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ARRA funding from federal agencies has helped to put the research enterprise at our institutions on a fast track to regrowth and prosperity. There are signs that the economy is in the early stages of recovery in the United States and in other industrialized nations throughout the World.

In his interview, Richard N. Foster speaks to the challenge of interdisciplinary research across departments, universities and scientific disciplines and taking a non-traditional approach to collaborative research. Mr. Foster suggests that this nontraditional, “creative” approach could also apply to problem solving in research administration. Internationalization of scientific research has brought NCURA into a very strong position in the international arena. NCURA’s international presence is reflected in Anca Greana’s article: “The Eastern Challenge: A Brief Overview of Changes in the European Research Environment and its Impact on Research Administration.” Ana Rita Remigio’s in-depth look at technology transfer at a Portuguese university, “Technology Transfer at the University of Aveiro: Moving Towards Specialization & Internationalization,” further demonstrates the internationalization of research and research outcomes. The report on the EARMA-NCURA International Fellowship Program demonstrates the important progress that we have made with our partners in EARMA in successfully launching this fellowship program. My institution, Rush University Medical Center of Chicago, is looking forward to extending a warm Midwestern welcome to our EARMA-NCURA International Fellow, Margarida Trindade from the Institute of Molecular Medicine in Lisbon, Portugal.

Aside from the three international articles mentioned above we have many other articles which I hope you will find of interest including Dave Richardson playing Kevin Bacon’s starring role in “Six Degrees of NCURA.”

Hopefully you have dug out from both the severe winter weather and the depths of economic downturn and are well on your way to a Spring season of regrowth and prosperity.

Tom Wilson
Co-Editor
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The University of Aveiro – UA – was created in 1973, in the city of Aveiro, Portugal. On December 22, 2008, the University made the important decision to become a public Foundation, operating under private law, a process to be completed this year.

Since its beginning, UA has transformed itself into one of the most dynamic and innovative national universities. Student enrollment is approximately 14,700 and approximately 2,000 highly qualified teaching staff work on campus. The teaching staff utilize practical and experimental teaching methods. The University offers a variety of undergraduate degrees and over 100 graduate degree programs. Electronics and Telecommunications, Engineering, Mathematics, Health and Life Sciences, Environment and Planning, Economics and Management, Communications and Art, Education and Humanities, and Social Sciences are the key scientific and technological fields of the University.

UA is composed of seventeen academic departments, which work together in an inter-disciplinary manner, according to their academic and research affinities. Apart from University-level higher education, UA also offers Polytechnic-level higher education in its four Higher Schools distributed throughout the Aveiro District, in order to meet the regions’ needs of more practice-oriented curricula.

UA is, as well, a place for research where innovative products and solutions are developed, not only to contribute to the advance of science and technology, but also for the public good. The university has currently fourteen research units and four associated labs. The latter can be broadly defined as those laboratories systematically evaluated by the Portuguese government under previously defined national scientific and technological political programs and tools, and which integrate the coordinating legal structures of scientific and technological politics. Partnerships with companies and other national and international organizations are established, both for collaborative research and the provision of services.

The mission of the University is to create knowledge and extend its access to and for the community, through teaching, research and cooperation.

UATEC: MISSION, VISION, AND COLLABORATORS

The Technology Transfer Unit of the University of Aveiro (UATEC) helps meet the above mentioned purposes – the latter, in particular. Its mission is to support UA in its aim of being a national excellence center of knowledge creation and dissemination, through: (1) promotion of its technologies in the marketplace; (2) intellectual property management and prosecution; (3) identification of industry needs; (4) promotion of entrepreneurship; and (5) support of technology-based company creation. Through these means, UATEC will help foster the social-economic development of the region by making it competitive at the national and international levels.

As an institutional partner of the UTEN program (University Technology Enterprise Network) which is described below, UATEC’s vision is to increment technology licensing and spin-out creation in the global market, in order to increase knowledge valorization and provide value to Portuguese society.

UATEC, under the direct supervision of the University’s Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer, is composed of five people: one coordinator – Dr. José Paulo Rainho – and four project managers, who specialize in different areas (see photo on left).

[From left to right: Marlos Silva, PhD student; Ana Rita Remígio, PhD student; José Paulo Rainho, PhD; Lúcia Oliveira, MBA student; Ana Teresa Pinto, MBA]
UATEC: FUNCTIONAL AREAS

UATEC was created in 2006, having as its primary goal knowledge valorization.

As a result, it engages in value creation activities such as start-up and spin-off creation, business alliances, sponsored research contracts, collaboration contracts, IP protection and prosecution, licensing, and marketing, among others.

This technology transfer office covers four main interrelated functional areas – Intellectual Property Management, Licensing, Entrepreneurship, and Industry Liaison (see Figure 1, below).

FIGURE 1 – UATEC FUNCTIONAL AREAS

Intellectual Property Management

This area focuses on management and information dissemination activities for intangible assets, namely patents, trademarks, utility models, design, and copyright. These activities are for the national and international levels. IP prosecution and agreement celebration are tasks that are as well comprised in IP management.

Many success stories could be told in this specific functional area. I will, however, refer to two specific ones that led to licensing agreements, and subsequent product commercialization: Courseware SerE and Learning Portuguese is so easy!, both protected by copyright and with registered trademark.

Licensing

Licensing, which is the area I am specializing in, aims to bring into the marketplace technologies with IP and commercial value, via exclusive or non-exclusive licensing agreements. Broadly speaking, our strategy comprises technology scouting, evaluation, valuation, negotiation, and post-negotiation activities.

UATEC’s IP portfolio has technologies from almost every field of knowledge – from Civil Engineering to Educational Sciences. Actually, it reflects the variety of scientific and technological fields the university has to offer. Very recently, an undergraduate degree in medicine was approved by the Portuguese Government, and is available beginning in the 2011-2012 academic year. As a consequence, we foresee that more Health Science technologies will become integrated in our IP portfolio. These areas comprise a small portion of our IP portfolio at the present time.

Working with technologies from a wide variety of fields of knowledge constitutes a daily, but rewarding, challenge. Every day I learn new concepts, new methods, new scientific and technological tendencies, which keep me up to date as far as high tech knowledge is concerned. Since I have a background in Applied Linguistics, more precisely in Terminology – where we study and create databases with technical terms from different special subject fields – I have developed the ability to better and more easily decode the dense and opaque language that frequently constitutes the discourse produced by faculty and researchers. On the other hand, the awareness of the importance of communication – of knowing the target audience, their needs and level of understanding, and of, consequently, adapting our discourse and language register – facilitates contact with potential licensees.

