the Export Control Officer and Facility Security Officer at The University of Tennessee at Knoxville. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in English and a Master’s degree in Education from the University of Tennessee. Ms. Witherspoon has been with the University for eleven years. Prior to joining UT, she served as a Paralegal in law firms in North Carolina and Tennessee. As Export Control Officer, Ms. Witherspoon implemented the first export control compliance program at UT, is the point of contact for all export control issues, and is a delegated empowered official.
Responsible Bioscience for a Safe and Secure Society: A Jordan Workshop Summary

By James Casey

Introduction
Some of the more esoteric yet important areas of research administration include international research collaboration and laboratory safety. As many of you are aware, NCURA has made a number of inroads into the international realm over the past number of years; in this same time period, NCURA Magazine itself has shown an increasing focus on international collaboration and exchange.

From an institutional standpoint, laboratory safety is a critical component of a successful university research enterprise. Although there are obvious individual interests in ensuring laboratory safety (faculty, staff, students, etc.), there are also strong institutional interests in ensuring that all laboratories on any campus are safe and meet the applicable regulatory and legal requirements.

These two topics were interwoven into a U.S. Department of State-funded workshop organized by the American Association for the Advancement of Science Center for Science, Technology and Security Policy (AAAS-CSTSP, http://cstsp.aaas.org) and the Jordan University of Science and Technology (JUST) in Irbid, Jordan, on October 3-6, 2010. This paper provides an overview of the workshop as well as the thoughts provided by the author during a session on collaboration he participated in.

An Overview of the Jordan Workshop
The goal of this meeting was:

To promote international scientific collaborations in the biological sciences—particularly in the field of infectious diseases—among leading scientific experts, influential administrators from educational and/or research institutions, and relevant regulators or policy-makers in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and North Africa regions (BMENA) and their U.S. counterparts.

Specific objectives of the meeting were:

1. To identify successes and barriers towards international scientific collaboration, particularly those beyond export control issues, in the areas of infectious disease and biomedical strategies to combat disease.

2. To determine the available pool of biological scientists at education and research institutions in the BMENA region for international collaboration.

3. To understand how international collaboration can benefit regional science, economies, and human resources in the biomedical sciences, health, safety, and security.

4. To facilitate a dialogue on norms that could demonstrate a shared sense of safe, secure, and ethical conduct among the scientific community, which in turn can facilitate collaboration.

5. To develop recommendations for international collaboration in the biological sciences.

The workshop had some very intriguing dimensions. For instance, on October 3, workshop attendees participated in several sessions on Communicating Science to Technical and Non-Technical Audiences. Some of the discussion focused on grant writing within research proposals. Later that day, attendees took a tour of the H.R.H. Princess Haya Biotechnology Center at JUST in Irbid, Jordan. There, attendees were able to tour labs and listen to scientists explaining their lab experiments and research agendas.

On October 4, there were a number of focused sessions, including: International Collaborations in the Biological Sciences, Region-specific Issues Affecting International Collaboration, and Public-Private or Private-Private Partnerships.

October 5 included a session on Exploring Good Laboratory Practices in Ethics, Safety, and Security, several breakout sessions focused on Human Resource Needs to Support International Scientific Collaboration and Putting Policy and Training into Practice, and a final moderated general discussion on major workshop themes.

Thoughts on Building Industry Collaborations in Academia
The author spoke at the Public-Private or Private-Private Partnerships session and conveyed the following points:

1. Institutions should create a “Culture of Collaboration” on campus, particularly between academic and administrative personnel. This culture should be based upon mutual trust and respect in each other’s roles on campus. This culture should be complementary to another culture on campus, that of a “Culture of Yes!” Find reasons to say “yes” to industry partnerships, not “no.”

2. Once a “Culture of Collaboration” has been established, follow through by establishing a “contracting pipeline,” whereby nondisclosure agreements, teaming agreements, and memoranda of understanding are used in a linear fashion to ultimately create sponsored research agreements and other funding agreements. As director of contracts and industrial agreements at The University of Texas at San Antonio, the author has put such a pipeline into practice, thereby moving the institution into position to achieve Tier 1 status in the future.

3. Legal considerations are important but should not lead faculty to think that there is a “Culture of No!” For some faculty, one bad experience is enough for them to be tempted to operate outside the system.

4. Educating faculty is important, particularly with reference to the grants world and specific types of contracts (particularly nondisclosure and teaming agreements). This information sharing should include both faculty responsibilities and rights. For example, with respect to nondisclosure agreements, faculty should know to keep detailed log books and notes when companies visit their labs.
5. View relationship building with industry as an asset that should be protected and developed.

6. Quick execution of contracts—being nimble and flexible—is a hallmark of strong University/Industry (U/I) collaboration.

7. BMENA (Middle East and North Africa) institutions should be proactive in training their faculty about the ways of dealing with industry (along the lines suggested earlier) and balancing individual scientific interests with institutional (university) interests.

8. Early, frequent, and honest communication between U/I partners is critical to success.

9. Research expectations must be clearly outlined and understood between the parties, elucidated in the Statement of Work (SOW).

10. Potential headaches (including but not limited to background intellectual property—BIP) need to be addressed up front.