I would now like to describe in more depth the two above mentioned inventions: the SerE Courseware – The Human Being and Natural Resources – and the multimedia project Learning Portuguese is so easy!

The first one was developed by a multidisciplinary team from the Department of Didactics and Education Technology at UA. Created in the context of Education for Sustainable Development, it responds to a need for quality computerised didactic resources for students between 8 and 12 years of age. It was in the scope of its valorization and knowledge transfer policy that UA, through UATEC, in partnership with a Portuguese company – Ludomedia, has turned SerE into educational software.

continued on next page ➤
The second invention, Learning Portuguese is so easy! – Portuguese as a foreign language, was, on the other hand, developed by a research team of the UA Educational Sciences Department, to respond to a need of educational resources and programs, in the context of language didactics. This CD-Rom is an innovative device in assisting Portuguese as a Foreign and Second Language teaching and learning process.

Likewise, in the scope of its valorization and knowledge transfer policy, UA, through UATEC, in partnership with the Portuguese company I-ZONE, which among its goals aims for the development and implementation of IT systems, e-learning and training, has turned this project into an interactive CD-Rom. The device is directed towards immigrant and emigrant students who live inside or outside the country and who need incentive and support in learning the Portuguese language. Both products are now available on the national market. An international market approach, particularly as far as the second product is concerned, is currently under analysis.

→ Entrepreneurship

This functional area fosters entrepreneurship through four groups of activity: business development, capital sourcing, mobility and training. The first one – business development – focuses on start-up and spin-off creation, business planning, and technology transfer promotion. As an example of activity of this functional area, one success story, among many others, can be named: Biodevices. This company is a spin-off from the University of Aveiro, which, through a successful valorization of R&D developed within the University and materialized by a technology transfer agreement, has developed an innovative product named VitalJacket – a wire-embebbed t-shirt, which helps athletes and people with heart conditions to monitor their heart beat in an easy and comfortable way.

Capital sourcing, on the other hand, focuses on networking with venture capital firms, business angels and grant programs. Carbono Eficiente is an excellent example of a company formed with the aid of capital sourcing. The company develops entire biogas production systems to large farms. The venture was created by a Masters student from our University. UATEC helped him set up a business plan and a persuasive proposal. Last year, through our networking, the company got its first major funding from a venture capital firm. Nowadays, Carbono Eficiente has a developed product already and got its second major funding source, through a Spanish company. Recently it also secured its second client.

Mobility concerns partnerships and student internships in existing companies, and, lastly, training comprises technology-based entrepreneurship courses and business plan competitions that take place at UA.

→ Industry Liaison

The industry liaison functional area aims to promote and maintain the university-company connection. Requests from companies, which intend to develop collaborative research with UA, are received on a regular basis. Some other companies, on the other hand, envision R&D services provided by the University. In that way, we celebrate and promote collaborative R&D and sponsored research contracts, in which the cooperation process between our researchers and the companies has our full support from the very beginning.

In the near future we have as the main goal a more proactive approach, in which a direct contact with specific companies is established and a challenge to work in collaboration with our faculty and researchers is proposed. For that purpose, and also in order to obtain more and even better collaborative projects, dissemination and awareness-raising events are planned and scheduled throughout the year.

This functional area has shown great outcomes, in particular as far as applications to financing sources are concerned, having, consequently, high funding rates. It is hoped that these successful applications will result in more funding to support R&D at UA and, obviously, new products and services with commercial viability. Nevertheless the outcomes are beneficial not only for the University, but also for the companies and the socioeconomic development of our country.
**UTEN: University Technology Enterprise Network**

UTEN Portugal is a network of technology transfer and commercialization offices supported by the Portuguese Science and Technology Foundation (FCT), a governmental entity aiming to support the Portuguese research and technology community, within its program of international partnerships, in collaboration with the Portuguese Institute of Industrial Property (IPI). In March 2007, FCT working with the IC² Institute and The University of Texas at Austin (CoLab), launched the UTEN program with the mission of fostering “entrepreneurial attitudes and international business competitiveness of Portuguese science and technology, facilitating access to market opportunities worldwide” (UTEN Portugal – 2008-2009 Annual Report, 2009:4).

UTEN activities focus on three main areas, aiming at building sustainable, value-added partnerships and networks in Portugal, between UTEN Portugal and UTEN Austin and its Texas network. MIT, Carnegie Mellon University, Harvard Medical School, Cambridge University and the Fraunhofer Institute, as well as other potential participants, are part of this growing network.

The above-mentioned areas of focus include:
- Specialized training and networking
- On-the-job practice
- Continuous support and assessment on technology transfer practices and results

For this article, the second area is most pertinent. Training Portuguese technology transfer managers and staff, through internships in diverse centers of expertise for “on-the-job” competence building, skills acquisition and enhanced network development, is among UTEN’s goals. UTEN provides both short- and long-term internships, aimed at technology transfer and commercialization expertise and know-how and building on entrepreneurial capacity within Portuguese universities. At the same time, assessment of Portuguese technologies with international market potential is envisioned, and market access is facilitated.

**Individual Specialized Internship in Technology Transfer**

The goals of my Individual Specialized Internship in Technology Transfer, which took place from mid-August to October 2009, consisted of skills and experience acquisition and improvement in licensing-related issues, in order to meet UATEC needs. The main goal was to provide UATEC with more effective and efficient services.

The main part of my internship took place at South Texas Technology Management, a regional technology transfer office supporting The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio (UTHSCSA), The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA), The University of Texas at Pan American (UTPA), and The University of Texas at Brownsville (UTB). During the 10-week internship, my mentor was Sean Thompson (MS, MBA, CLP), as I assumed the duties and responsibilities associated with being a STTM Licensing Associate. I also worked closely with Licensing Associates John Fritz (M.S, MBA) and Christine Burke (PHD).

This on-the-job training provided me with a deep dive into the world of technology transfer with all the challenges, expected and unexpected outcomes, and successes that are likely to occur in a U.S. university-based technology transfer office.

Systematization and documentation of licensing processes and frameworks at STTM, and acquisition of licensing skills and experience through real case management were among my internship goals. The medium and long-term objectives at my home institution are to effectively and efficiently enhance knowledge valorization and commercialization practices and procedures in licensing, and to further promote collaboration between STTM and UATEC.

**Conclusion and Future Directions**

The purpose of this article was to depict two main tendencies in technology transfer at the University of Aveiro: specialization and internationalization. The former comprises the four functional areas of UATEC: Intellectual Property Management, Licensing, Entrepreneurship and Industry Liaison, which were here described along with some success stories. The latter concerns the UTEN program. These two tendencies are, however, interrelated; and that connection is intimately related to the Individual Specialized Internship in Technology Transfer promoted by the UTEN program.

The value of the Individual Specialized Internship in Technology Transfer, comprising both training and internship components, is of undeniable importance. This distinguishing characteristic is of special relevance for interns with early-stage experience, who are acquiring and developing TT skills. The best way to learn is to learn with the best and most experienced people and institutions.

Moreover, the contact and interaction with different TTO officers and industry players allows for the creation of valuable networks and contacts, which will lead to future partnerships and collaborative projects.

My internship, in particular, focused on licensing processes and frameworks, with the aim to accelerate the movement of our technologies to the marketplace at a national and international levels. Skills regarding technology cases management, prior art search, technologies’ evaluation through IP and commercial value analysis, marketing, negotiation, among many others, were acquired and improved, and will definitely be applied in my everyday practice at UATEC.

We hope and expect to see a considerable growth in our licensing rates over the next year. That is the challenge for us in 2010.
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Question 1: One of the major points of emphasis within higher education over the past twenty years has been an increased focus on interdisciplinary research and education. What are your thoughts on interdisciplinarity and how effective interdisciplinary conversations can occur in academia?

Answer 1: The expertise at the department/field level is a time honored tradition. Partially because of this, interdisciplinary work across departments can be quite difficult. For example, how would a physics professor and a lawyer talk to one another? The physicist starts with data and builds his/her research while the lawyer starts with the conclusion and reasons backward. That gap is quite a big challenge. What is the other option? The lawyer becoming a physicist and that is not very common. Interdisciplinary information comes from the bisection of individuals. American universities have made some solid progress in the area of interdisciplinary work, but more needs to be done. As we discussed, interdisciplinary work is harder than it appears.

Question 2: Universities are well known for being collections of “silos,” generally grouped by discipline. What thoughts can you share with research administrators about getting faculty to think outside their silos?

Answer 2: This question is closely related to Question 1. Part of the “silos” issue is related to publishing in academic journals, which are often grouped, not surprisingly, by “silos.” Continuing down the traditional path – by silo and the associated academic journal – is easier than breaking into new areas of knowledge. In addition, there are often many faculty standards and rules, whether dictated by the institution or the discipline. The rule(s) can often hinder the development of new knowledge into the field. If you are a faculty member and starting something new that is “non-traditional,” you are going to take substantial risk, and there is punishment if you fail. Sometimes faculty enter into interdisciplinary work because they have a hard time meeting the existing standards of the discipline. Think about the example before (the lawyer and the physicist). That example requires thinking that utilizes both disciplines, simultaneously. Working with faculty to encourage interdisciplinary research, or working outside their silo, the research administrator must be sensitive to conflicts with existing disciplines. As I said earlier, interdisciplinary work is harder than it appears.

Question 3: The research administration field is well aware of the impact of bureaucratic/paperwork requirements on faculty research, teaching, and service. What thoughts can you provide on this area, given your experience in academia and the private sector?

Answer 3: Washington, D.C. is the prime generator of rules and requirements for faculty research. I would like to see the federal government eliminate 5%-10% of the most unnecessary research requirements. Most of the time the intentions of bureaucrats are well meaning, but they don’t address the difficult task of removing unnecessary rules. For every new rule established, an ineffective rule should be eliminated. A “Czar” should be established within the major funders of academic research in the U.S. Government to get rid of ineffective regulations.

Question 4: In other situations and contexts you have spoken about the difference between “creative” problem solving and “traditional” problem solving. What is this difference and how can it apply to research administrators who are responsible for facilitating yet managing faculty research efforts?

Answer 4: How would you recognize a “creative” solution as opposed to a “traditional” solution? Creative solutions are novel, efficient, effective, simple and elegant, and generative. “Generative” refers to solutions that lead to more solutions (the ones that were not planned for). Many Apple products, e.g. the iPhone, are examples of generative products. Once you have the basic product you can think of all kinds of new things to do with it. I think there are more than 100,000 apps now available for the iPhone.
Then there is the issue of discovering what problems we are going to choose to solve. The university administrator should strive to discover problems within its sphere of operation. Discovering problems is the first step towards crafting creative solutions. So, it is not only the solution, but the problem ascertainment that is critical in this analysis. This leads to another question: Who is the “problem presenter,” the person who presents the problem? This is a critical inquiry. At the end of the day, creative solutions are equally dependent upon discovered problems and problem presenters.

**Question 5:** Another trend in higher education that is receiving increasing emphasis is the internationalization of research and education. Given your years in higher education and the private sector, what thoughts can you share with NCURA?

**Answer 5**

I am a globalist. I believe it is necessary to develop knowledge on a global scale. In my position at Yale, I see the institution’s strong emphasis on internationalization. Internationalization can help the process of creative problem solving discussed earlier. Do you “zoom in” or “zoom out?” These are frames of reference. Moving from an American view to an international view is the process of zooming out. Bill Gates has the ability to “zoom in” and “zoom out,” often within the same discussion. That ability is critical for university faculty and administrators.

The more Americans can “zoom out,” the better off the country will be. And while I am focusing on Americans in this discussion, the reality is that all people across the planet should have this same skill. The ability to “zoom in” and “zoom out” is a universally needed skill.

**Question 6:** Any final thoughts you want to share?

**Answer 6**

It is hard to imagine a more important issue today than education. While I am a fan of teaching assistants, it is still important for a full professor to teach freshmen and sophomore undergraduates. While I am aware of the economics of higher education, it is important that full time, tenure-track faculty teach in the classroom on a consistent basis.
Diminishing Natural Resources: Recognizing Limitations, Responding to the Challenges

The planet’s expanding population and rising standards of living are placing unprecedented demand on finite natural resources. These resources, which include oil, water, and other natural commodities (aluminum, copper, nickel, iron, “rare earth” minerals – virtually every element of the periodic table), serve at the core of our emerging and legacy technologies and underpin modern economic development. At its October 2009 meeting, members of the National Academies Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR) took a hard look at the criticality of materials. The group examined the supply, demand, availability, and cost of natural resources. It considered the risk factors in the sourcing of material, the flow of natural material within the industrial system, and the geopolitics of strategic minerals. Finally, GUIRR members sought means for achieving critical materials sustainability, notably by way of greater cross-sector collaboration and investment in a broad range of technologies aimed at minimizing materials usage and developing materials alternatives. Recycling was also considered. The objective of the meeting was to identify areas where government, academia, and industry can work more closely to better understand limits on material availability, mitigate risk, enhance materials research, shape policy, and effectively communicate the criticality of our nation’s natural resources to the broader public.