11. Approach all collaboration as potentially long term.

**Conclusion**

The workshop was considered by the participants to have been a success, and enthusiasm has been maintained since the workshop. As this workshop was the first in a series of events going into 2011, additional activities have been and are being developed, including the recent establishment of an online discussion forum. This workshop was an effort of “soft power diplomacy” by the State Department to the Middle East and as such, it succeeded in bringing Americans and non-Americans together to discuss scientific and non-scientific issues relating to international collaboration, infectious diseases, and laboratory safety.

James Casey is Director, Office of Contracts and Industrial Agreements, at The University of Texas at San Antonio. A member of AAAS, he is senior editor of the NCURA Magazine and sits on the editorial board for the Wisconsin Lawyer magazine. All opinions and commentary in this article are solely those of the author and do not represent the position or thinking of the AAAS, nor of the recently concluded workshop.
It’s Not About Me:
Musings of a Grant Writer

By Virginia Burggraf

As a faculty member at a Predominantly Undergraduate Institution, the question often comes up among my colleagues: “Why write grants?” They are seldom necessary to achieve promotion and tenure (although they do help) and the few other extrinsic rewards that come with grant writing seldom serve as adequate motivation. At my home institution, Radford University, faculty teach a 4 x 4 load leaving precious little time to prepare fundable proposals. This teaching load is not uncommon among PUIs. Years ago, a teaching load of 4 x 4 was considered to be manageable. However, in recent years, many universities have expanded to 1 in at least 8 or 9 or more by now. The risk for a return on investment of time by faculty grows in tandem with these estimates. So, “Why write grants?”

My motivation to write grants in almost entirely internal and stems from some of my earliest recollections. I can still hear the raspy voice of Walter Winchell, the radio announcer in the 1940 and 50s. I had to be about 7 or 8 years old, and I recall that World War II was coming to an end and we continued to listen attentively each evening to the radio. This may sound like ancient history to many of you, but that was our only mode of communication about the events of the world. Of course we also had the newspapers, but as a “little one” I was often fearful of what I heard. We lived in New York City, so we were a potential site for the “enemy” and had black shades that were pulled when an air raid occurred. One particular night, Winchell announced that there had been an earthquake in Chile (sound familiar?) and thousands were killed. His voice was chilling and often registered fear and dismay. When he mentioned that the Red Cross was collecting clothes, I asked, “Daddy, is there anything we can do?” My Dad went to work, mimeographed signs for to place on our neighbor’s doors or in their door-slot mailboxes, and thus we began collecting clothes in our garage. The Red Cross came for weeks. That started me on a path as a grant writer.

Grant writing is just that: “how can we help?” It was not until 1990 when I was employed by the American Nurses Association with my MSN in gerontology that this helping concept came again into focus. We were in the midst of a measles epidemic in the U.S. and hundreds of children were dying. I wrote a cooperative agreement grant to partner with the Center for Disease Control where each State Nurses Association was to receive about $20,000 to mobilize nurses and create immunization clinics—and it has been non-stop since that time. After achieving my Doctorate in 1998, it was time to look for a return on investment of time by faculty grows in tandem with these estimates. So, “Why write grants?”

Grant writing is not easy—it’s tedious, at times seems fruitless, often fatiguing and, depressing (particularly when you are the only one who believes in the concept). That being said, it is also one of the most rewarding aspects of my nursing career. Of course there have been many other positives and rewards, particularly patient care. Grant writing, for me, is worth the weeks of diligence. It’s motivating and joy filled. It allows me to use my talents to the best advantage. I love selling others on a grant concept and seeing partnerships become a reality. I have often been accused of having “boundless” energy but that is only a perception. I just believe in what can be accomplished with a vision toward the future.

Requests for proposals come across my desk often. When I read them, I begin to vision, set goals, think of partners and the beat goes on and on, often leading to sleeplessness until I get it on paper—at least in draft form. A grant writer, I have learned over the years, must have that vision, set goals that are realistic, and often mobilize partners within the institution, and sometimes outside, to help with researching the topic. I am very possessive of my gerontology grants, and protective of my ideas. I do my own writing; however, if I am writing a public health grant or a psychiatric mental health grant I will mentor others and work with the experts.

Grant writing also gives me a means to express my creativity. Creativity not only in developing the original idea but also selling it to the reviewers, whether through coming up with a catchy phrase or acronym that captures the key innovative concepts or providing graphic illustrations or flow charts to provide a clear visual representation of the proposed project. This type of creativity has been my hallmark, but that does not equate to getting the grant. You win some and you lose some.

So grant writing isn’t about building my resume or vitae, but I am sure that it helps. Writing and possibly obtaining a grant means using funds that were once unattainable to do good things for others. Just think about what you can do in your own discipline, particularly with budget cuts that are hitting nearly all of higher education. Grants are my way to deal with hardships and challenges and I hope will soon become yours.

Dr. Ginger Burggraf is a Professor of Geriatric Nursing Radford University.
The fiscal year has drawn to a close along with my first year as the Grants Development Specialist at the University of South Alabama (USA). Part of our end of the year reporting requires me to document what I have been doing for the past 12 months. As someone who can’t always remember what errand I ran during lunch yesterday, this is a daunting task. As I go through my files searching for proposals edited, their funding status, faculty members consulted, and conferences attended, I realize two things: one, that my system for documenting activities is deplorable and keeping track of things in a frequently updated Excel file will be my fiscal new year’s resolution; and two, that I have learned a lot about the business of research administration. (For example, reading densely-worded proposals dries out contact lenses.)

With two years of part-time grant writing experience as a graduate assistant under my belt, becoming fully immersed in research administration felt like visiting a foreign country with only a general understanding of the language. Sure, I could confidently order an NSF grant with a side of Broader Impacts—hold the rambling—but I might get lost trying to catch the F&A to Budget Town. I had much to learn.

In March, I attended a conference in New Orleans where handouts included a binder that could stun a deer if properly aimed and copies of the OMB circulars. OMB circulars, my secret nemesis at the time, made me sweat with fright. Their content did not excite me like proposal editing, and the lack of desire to pour over them until their words were etched into my brain made me feel like a fraud. No hablo OMB, Señor.

By June, many more proposals had been reviewed, and CRA training for the research administrators at USA had commenced. Before I could whistle Dixie, I was on a plane to Chicago to attend a research development conference. I felt like I had landed in Provence. I was a foreigner in a sea of highly articulate natives. “Dear Lord, please don’t let me say anything stupid,” I prayed. (I still had not forgotten how challenging the New Orleans workshop had felt.)

The conference started with a bang, and, much to my surprise, I not only understood the language, but I had opinions, actual valid thoughts, on what was being said. Yes! I could relate when the discussion geared toward the vagueness of grant proposal language, and I agreed that people in my position should make considerable efforts to help get to know and support new faculty throughout the grant writing process. How exciting to feel like part of a culture!

The euphoria of the workshop remained as I returned home. I immediately procured my first organizational membership and joined the group’s listserv. Discussions about faculty incentive program ideas, skills development, research development trends, job opportunities, networking, and defining the field spilled over from the conference and into our respective inboxes. A major priority in research development, from my novice perspective, pertains to defining various administrative positions. What is the job title? What does that job entail? Is this consistent across institutions? How can we make it so? Would my job have a different name if I were at another university, and would my duties vary? Establishing a structure that is consistent is necessary to facilitate proceedings in research administration.

After Chicago, there were several webinars I attended, more than one pertaining to the British Petroleum (BP) crisis. Unpredictable tragedies such as BP remind us that the tighter the definition of our administrative roles, the better prepared we are to procure funds for our institution’s research. The most useful impact will be on facilitating multidisciplinary grant applications, the current trend in research (and I expect will be for a long time).

As I send my year-end report to my superiors, I realized that my road in research administration is going to be a long one as there is much to learn and even more to do. My resources for surviving the stretch have significantly increased in the past 12 months—now to organize the rucksack (possibly with an Excel file) of acquired information so it can be built upon in coming years. After all, it is my goal to be fluent in research administration’s lingo sooner than later…and that includes OMB.

Amy Brown is a grants development specialist at the University of South Alabama in Mobile, Alabama. Ms. Brown earned her Master’s in English, Creative Writing from USA in 2009 and plans to pursue a Ph.D. in technical writing in the near future.
The Catherine Core Minority Travel Award is available to minority applicants who, because of institutional financial constraints, could not otherwise attend NCURA’s Annual Meeting. Each award recipient receives up to $1500 toward travel-related expenses associated with attending the Annual Meeting. In addition to assisting in the financial aspects of attending the Annual Meeting, this award also offers a wide variety of services and opportunities for the awardees to interact with their peers and colleagues from other educational institutions around the country. The 2010 pool of applicants for this award was very impressive, and the NCURA Nominating and Leadership Development Committee [NLDC] eagerly anticipates the participation and leadership that our awardees will bring to future NCURA activities. Here’s what this year’s award recipients have to say about their experience:

Kevin Ferrell, Contract & Grant Administrator, Pre Award Services, University of New Mexico

“I would like to first thank the NCURA nomination committee [NLDC] for granting me the privilege of being one of the recipients of the 2010 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award. This award allowed me to attend the NCURA Annual Meeting for the first time in the three years I’ve been involved in Research Administration. Over the last year at the University of New Mexico, I have had the honor of working with a fantastic group of colleagues using IT solutions to help in simplifying, facilitating and expediting the proposal development process on our campus. My main goal in attending the annual meeting was to determine how we could now begin to measure our process and our customers’ satisfaction. Many of the workshops and sessions I attended involved this very topic. In addition, I was able to exchange ideas with fellow administrators from other institutions on improvement initiatives. The access one has at the annual meeting to talk with peers about the latest issues in our field is invaluable. I also gained a wealth of knowledge from many of the wonderful speakers that I will be able to share back in New Mexico as we continue to strive to do our part in increasing our research footprint around the world. Finally, I was so pleased to be able to meet the woman that this wonderful award is named after. Thank you very much for this opportunity and I look forward to being an active member of NCURA for many years to come.”

Ebenezer Idowu, Financial Specialist, Clinical Science Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison

“AM52 opened my eye to the richness, professionalism, resiliency, and potential of the profession. The workshop and sessions I attended were superb and very educational. I had several ‘aha’ moments as pieces came together to make sense of the entire research administration process. The opportunity to network with members from various parts of the nation was very valuable. The members’ passion about the profession is contagious. I was really swept off my feet by the spirit of camaraderie that was displayed. This was especially noted in the way other members are ready to accept new faces and help them in any way possible. The experienced and seasoned members were reaching out to the not so experienced ones. There seems to be mentors everywhere waiting to take you under their wings and teach you the way to go.”