The October 2009, meeting was notable as it represented the 25th anniversary of GUIRR. Established in 1984, GUIRR was created in response to the report of the National Commission on Research, which called for an institutionalized forum to facilitate dialogue among the top leaders of government and non-government research organizations. The Roundtable is sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine.

To view a written recap of the October 20-21, 2009 GUIRR meeting and access the various guest presentations, visit the GUIRR web site at www.nas.edu/guirr (see “Past Meetings” under QUICK LINKS, left column). All online presentations are posted with the speakers’ permission.

Susan Sauer Sloan is Director of the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable.
Some of you may have played or remember the once-popular collegiate game called, “Six Degrees of Kevin Bacon,” where the actor served as the theoretical center of the universe. The concept of the game was simple in that given the name of a fellow actor or actress, the player was challenged with linking them back to Kevin Bacon via their prior opportunity to have either co-starred in a movie with Kevin directly or indirectly. Given Mr. Bacon’s long and distinguished career combined with the leverage of six degrees of freedom, it is estimated that nearly ninety percent of all actors and actresses can be successfully linked back to him. Borrowing from the game’s principles, I’m confident that you could substitute NCURA for Kevin Bacon and manage to link all domestic-based sponsored research projects back to our organization.

Six Degrees of NCURA
by David W. Richardson

While the game demonstrates the mathematical reach of six degrees of freedom, it reminds me that given the size of our membership, we are never too far removed from any single sponsored research project regardless of where it resides on the globe. While this mathematical proximity of any one project to any one member has positively altered how we manage our interactions domestically, it has not significantly increased our efficiency in negotiating international agreements. The scientific community continues to demonstrate that it can operate in a globally collaborative manner as research administrators continue to struggle with widely varying differences in administrative policies and practices. It’s not uncommon for an internationally funded sponsored project to remain in negotiation for weeks or even months with the cost of negotiation sometimes threatening to exceed the monetary value of the award. If we are to sustain our increasingly growing global portfolios, we must work toward the normalization of policies and practices and find common global ground. Achieving commonalities among varying nationalistic policies is one of the next great challenges for our profession.

Fortunately for all of us, the foundation for creating global commonalities was created with the founding of NCURA’s Commission on International Research Administration nearly a decade ago. Over the last several years, the “Commission” has worked diligently to broaden opportunities to members outside of the United States and set the future standards for our organization to expand globally. Like all early pioneers, the members of the Commission ventured outside of their norms into unchartered territories to forge institutional partnerships and professional relationships around the globe. The efforts of the Commission led to the formation of NCURA’s International Neighborhood and the creation of the bilateral International Fellowships. Both of these outreach efforts have added considerable value to our organizational efforts to build relationships around the globe. With the Commission’s having achieved its original objectives, it is time to transition to our next international outreach phase; but before we do, I wish to recognize the members who have so graciously volunteered their time and energy to this pioneering effort:

- John Carfora, Loyola Marymount University
- James Casey, The University of Texas at San Antonio
- Paul Craven, St. George’s University of London
- Steve Jerrams, Dublin Institute of Technology
- Bob Killoren, Ohio State University
- David Mayo, California Institute of Technology
- Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico
- Ian McMahon, Australian National University
- Bob Killoren, Ohio State University
- Paul Craven, St. George’s University of London
- Steve Jerrams, Dublin Institute of Technology
- Bob Killoren, Ohio State University
- David Mayo, California Institute of Technology
- Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico
- Ian McMahon, Australian National University

The mission of the Ambassador Corps will be to increase our members’ knowledge of international research administration by facilitating cooperation and collaboration between the NCURA membership and research managers, organizations, and funding agencies around the world. The Ambassador Corps will be comprised of select NCURA members who demonstrate the capacity to engage and share best practices around the world with the goal of developing global commonalities in research administration. The Corps will oversee our organizational international initiatives as well as serve as a repository of individuals who can be called upon by our visiting international guests with the role of sharing and emulating best practices.

The greatest benefit that NCURA provides its members is the capacity to network, share, and synchronize operational best practices. Much of the domestic efficiencies gained in our field of research administration can be linked to the existence of a common sponsor. Unfortunately, no such force of cohesion exists globally. Absent this gravitation force, the responsibility falls back to the relationships that we create either as individuals or as an organization with our fellow research administrators around the world. For the sake of achieving global commonalities, I challenge every member of NCURA to utilize the power of six degrees of freedom to remain connected with the greater global community. The next time you spot Kevin Bacon in a movie – remember that you are never too far removed from any one sponsored project and that your actions as an individual research administrator can make a real difference in the world.
A few years after the 1989 fall of the communist regime in Romania, my home country, business, and non-governmental organizations started to use buzz words such as “assistance,” “non-reimbursable loans,” and “grants,” all similar to “free money.” These were very intriguing concepts for those times. Growing up in a centralized economy, I wondered why an agency would give money to someone else to execute a project instead of simply hiring its own people, and buying materials or equipment itself. Nevertheless, after doing some research, I realized how powerful this concept could be in the hands of Romanian investigators. A grant would give them the freedom to pursue their own research interests, and decrease their dependence on obsolete facilities, government purchasing priorities, or their superiors’ agendas. Virtually, they could become self-employed in a country where the healthcare system, education, and research were (and still are) substantially run by the government.

I was fascinated then by how grants not only can open new opportunities for people with entrepreneurial spirit, but also may change an obsolete economic system; of course, little did I know that someday I’d make a living off of grant administration. And that day came just a few years later when I started to work as a grant project manager at the Missouri School of Journalism, after I finished my graduate studies in business administration at the same university. The opportunity to start a collaboration between University of Missouri and Romanian health care partners came very soon when we decided to apply for a capacity building grant with a research component in a low-middle income country, sponsored by the international arm of NIH – Fogarty International Center. Of course, we thought Romania was a good option, so we started to explore potential partners. In 2006, I traveled back to set up some contacts and establish collaborations with investigators from a research hospital and several NGOs.