Sandra Pena Logue, Grants Manager, University of Colorado Cancer Center

“My attendance at NCURA’s [Annual Meeting], while certainly an individual honor and privilege, will have a cascading impact on our department and those that would generate new ideas and concepts from which we can improve our work flow efficiency and customer service to PIs and others in our institution. My goal is to plan a retreat for our team within the next few months to address de-
partmental concerns and put some of the ideas I gained from NCURA into action. The presenters' slides will be helpful in discussing what has worked for others and what kinds of activities we feel could work for our team. Finally, I am eager to get more involved at the Regional level. I was inspired by all the amazing people in the NCURA leadership and feel that I have something to contribute. I am looking forward to assisting with the logistics of the upcoming Regional meeting here in Denver in April [2011]. Again, I would like to thank all who were involved on the Committee [NLDC] to select the awardees. I could not have asked for a better experience. A cherished memory I have was the opportunity to meet and have lunch with Catherine Core, for whom this travel award is named.

The application for the 2011 Catherine Core Minority Travel Award will soon be available, and we look forward to many outstanding applications in 2011!
As 2010 draws to a close and we look forward into 2011, the right place to start is to welcome our new officers and thank those who are moving on to new adventures in NCURA. We welcome: Treasurer Mary Holleran (West Virginia University), Chair-Elect Jared Littman (St. John’s University), Treasurer-Elect Erin Bailey (University at Buffalo - SUNY), and Regionally Elected Member of the National Board of Directors Toni Lawson (University of Maryland, College Park). We thank: Treasurer Holly Benze (The John’s Hopkins University), Former Regionally Elected Member of the National Board of Directors Brenda Kavanagh (University of Rochester), and Past Treasurer Jeanne Galvin-Clarke (University of Maryland, Baltimore). We would also like to thank Joe Sullivan (Carnegie Mellon) for his service as Chair during the first half of 2010. Special thanks to Past Chair and Chair Elect (Interim) Alex McKeeown (The Johns Hopkins University) who has been our go-to-leader for the past three years.

Activities we are looking forward to during the year will first be focused on the Spring Meeting in New York City, May 1 to 3: Setting Our Sights on the New World of Research Administration. Information on the workshops and sessions, the keynote speaker, the hotel and related activities, at the time of this writing, are still in development but were (as you read this) announced at National and details have gone out to Region II members. To summarize: Plan to come to NYC!

Region II will be giving two travel awards for the Spring Meeting. Recipients will receive $1,000 toward their travel expenses, will be introduced during the Business Meeting, and will be required to provide a report on their experience. Nominees must be research administrators from Region II, cannot have previously attended a Spring Meeting, and demonstrate their financial need for the award. An announcement will be made in early January with application details.

The Region II Distinguished Service Awards will be given to two individuals who have demonstrated their commitment to NCURA through service and leadership on the Regional or National levels. Again, an announcement will be made in January with details concerning submitting a nomination.

Martin Williams is Chair of Region II and serves as Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at William Paterson University.
Dear NCURA Region IV Friends:

I hope everyone has recovered from and learned a lot at the recent Annual Meeting. It is always wonderful to connect with old friends and make new ones!

Soon you will be hearing more about some of Region IV’s exciting new initiatives. At the Board meeting this last summer, I have asked volunteers to begin work on three new projects:

1. **Task Force on Website Improvement**: this task force will conduct an assessment of the functionality and navigation of the current Region IV website, make recommendations to the Board for both a new architecture for the Region IV website (new outline, navigation and list of where content should reside) and recommendations for a new design template.

2. **Task Force on Position Descriptions**: this task force will make recommendations for thorough position descriptions in preparation for a new website.

3. **Task Force on a new Region IV Mentoring Program**: this Task Force will be looking into the feasibility of creating a new Region IV mentoring program. This group will also make recommendations for a potential structure, funding mechanism, and application and review processes for a new mentoring program.

We are looking forward to making progress this year on these wonderful initiatives. We are certain they will bring welcome changes and opportunities for new members. Watch for upcoming details from the task force chairs and announcements via email and the Region IV Newsletter.

Christa Johnson is Chair of Region IV and serves as the Associate Dean for the Office of Research and Projects at the Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.

NCURA Fundamentals faculty. Jill’s many networking avenues with NCURA staff and with colleagues nationwide will be a valuable asset in her new role. Her term as Board Member begins January 1, 2011. The committee would like to send a special thanks to Region III’s Webmaster, Tricia Page (University of Tennessee Health Science Center) for quickly designing an awesome webpage with the candidates’ statements and biographical information.

Region III would like to congratulate travel award winners Amy Lutero (Virginia Commonwealth University) and Hana Boed (New College of Florida). Each received $1,000 applied toward their expenses associated with attending the 2010 Annual Meeting. We thank the Membership & Awards Committee for their work in coordinating the selection process. We hope Amy and Hana had a great professional development and networking experience. We are sure they will never forget the outstanding Region III spirit exhibited by our cheerleaders and flock of flamingo mascots at the tailgate party.

Speaking of Region III spirit, we hope you are enjoying your copy of *The Research Administrators Can Take the Heat* cookbook. We in the southeastern region have a penchant for great food, so it was no surprise that we won the cookbook contest, contributing almost a third of those wonderful recipes. Special thanks to all Region III members who helped make this fundraiser a success by sending in their recipes and by purchasing copies at the Annual Meeting. Every time you try out a new appetizer, entrée, side dish, or dessert, you will have the satisfaction of knowing that your contribution went to help Feeding America, a remarkable organization that provides hunger relief to over 37 million people each year.

Don’t forget to make plans to be in Isle of Palms, SC on May 1-4 2011 for the NCURA Region III Meeting. Never are we “One Beachin’ Region” any more truly than when we have our meeting at this site. The beautiful Isle of Palms was the site for the Region III meeting in 2008. You can flip through the photos at [http://www.flickr.com/photos/riddicksmiley/sets/72157605033073418/](http://www.flickr.com/photos/riddicksmiley/sets/72157605033073418/) to remind yourself of what a great meeting and networking event this was. There will be travel awards available for this meeting, so please consider applying. Please also encourage your colleagues to apply, especially new colleagues and others who may have never had the opportunity to attend. Let them know how much we welcome and value the contributions of all members, including the newest ones. See you soon!

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

**REGION IV Mid-America**

www.ncuraregioniv.com

Dear NCURA Region IV Friends:

I hope everyone has recovered from and learned a lot at the recent Annual Meeting. It is always wonderful to connect with old friends and make new ones!

Soon you will be hearing more about some of Region IV’s exciting new initiatives. At the Board meeting this last summer, I have asked volunteers to begin work on three new projects:

1. **Task Force on Website Improvement**: this task force will conduct an assessment of the functionality and navigation of the current Region IV website, make recommendations to the Board for both a new architecture for the Region IV website (new outline, navigation and list of where content should reside) and recommendations for a new design template.

2. **Task Force on Position Descriptions**: this task force will make recommendations for thorough position descriptions in preparation for a new website.

3. **Task Force on a new Region IV Mentoring Program**: this Task Force will be looking into the feasibility of creating a new Region IV mentoring program. This group will also make recommendations for a potential structure, funding mechanism, and application and review processes for a new mentoring program.

We are looking forward to making progress this year on these wonderful initiatives. We are certain they will bring welcome changes and opportunities for new members. Watch for upcoming details from the task force chairs and announcements via email and the Region IV Newsletter.

Christa Johnson is Chair of Region IV and serves as the Associate Dean for the Office of Research and Projects at the Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.

**REGION III Southeast**

www.ncuraregioniii.com

Please join the NCURA Region III Nominating and Elections Committee in welcoming Cindy Hope as Vice Chair/Chair Elect and Jill Tincher as the regionally elected Member of the National Board of Directors. Cindy is the Assistant Vice President for Research with the University of Alabama. Cindy has firsthand experience in conducting business for Region III as she has been the treasurer for the past two years. She also served as the co-chair of NCURA’s FRA XI which will be an asset as she designs the 2012 Region III meeting. Her term as Vice Chair/Chair Elect begins at the Spring Meeting. Jill is the Senior Director of Medical Research Administration and Sponsored Programs Education & Training with the University of Miami. She has volunteered in many capacities both regionally and nationally and is a member of the NCURA Fundamentals faculty. Jill’s many networking avenues with NCURA staff and with colleagues nationwide will be a valuable asset in her new role. Her term as Board Member begins January 1, 2011. The committee would like to send a special thanks to Region III’s Webmaster, Tricia Page (University of Tennessee Health Science Center) for quickly designing an awesome webpage with the candidates’ statements and biographical information.

Region III would like to congratulate travel award winners Amy Lutero (Virginia Commonwealth University) and Hana Boed (New College of Florida). Each received $1,000 applied toward their expenses associated with attending the 2010 Annual Meeting. We thank the Membership & Awards Committee for their work in coordinating the selection process. We hope Amy and Hana had a great professional development and networking experience. We are sure they will never forget the outstanding Region III spirit exhibited by our cheerleaders and flock of flamingo mascots at the tailgate party.

Speaking of Region III spirit, we hope you are enjoying your copy of *The Research Administrators Can Take the Heat* cookbook. We in the southeastern region have a penchant for great food, so it was no surprise that we won the cookbook contest, contributing almost a third of those wonderful recipes. Special thanks to all Region III members who helped make this fundraiser a success by sending in their recipes and by purchasing copies at the Annual Meeting. Every time you try out a new appetizer, entrée, side dish, or dessert, you will have the satisfaction of knowing that your contribution went to help Feeding America, a remarkable organization that provides hunger relief to over 37 million people each year.

Don’t forget to make plans to be in Isle of Palms, SC on May 1-4 2011 for the NCURA Region III Meeting. Never are we “One Beachin’ Region” any more truly than when we have our meeting at this site. The beautiful Isle of Palms was the site for the Region III meeting in 2008. You can flip through the photos at [http://www.flickr.com/photos/riddicksmiley/sets/72157605033073418/](http://www.flickr.com/photos/riddicksmiley/sets/72157605033073418/) to remind yourself of what a great meeting and networking event this was. There will be travel awards available for this meeting, so please consider applying. Please also encourage your colleagues to apply, especially new colleagues and others who may have never had the opportunity to attend. Let them know how much we welcome and value the contributions of all members, including the newest ones. See you soon!
Save the Date:

Region V has seven active committees and wishes to thank the chairs that will be working hard this next year in making our region the best:

1. Program Committee: Jeremy Forsberg, Chair
2. Membership/Hospitality Committee: Joanne Palmer, Chair
3. Nomination Committee: Katherine Kissman, Chair
4. Publications/Communications Committee, Thomas Spencer, Chair
5. Finance Committee: Reggie Crim, Chair
6. Awards Committee: Gail Davis, Chair
7. Volunteer Coordinator/Committee: Christian Pheiffer-Flores

Save the Date: The Region V Regional Meeting will be held this year in Houston, Texas at the Magnolia Hotel. The meeting will be from April 17-20, 2010. Jeremy Forsberg from the University of Texas at Arlington is chair-elect and will be the program chair for the meeting.