In the few years since I left Romania, the health care system and medical research hadn’t changed much; everything was still centralized. So, I had to establish contacts with representatives from the Ministry of Health in order to obtain letters of agreement for the proposed research activities at the state-owned hospital. But I was pleased to see the multitude of non-profit organizations financed entirely on “soft” money, or funneling European funds toward civic projects. I liked the enthusiasm of many specialists I met, eager to participate in our project, and even though research facilities and resources were not as widely available as in more developed countries, the investigators were all on the same tune. Science is the same everywhere, and knowledge is shared and accessed more easily than ever. However, I realized how difficult it would be to implement the mechanics of the project in a government-owned health care and research system, where employees are state employees paid through a complicated and rigid state payroll, with no mechanism for external funding through soft money. Keeping the grant accounting separate, not to mention things like sub-recipient monitoring, human subject assurances, HIPPA rules, etc., was an added challenge. Looking for a possible solution that would please both American and Romanian partners, we came up with the idea to run the project through a non-profit organization that already had under its belt several major projects in health care financed through European Union funds. However, this subcontracting organization needed cash advances to maintain a positive cash flow for a project that size, with all expenses accounted for according to the local accounting regulations. Most of their previous sponsored projects were actually interventions; sponsored research as we know it here, not so much. This was a novel concept for most people I talked to, so we expected a lot of preparation, instruction on federal policies and regulations, and know-how transfer before we could start the work. Obviously, people were further puzzled by the term “research administration,” although many were unknowingly performing this function, most of the time - the project leaders. Even in a centralized system, this role doesn’t go away; it’s just meshed with other functions. The end of the tale is that the proposal wasn’t funded, but the experience was...well...priceless.

I presented my story in Romania to give a glimpse of the many challenges posed by international collaborations in research administration, but also to illustrate the fast pace of changes in these countries. A similar research environment is present in other Eastern European countries and also in some western non-Commonwealth countries. The researchers are paid by the government and expected to produce research outcomes to advance professionally, such as papers, publications, presentations, or even innovations, based on the (sometimes limited) institutional resources. In exchange, with local variations, the institution receives money for research based on its scientific output and the country’s budget allocation considerations. The investigators are not expected to cover their salaries from external sources, but they are welcome if it happens; although this option is relatively cumbersome to integrate in the existent fiscal systems. As a result, many times they go in parallel, and external funds are administered through a separate non-governmental institution, or through other creative solutions.

However, the role of governments in directly funding research and development is declining dramatically internationally, being replaced by industry and other sources, a trend emerging in all countries that are members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Table 1 shows a breakdown of R&D source of funding for G-8 countries for the period 1980-2000:1
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ERC complements other funding activities in Europe such as those initiatives under a common roof playing a crucial role in reaching over 50 billion euro. FP7 brings together all research-related EU funding sources are the newly created organizations after the fall of communism and the eastward extension of the European Union, access to new funding resources and a plurality of research projects fueled the interest for a standardization of research administration practices across nations. The descendent trend in both state- and industry-funded research observed in Europe after 2001 have further increased competition and promoted the importance of research administration for both funders and investigators. I expect that globalization, and increasing research cooperation between both sides of the Atlantic, will raise new challenges for research administrators, and probably drive the quest for a global approach to research administration in the new millennium.

Anca Geana is a pre-award Grant Specialist at the University of Kansas Medical Center Research Institute, Inc.

### Table 1. Academic research and development expenditures, by country and source of funds: 1981, 1990, and 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Kingdom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Italian data are for 1999.

**Sources:** Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Science and Technology Statistics database, 2003, and National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics, National Patterns of R&D Resources (Arlington, VA, annual series).
Don’t e-mail me... I’m too busy!

As Department Research Administrators (DRAs), we have many different hats to wear. A colleague said to me recently, “Which hat looks good on me today?” It’s important for DRAs to keep the channels of communication open. What happens when you are trying to communicate with your sponsored programs office and your representative responds, “I am very busy reviewing proposals. Due to the high volume, this issue will not be completed for a week, at the very earliest. In the meantime, please withhold e-mails for routine issues until this time. Sorry to ask but your cooperation is appreciated”?

When things like that happen, we can’t do anything but laugh! What would happen if a faculty or staff member came to us and said, “I didn’t get my paycheck today,” or “I’m up for reappointment--would you help facilitate the process?” and we said, “Sorry, I’m really busy right now and will be for a week, so please don’t bother me.” We might not have to worry about which hat to wear that day, but what job we’ll be looking for the very next day!

Can we wait a week, or even a month, to receive timely service on routine issues?

What happens when you have reacted to a situation based on what you thought was good information—but later learn that the information is inaccurate? Get a second opinion. When dealing with sponsored projects, you may need to contact the agency to ensure that you are given proper guidance and learn the correct procedure. What’s next? You never want to be that person who always blames everything on someone else; but when bad information leads to unhappy PI’s or loss of funding, what do you do?

When something for which you are responsible is delayed because of untimely customer service in another area, you may want to attach a copy of the correspondence along with the document, explaining the situation in a “PC” sort of way:

“Due to a delay in processing the GL number by sponsored programs, I was unable to process the payroll distribution by the due date, which caused an error in distribution. (See attached e-mail documentation.)”

How do we address a situation in which a colleague isn’t providing good customer service without jeopardizing future interactions with that individual? What happens when we request information and receive direction that is later contradicted by another colleague or, even worse, an NIH grants specialist? Receiving inconsistent information can be very frustrating, and it’s imperative that DRAs be on the top of their game.

Ask questions if something doesn’t sound right. If something smells fishy to you, it will definitely smell worse to auditors. Whether the information is passed down by an agency representative or your central offices remember, you can only react based upon the information that you are given.

If a colleague consistently reacts to you in a negative manner, how does he/she represent the institution with external clients? The message that is being sent is that we are either incompetent or are somewhat difficult to deal with, which doesn’t reflect well to our peers. The best thing to do is notify a supervisor regarding these types of consistently negative interactions. In most cases, this is typically the most efficient way of dealing with bad customer service; after all, when situations are handled in a negative manner, the result isn’t good for anyone. By the same token, always make it a point to make sure everyone knows when someone has done a great job. Be sure to let your colleague know how much you appreciate their assistance.

While wearing the many hats of the DRA, we need to be proactive and plan ahead to meet deadlines if possible and maintain good working relationships with colleagues; then, in situations that arise where something must be processed at the last minute, work together for a positive resolution. When working with your central office of sponsored programs, remember that neither department can operate without the other, so let’s make a better effort to be a team and work together.
Much has happened over the past year at NCURA and internationally, and I will briefly review a few developments of interest to members.