Marianne Woods is Chair of Region V and serves as the Senior Associate Vice President for Research Administration at the University of Texas at San Antonio.

Region V is happy to congratulate Jane Youngers, Assistant Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs at the University of Texas Health Science Center San Antonio for receiving the NCURA 2010 Distinguished Service Award. We would also like to congratulate Zoila Franco-Hinojosa from Texas A&M International University for receiving the Travel Award to the National Meeting. A special thanks to all of the Region V members who presented at the National NCURA Meeting in November.

The Region V Regional Meeting will be held this year in Houston, Texas at the Magnolia Hotel. The meeting will be from April 17-20, 2010. Jeremy Forsberg from the University of Texas at Arlington is chair-elect and will be the program chair for the meeting.

Last but not least, it has been my privilege to know you, work with each of you, and have your support in this great journey. Best wishes for a Happy and Healthy Holiday Season!!

Sinh Simmons is Chair of Region VI and serves as Associate Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Washington.

As I write this message it is hard to believe that I will be seeing you all in just a couple of weeks and by the time you are reading these words a month will have gone by since AM 52. The program “At the Confluence of Creation and Collaboration” was tremendous and I was so happy to be able to spend time with the members from Region VII who participated and joined in the wonderful learning experiences and free-time activities. I hope everyone enjoyed the Sessions, Workshops, Tail Gate Party and networking with colleagues. If you were not able to join us in DC I want you to know that we missed you.

I was especially pleased that this year we were able to award 3 travel awards for the national meeting to Dana Schwartz from Colorado State University, Alicia Mangosing, Arizona State University and Peggy Roberts, University of Montana. It was just terrific to see the turn out for our Region.

As you start filling up your calendar for the New Year, please remember to mark your calendar for the Spring Regional Meeting in Denver, Colorado April 3-6, 2011 at the Westin at Tabor Center in downtown Denver.

Best wishes to everyone for a Happy, Healthy, and Safe 2010 Holiday Season!!

Debra Murphy is Chair of Region VII and serves as the Director, Office of Research Integrity and Assurance at Arizona State University.
Regulation and Compliance: 2011
A Compendium of Regulations and Certifications Applicable to Sponsored Programs

One Well-Organized Guide to More Than 100 Sets of Federal Requirements

- OMB Circulars
- Export Controls
- Privacy
- Environmental Protection
- Human and Animal Subjects
- Safety and Security
- Employee Directives
- Fraud and Abuse
- Data and Dissemination
- And More!

Order Your Copies of Regulation and Compliance: 2011

YES! Please send me
Regulation and Compliance: 2011
for immediate delivery.

__ copies @ $____ per copy = $____
D.C. customers add 6% sales tax $____
Shipping & Handling $____
Total $____

Name:
Title:
Address (no PO boxes, please):
City/State/Zip:

Three Payment Options

☑ Payment enclosed
Make checks payable to NCURA. D.C. residents add 6% sales tax.
☑ Charge my credit card
Card #____
Exp. date____
Charges will appear as Atlantic Information Services, Inc.
☑ Purchase order enclosed
Signature:
Phone:
E-mail (optional):

NCURA Member Price Nonmember Price Shipping & Handling

Single Copy $92 $122 add $5
2-4 Copies (per copy) $78 $108 add $10 (total)
5-10 Copies (per copy) $67 $97 add $15 (total)

Order Multiple Copies for Your Campus
Take advantage of multiple-copy discounts to order copies for your business officers, researchers, department administrators, and pre-award and post-award officers. For more than 10 copies, please call 800-521-4323 for discount pricing.

Four Easy Ways to Order

Call 800-521-4323
Visit www.AISEducation.com
Fill out this order form and fax to:
202-331-9542
Complete this form and mail to:
National Council of University Research Administrators
P.O. Box 65765
Washington, DC 20035-5765

Order Today! Call 800-521-4323 • Visit www.AISEducation.com
Call for Research Management Review (RMR) Editor

Duties and responsibilities include the overall production of NCURA’s scholarly journal, including recruiting authors, recruiting the editorial board, assigning submitted papers to reviewers, overseeing editing and publication. The RMR provides a forum for the dissemination of knowledge about the political, economic, legal and social aspects of research administration.

Qualifications include:
1) Being aware of the issues of current importance to research policy and administration, and the key individuals having substantive knowledge related to those issues;
2) A record of success in scholarly publication, and appropriate academic credentials or equivalent experience;
3) Responsibility for denying publication of articles;
4) Ability to act decisively while maintaining sensitivity to feelings;
5) Being committed to professional objectivity;
6) One who is well organized, pays close attention to detail, and consistently meets deadlines

The RMR Editor shall be responsible for:
1) Quality, content, and timelines of the journal;
2) Selecting the RMR Editorial Board;
3) Identifying specific topics of interest to the membership and authors to write on these topics;
4) Identifying single topic issues and soliciting possible authors and contributors in consultation with the Editorial Board;
5) Consulting with the Professional Development Committee before implementing any significant departures from current practices.