First, NCURA’s planned “retirement” of the Commission on International Research Administration took place on December 31, 2009. The Commission, which I was privileged to Chair ever since former NCURA President Bob Killoren launched it in 2003, was created to establish and maintain meaningful international relations between NCURA and similar professional research organizations and societies abroad. As a direct result of the Commission’s work, in 2007 NCURA became a member organization of the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA), and in 2008 NCURA became a member organization of the International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS). Please visit both organizations via their respective websites at: http://www.earma.org/ and http://www.INORMS.org/.

Consonant with the above, NCURA is planning to establish an “Ambassador Corps” to continue developing contacts and collaborations with professional research organizations and societies around the world, and David Richardson outlines in broad detail the vision and direction of the new Corps in his article for this issue. The Ambassador Corps is a much welcome and exciting concept, and one that will attract the interest of NCURA members.

Second, following a very successful term as Chair of NCURA’s International Neighborhood, Jim Casey (University of Texas at San Antonio) handed the gavel over to our new Chair, Denise Wallen (University of New Mexico), on December 31, 2009. As readers may already know, Denise was also an original member of the International Commission, and brings an outstanding international portfolio to her new duties. If you are an international reader of the NCURA Magazine, or perhaps new to NCURA, please visit the International Neighborhood’s website at: http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/international/index.php. The site is truly an invaluable international resource.

Last but not least, next on the global horizon is the Third INORMS Congress, which convenes in Cape Town, South Africa, from April 11-15 (2010). The theme of the Congress – which officially meets biennially and this year is being co-hosted by the Southern African Research and Innovation Management Association (SARIMA) and the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) – is Managing Research for Impact: New Approaches to Research and Innovation Management. This is the first time the INORMS conference will be held in Africa, and David Richardson and I will make up the official NCURA delegation; indeed, we will attend along with similar professional delegations from the Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA), Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS), European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA), Southern African Research and Innovation Management Association (SARIMA), Swiss Association of Research Managers and Administrators (SARMA), Society of Research Administrators (SRA), West African Research and Innovative Management Association (WARIMA), Canadian Association of University Research Administrators (CAURA), and the Danish Association for Research Managers and Administrators (DARMA).

For those unfamiliar with the two African-based associations noted above, the objectives of the Southern African Research and Innovation Management Association (SARIMA) – founded in 2002 – are: (a) professional development and capacity building of those involved in managing research and innovation systems; (b) promotion of best practices in the management and administration of research and innovation to create value for education, public benefit, and economic development; (c) creation of awareness in academic and public forums of the value of a stronger research and innovation system and the contribution it can make to economic and social development; (d) advocacy of appropriate national and institutional policy in support of research and innovation and participation in the development and testing of policy; and (e) advancement of science, technology and innovation, including addressing the asymmetries in access to, and diffusion of, knowledge between “North and South.” Indeed, SARIMA has members across Southern Africa, and includes Botswana, the Kingdom of Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe.

The West African Research and Innovative Management Association (WARIMA), established in 2006, is the professional body for research managers in the West Africa region. As such WARIMA’s aim is to help universities make the best use of their research resources by promoting good practice in accessing external research funds, in contract negotiation, financial and other project management, and the development and management of intellectual property. WARIMA has members across Western Africa, and includes the Cameroon, Gambia, Ghana, Nigeria, and Sierra Leone. For an interesting perspective on research management at African universities – along with more information on the founding of SARIMA and WARIMA – see an article by John Kirkland, Julie Stackhouse, Liam Roberts, and Patrice Ajai-Ajagbe that appeared in the April–May (2009) edition of the NCURA Magazine.

That’s it for now, but I will be writing again soon with a report from the INORMS conference in South Africa.

John M. Carfora is Executive Director of the Office for Research and Sponsored Projects at Loyola Marymount University (Los Angeles), former Chair of NCURA’s Commission on International Research Administration, and a member of NCURA’s International Neighborhood.
By Julia Lane and Stefano Bertuzzi

As part of the innovation agenda, and to ensure that the increased research funds are spent well, the Obama Administration has also instructed agencies to work on constructing a set of systematic tools to track the long-term results of federally sponsored research, such as journal articles published and cited, patents obtained, medical advances achieved, or other measurable consequences (particularly in areas of national importance such as health or energy). Although the fruits of this effort will not be available for a number of years, the project is one of the most promising in the Administration’s efforts at turning the evaluation of scientific research into a “science of science.”

There is currently neither a data infrastructure that systematically couples science funding with outcomes nor any mechanism to engage the public with the scientific funding. However, there are substantial existing investments that could be leveraged to remedy the situation. Federal agencies already collect data on federal investments at the award, individual, and institutional level for the purposes of managing awards. Academic institutions collect data on all individuals working on projects in their financial and human resources systems. Academic researchers have collected large bodies of data on such scientific and innovation outcomes as citations, patents, business startups and IPOs. And there is a deep body of knowledge about creating measures of job creation and the associated earnings drawn from the experience of Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics program at the Census Bureau. Finally, there has been substantial investment in visualization and other tools that convey complex information about science to a lay audience. The existence of these separate investments motivates the Science and Technology in America’s Reinvestment − Measuring the Effect of Research on Innovation, Competitiveness and Science (STAR METRICS) approach to studying the impact of science funding and disseminating the information to the public.

The STAR METRICS program is anticipated to be a broad partnership of Federal Science and Technology funding agencies with a shared vision to develop data infrastructures and products to support evidence-based analyses of Science and Technology returns on investment, as well as to provide information for policy making. The goal of the STAR METRICS Program is to utilize existing administrative data from Federal agencies and their grantee institutions, and match them with existing research databases on economic, scientific and social outcomes.

STAR METRICS is being created in direct response to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP)’s request that Federal agencies develop outcome-oriented goals for their science and technology activities (OSTP). It is also in direct response to the reporting requirements of the ARRA, and aims to provide American taxpayers with precise information on the value of their investments.

The aim of STAR METRICS is twofold. The initial goal of STAR METRICS is to provide mechanisms that will allow participating universities and federal agencies to reliably and consistently account for the number of federally funded scientists and staff on research institution payrolls. In subsequent generations of the program, it is hoped that STAR METRICS will allow for measurement of science impact on economic outcomes (such as job creation) and knowledge generation (such as citations and patents), as well as on social and health outcomes.

People have asked important questions about the impact of federal investments in science, particularly with respect to job creation and economic growth. It is important to collect and analyze data so that such questions can be answered in a credible fashion.
The STAR METRICS Project is a working initiative of the Science of Science Policy Interagency Group and was developed from a very successful pilot project tested with the Federal Demonstration Partnership in 2009. The Office of Science and Technology Policy National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) Committee on Science established the Science of Science Policy Interagency Group to develop an evidence-based framework for making policy investments in research and development.

As part of the STAR METRICS Pilot Project initial proof of concept phase, six volunteer universities provided administrative data records to support a STAR METRICS Proof of Concept prototype, successfully showcased at the Washington DC FDP meeting in January, 2010. More information about the FDP participation is provided here: http://nrc59.nas.edu/star_info2.cfm.

Anonymized administrative records were received from the volunteer universities. These records were used to develop measurable outcomes such as jobs and FTEs funded by federal and stimulus science research grant programs. In addition, the data were matched at the PI level with external data bases such as the patents registry (Stockman, 2007) and information about citations and publications for the PIs were scraped from the web. (Penn State) As the pilot is developed, we expect further analyses to enable a longer term view of the economic impacts on business, jobs and science outcomes. The presentation summarizing the results is available here: http://thefdp.org/January_2010_Presentations.html.

For more information on joining STAR METRICS, email Julia Lane (jlane@nsf.gov); Stefano Bertuzzi (stefano.bertuzzi@nih.gov), or Diane Dieuliis (ddieuliis@ostp.eop.gov).

The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of John Voeller, Ph.D., ASME White House Fellow, Senior Vice President, Chief Knowledge Officer, Chief Technology Officer.
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Julia Lane is Program Director, Science of Science & Innovation Policy, NSF; Stefano Bertuzzi, Ph.D. serves in the Office of Science Policy, Office of the Director, NIH.
COMPLIANCE

Most colleges and universities have processes for protecting classified, export controlled, or industry proprietary information on their campuses, but there is yet another type of information requiring protection that may also be showing up on your campuses: Protected Critical Infrastructure Information (PCII). Information may only be designated PCII by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) PCII Program Office or PCII Program Manager Designees. PCII must be marked and carry a submission identification number; information that does not contain the requisite PCII markings and identification number is not PCII. Funding opportunity announcements may or may not refer to PCII, but, if determined to be applicable, it will be included in the award terms and conditions. The publication and access restrictions associated with PCII may or may not be acceptable to your institution; so read them carefully. Required computer-based PCII Authorized User Training must be completed by all government employees and contractors before accessing PCII. For more information about PCII, visit the DHS PCII Program website (http://www.dhs.gov/files/programs/editorial_0404.shtm).

Kelly Hochstetler is Chair of the Compliance Neighborhood Committee and serves as Senior Research Compliance Officer, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

DEPARTMENTAL

Conflict of Interest

As department administrators, we deal with all aspects of research. In recent years, one subject that has come under greater scrutiny in the academic medical center arena is the relationship between medical faculty researchers and industry sponsors. The U.S. Department of Justice has embarked on a number of investigations regarding the relationships of medical faculty researchers and industry sponsors, which have resulted in lawsuits costing the faculty and their universities large sums of money and, in some cases, have resulted in job loss.

By definition, a conflict of interest occurs when a person represents two distinct entities (persons). Faculty face this situation when they are approached by an industry sponsor and asked to be a consultant/speaker or when they are doing a specific research study for a sponsor. The potential conflict occurs because they are acting on behalf of the university and the sponsor.

For example, let’s say Dr. XYZ notifies you that he or she was asked by Company A to speak at their national meeting. Dr. XYZ is receiving an honorarium and his/her travel is being paid for by Company A. During the meeting Company A would like Dr. XYZ to look at a new product that they have developed.

So, what would you do? What seems like a harmless arrangement to Dr. XYZ, actually has many areas of concern. In this situation there are conflict of interest and intellectual property issues. Before Dr. XYZ leaves for the conference, you would want to ensure that he has a fully executed consulting agreement and has reported his outside activities to the university.

Explaining conflict of interest to a faculty member can sometimes be challenging. The simplest explanation is to ask the faculty if they are receiving anything (including, but not limited to honoraria, salary support, travel support) from the sponsor in return for their consulting/speaking/research. If the answer is yes, then there is a potential conflict of interest.

As department administrators, our job is to protect our faculty. The best bit of advice that you can give your faculty is to have them disclose everything. The only way the faculty member can be protected from a lawsuit is if he or she discloses all non-university financial relationships.

Mieko Dunn is a member of the Departmental Administration Neighborhood Committee and serves as Assistant Director of Research, Department of Orthopaedics, University of Florida.

The eRA Neighborhood is buzzing these days with news from Grants.gov, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health. Grants.gov has completed its upgrade to handle more proposal submissions and reports that it has received its 1,000,000th proposal. No, it was for the Feb 5 deadline...

More federal agencies, including the National Science Foundation, are returning to Grants.gov submissions; including the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health recently released Adobe B, the new restructured application forms and instructions. Among the changes are shorter page limits, and the NIH website has a nice table that lists them all.

One area of recent confusion is the difference between “Overall Impact” and “Significance” in NIH applications. The NIH admits some confusion over these two terms. In a nutshell, the NIH says the “Overall Impact” of the application is the compilation of the evaluation of the review criteria and the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved. Whereas, “Significance” is one of five review criteria concerning whether the project addresses an important problem or critical barrier to progress in the field. Much more information on the difference is explained at http://nexus.od.nih.gov/nexus/nexus.aspx?ID=379&Month=02&Year=2010
There are also some NIH application tips on a Human Subjects warning you’ll receive (NIH is aware of the bug) and another on filenames.

Finally, there are several professional development opportunities this spring from the NSF and NIH. Case Western Reserve University is hosting an NSF Regional Seminar and the cities of Philadelphia, PA and Portland, OR are hosting NIH Regional Seminars. Agency representatives will be attending all of them and will be prepared to answer all your questions.

Terri Hall is the Chair of the eRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Electronic Research Administration/Associate Director, Pre-Award Administration, University of Notre Dame.

INTERNATIONAL

The global nature of our business continues to expand, and with it come the accompanying complexities of international research administration. This contributes to an evolving environment that requires us to remain current and well informed. The International Neighborhood is committed to responding to these needs and invites you to visit our website. Of specific interest might be the Resources page which can be found there. This page has many links to international organizations engaged in research and/or research administration. We will continue to add resources throughout the year.

I look forward to “seeing” you at one of our forthcoming 2010 chats. If you have any specific ideas or requests, please feel free to contact me.

Denise Wallen is the Chair of the International Neighborhood Committee and serves as Research Faculty, College of Education; and Senior Fellow at the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Center for Health Policy, University of New Mexico.