The term of appointment is three years. A position description can be found at: 
http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/opportunities/rmr_editor.php

You can easily apply or nominate your colleagues online at:
http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/volunteer_app.php
Virtual Communities of Professional Interest

www.ncura.edu/members/neighborhoods

International Watch

The NCURA International Neighborhood has completed its initial updating of its Resources page to provide you with more tools and links to assist you in your international endeavors. Check it out at http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/international/international_resources.php Special thanks to Lealie Perry, formerly of Johns Hopkins University and now with USAID and Janet Simons, University of Maryland, Baltimore for their time and efforts in organizing this, and to Christina Boras and Paul Craven for their EU contributions.

We will continue to reach out to our constituents to provide new resources to share amongst the membership and beyond. NCURA has provided open access to the International Neighborhood so that our colleagues across the globe can access and also share their resources. Also, I would like to welcome two new members to the International Neighborhood Subcommittee: Susan Boone, Deputy Director, University Research Administration, University of Chicago, and Georgette Sakamoto, Administrative Officer, Office of Research Services, University of Hawaii.

The Neighborhood collaborated with the NCURA Ambassador Corps and hosted a podcast on What US Research Administrators Need to Know about Collaborating under Framework Programme 7. Our panel was: Norm Hebert, Director, International Research Administration, Brown University, and David Mayo, Director, Sponsored Research, California Institute of Technology. If you have not yet had the opportunity to hear this timely podcast please visit our website at http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/international/index.php.

The Neighborhood is committed to continue to offer training and professional development that can help you in your international research administration efforts. We will keep you posted as to what 2011 will bring!

Denise Wallen is the chair of the International Neighborhood Committee and serves as a Senior Fellow of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Center for Health Policy at the University of New Mexico/Research Asst. Professor, College of Education.

Pre-Award Watch

NIH Error Correction Window

NIH has decided to do away with the “error corrections window” when submitting an electronic grant application. As of January 25, 2011 you will no longer have that two day cushion, PAST the deadline to receive NIH-system identified errors/warnings.

Presently, AFTER you have submitted a grant application electronically through the Grants.gov system, you may receive notice that your application has an error that needs correcting, or it may have a warning...this process is called the “error correction window”. This error prevents the application from entering the Commons. If an error occurs, the application must first have been submitted on time...by 5:00 (local time) and all appropriate registrations must be in place. For warnings, you may choose to make the correction or not.

Now, this is the major change in the process...at this point, you currently have two business days in which to fix the error AFTER the submission deadline...as of January 25th, 2011, you will no longer have the additional two business days AFTER the submission deadline in which to make these corrections, if, you submit at the deadline time and date.

If you submit before the deadline, you will have as much time as you need up-to the deadline time and date that you submit to fix your errors. This process also applies to warnings. If you decide to make changes to the application as a result of a warning, you currently have the two business days after submission... after January 25, 2011, you will not be able to make changes after the application has been submitted.

Once you have an error-free application submitted through Grants.gov to eRA Commons, AFTER the deadline, a copy of your application will be available to view in the eRA system...this is called the “application viewing window”. At this point you will have two business days to view the assembled application just as a reviewer would see it. This viewing time is based on the time of submission which begins the day after the assembled application is posted in Commons. In this two day viewing time the Signing Official can Reject the application and stop it from moving forward in the process. If all looks good, the application automatically moves forward for further consideration and the submission process is complete.

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

eRA Watch

New Passwords Policy, New Forms & Submissions

Grants.gov passwords will now expire every 90 days. Those who forget can have it sent to them.

Grants.gov will also send email notifications at 15 days and then 5 days before passwords expire.

If the wrong password is used 3 times in a 5 minute period the account will lock for 15 minutes.

NOTE: When submitting to Funding Opportunities posted prior to October 11, 2010 with due dates after October 11, 2010...users may receive an “invalid user name and password” message and be asked to reset the password.
Moving to NIH news…The new forms package — ADOBE-FORMS-B1 is being added to ALL funding opportunity announcements. Applicants submitting for Ks - Fs - Ts and Ds are required to use ADOBE-FORMS-B1 for due dates January 25, 2011 and beyond. All other programs must use ADOBE-FORMS-B1 beginning May 8, 2011.

Another change is that NIH progress reports for multi-year funded awards (MYFs) can now be submitted electronically. Progress reports due on or after December 22, 2010 should use this method.

Two months before a progress report is due, PIs will be notified by NIH with a due date.

Administrators can track these in the NIH eRA Commons.

No-cost extensions do not constitute multi-year funding. Also, ARRA Supplements are NOT considered MYFs and do not require a separate progress report. They will be incorporated into the annual progress report of the parent grant.

Terri Hall is the chair of the eRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as eRA Program Director, Office of Research, University of Notre Dame

PUI Watch

What is the Difference Between Research Institutions (RI) and Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUI)?

From a research administration standpoint, the major difference is in the culture. Research and the acquisition of external funding is expected, if not required, at RIs and faculty have reduced course loads. There is time to gather preliminary data and write proposals and, once funded, PIs don’t have to beg for course releases. Conversely, many faculty at PUs have full teaching loads (four courses/semester), leaving little time for unfunded research or proposal-writing. Furthermore, department chairs often can’t grant course releases because of the difficulties involved in securing qualified part-time faculty to cover the PI’s courses. These are disincentives for faculty to seek external funding.

While PUI mission statements often mention the importance of external funding to the university, and T&P guidelines recognize it as scholarly activity, the reality is often the opposite. Enrollment keeps increasing, putting more pressure on chairs and faculty to cover classes, advise students, and serve on multiple committees. Once funded, PIs spend more time on administrative tasks than research or project implementation because the university’s systems are not designed to accommodate sponsored programs. Hiring, procurement, and verifying that expenses are correctly charged soon take over the PI’s life.

Despite these difficulties, many faculty choose to work at PUs where the emphasis is on teaching, not research. Researchers at PUs are teachers who conduct research, often integrating it into their courses and involving their students. Faculty researchers at PUs are passionate educators and researchers who must rely on their research administration teams for help in proposal preparation, financial award administration, and compliance with the institution’s and sponsor’s policies and regulations.

Carolyn Elliott-Farino is a member of the PUI Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Contracts & Grants Administration, Kennesaw State University.

FRA Watch

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) was signed on 9/26/2006. FFATA legislation is intended to collect information on Federal Financial Assistance awards to provide transparency to the general public in order to “empower every American with the ability to hold the government accountable for each spending decision,” with an end result of reducing wasteful spending by the government (or their PRIME recipients’ subcontractors).

The FFATA Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) has been established to collect data from PRIME funding awardees/contractors and on their respective subcontracts (www.fsrs.gov).

So who is collecting this information at your institution? Who is reporting this information on behalf of your institution? This requires a high level of coordination between the Pre Award and Post Award organizations of your institution. Also when do you collect the information; at the time of issuance of the Subaward or at the time of the first request for payment to the Subaward? This might impact which office (pre or post) completes the information request and subsequent report submission.

Since Phase 2 FFATA reporting began on 10/1/2010 are you prepared to meet this newest piece of the Federal compliance/reporting matrix? Phase 2 requires the submission of data on all subcontracts issued from a federally-awarded financial assistance agreement or contract greater than or equal to $550,000. But don’t think you are off the hook yet…starting 3/1/2011, Phase 3 reporting kicks into gear and the minimum threshold for reporting is on all subcontracts greater than or equal to $25,000.

More info can be found at:

The FFATA Subaward Reporting System (FSRS)


Click here for Public Law 110-252 FFATA Legislation (2008-Chapter 2)

USASpending.gov

Brian Sevier is a member of the FRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Assistant Director, Contracts & Grants @ IFAS, University of Florida
We see universities from the inside out.

See why Huron is the ideal partner to assist with managing the complexities of a university research enterprise

- Comprehensive plans for improving organizational and operations performance
- Helping institutions understand and respond to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)
- Interim management and staffing support
- Developing research education and training programs, including assistance with NSF’s RCR training requirements
- Huron’s ecrt® solution for web-based effort reporting

Knowledge Shared

Huron
CONSULTING GROUP

Shandy Husmann | 312-583-8757
shusmann@huronconsultinggroup.com

1-866-229-8700
www.huronconsultinggroup.com

© 2010 Huron Consulting Group Inc. All rights reserved.
ONLINE TUTORIALS
A Primer on Clinical Trials – 7 week program
A Primer on Subawards – 8 week program
A Primer on Federal Contracting – 7 week program
Visit the website for Enrollment Periods

WEBINAR
Best of Annual Meeting:
Why Fraud Happens and How You Can Protect Your Institution...............................December 16, 2010, 12:30-2:00 pm ET

PODCAST
Small Business Subcontracting Plans under Federal Contracts..............................................December, 2010

FUNDAMENTALS OF SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
December 13 – 15, 2010 ..................................................Orlando, FL
January 31 – February 2, 2011 ........................................San Francisco, CA
February 23-25, 2011 ....................................................New Orleans, LA

DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
December 13 – 15, 2010 ..................................................Orlando, FL
February 23-25, 2011 ....................................................New Orleans, LA

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
December 13 – 15, 2010 ..................................................Orlando, FL

SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION LEVEL II WORKSHOP
January 31 – February 2, 2011 ........................................San Francisco, CA

2010 NCURA TV WORKSHOP SERIES
Managing Financial Requirement of Awards ..................Available on DVD
Critical Issues for the Department Administrator...........Available on DVD
Non-Financial Research Compliance..........................Available on DVD
Negotiating Federal Contracts & Pass-Through Awards..Available on DVD

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION 12 CONFERENCE
Looking Forward Strategically: Balancing Collaboration, Problem-Solving and Accountability, Manchester Grand Hyatt
San Diego, CA .................................................................March 4 – 6, 2011

NCURA ANNUAL MEETING
53rd Annual Meeting, Washington Hilton
Washington, DC .............................................................November 6-9, 2011

THE NEXT ISSUE OF NCURA MAGAZINE IS:
JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2011

DEADLINES:
Submission of Articles to Contributing Editors: ..............December 10, 2010
Submission of Articles to Co-editors:..............................December 17, 2010
Submission of Advertisements:.....................................December 17, 2010

Additional information for authors can be found at http://www.ncura.edu/content/news/newsletter/index.php.

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