PRE-AWARD

Last year’s “hot topic” was the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and its impact on universities. Though we must still continue our ARRA reporting efforts, we are faced with a new hot issue, “RCR”. Unfortunately, RCR doesn’t merely stand for Really Chummy Research! The new Responsible Conduct of Research policy is effective for all NSF proposals submitted as of January 4, 2010. Each institution must have a plan in place to provide appropriate training and oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research to undergraduates, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers who will be supported by NSF to conduct research.

Is your University ready? Just as you prepared for ARRA reporting requirements last year, your Pre-Award offices must collaborate closely with numerous offices on your campus including your Graduate School, Registrar, Information Technology, Labor Accounting, and Sponsored Accounting offices. We also encourage everyone to consult with other universities and share RCR information, policies, and websites. Please visit NCURA’s online Pre-Award Neighborhood for ideas and samples of the RCR initiatives some institutions have taken to assure compliance with these new provisions.

Denise Moody is a member of the Pre Award Neighborhood Committee and serves as the Assistant Director of Grants and Contracts in the Office of Research and Project Administration, Princeton University.

PUI

Practical Tips for Implementing RCR at PUIs

January 4, 2010, was the deadline for implementing the Responsible Conduct of Research plans on our campuses... and yet, the conversation continues about how to accomplish this.

During a recent NCURA webinar, two PUI-ers and several participants shared ideas and tips. Most of the questions focus on how to develop and implement the plan, what type of training to use and how to document the training.

In most cases, the research administrator had been preparing the campus by mentioning the RCR requirement well in advance of the deadline. Faculty were involved in the discussion leading to the development and adoption of the RCR plan, with the focus on the “responsible conduct of research,” rather than compliance. Campus-wide workshops and specific training with the IRB and IACUC as well as with academic departments, were also parts of the preparation. Faculty were also encouraged to include RCR as parts of research methods courses.

Each institution has gathered information about the various training modules and programs from organizations and listservs such as CUR, IRB discussion, RESADM, NCURA Compliance and PUI Neighborhoods, PRIM&R, and CLASP. Each one has advantages and disadvantages. Each institution will choose according to its own criteria, volume, and budget. PUIs with small volume, for example, may not need the record-keeping option.

It is essential, however, to specify who will be responsible for maintaining the documentation and what system will be used. The plan for RCR training should address humanists and scientists, with information tailored to the specific disciplines while including the basic RCR principles. It seems reasonable that training should begin and be certified as early as possible in the research experience.

Anne Pascucci is the Chair of the Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Office of Sponsored Programs and Grants Management, Radford University.
FIRST REPORTS FOUND TO BE ENCOURAGING

Those members who attended the NCURA 51st Annual Meeting had the opportunity to meet three colleagues who were in the U.S. having just completed their EARMA-NCURA International Fellowship. Patriq Fagerstedt of the Karolinska Institute in Stockholm, Sweden, spent two weeks at Stanford University. Under the guidance of Stanford’s Associate Vice President for Research, Anne Hannigan, and Katherine Ho, Associate Director, Office of Sponsored Research, Patriq was given the opportunity to meet with numerous university staff through a series of 22 meetings and interviews during which both parties were able to share information on their institution’s practices. Patriq also participated in three regular staff meetings on accounting, conflict of interest, and post-award issues, in addition to the monthly contracts and grants meeting where he gave a presentation on Swedish and European research funding. Patriq finished his U.S. stay by both attending and co-presenting a discussion group on foreign sub-recipient needs and expectations at the annual meeting.

Jarosław Olav Horbańczuk and Cyprian Tomasik of the Institute of Genetics and Animal Breeding of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw, Poland, were hosted by The Ohio State University and Associate Vice President for Research Advancement, Robert Killoren. As with Patriq, Jaroslav and Cyprian had over 20 meetings during their stay, including a conference call with NCURA members, and had the opportunity to make a presentation. As noted in Ohio State’s evaluation, “Both parties enjoyed multiple fruits from their interactions. Most important, groundwork was laid for future collaborations.” After leaving Ohio State, Cyprian and Jaroslav traveled to New York City where they spent a day at NYU meeting with NCURA member, Marti Dunne, Associate Vice Provost for Research Compliance and Administration. After NYU, they headed to Washington, D.C. for the Annual Meeting, where they joined Patriq on a panel and gave an overview of their EARMA-NCURA Fellowship experiences.

As noted in one host institution’s evaluation of the program, “By all measures this exchange program is a magnificent experience for both the visitor and the host.” The one major downside appears to have been a shortage of time in which to cover the superb programs that both institutions designed. However, all who have volunteered in this BETA phase understand that this is a learning experience from which both the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA) and NCURA hope to build a quality program of value to both organizations’ members.

As the BETA continues, additional EARMA members will travel to the United States this spring. Shelia Vidal of the Gulbenkian Institute in Oeiras, Portugal and Margarida Trindade of the Institute of Molecular Medicine in Lisbon, Portugal have applied for funding for their fellowships to the Portuguese-American Foundation for Development and each have received a grant. Both will be traveling to Chicago for their fellowships—Margarida to Rush University Medical Center and Shelia to the Illinois Institute of Technology. Other EARMA members will travel to Washington State University, Texas Tech, Lehigh University and Lafayette College. Evaluations from these fellows and host institutions will be reported in a future addition of this magazine.

Sanna-Maija Miettinen from the University of Helsinki in Helsinki, Finland, was hosted by the University of Washington. During her two-week stay, Sanna-Maija was able to meet and shadow members of the Office of Sponsored Programs. Under the guidance of Lynn Chronister, Assistant Vice Provost for Research and Director of Sponsored Programs, and Sinh Simmons, Associate Director of Sponsored Programs, Sanna-Maija was able to discuss various topics, including review of compliance, negotiation, budget monitoring, closeouts, and record retentions with staff in the office. She further provided information about both the EU Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) and her experiences with European Union funded research. Sanna-Maija was even able to immerse herself more fully in United States culture by spending Thanksgiving with Sinh Simmons and her family. In their evaluation, the University of Washington notes that they “had a positive experience hosting and working with the EARMA-NCURA Fellow and [they] would be happy to host another... Fellow in the future.”

Part II of the BETA is a call to NCURA members to apply to become a Fellow and travel to Europe in late spring/early summer. The call, including application materials and information on EARMA host institutions was sent to all NCURA members at the end of February. For more information, go to the NCURA Home Page at www.ncura.edu.
A Moderas managed installation of the Kuali Coeus gives your institution the opportunity to **ADOPT** a free open source software product written by researchers for researchers.

Moderas can **ENHANCE** your experience by facilitating a shorter learning curve, improving functionality, and customizing your installation to fit the unique needs of your institution.

We specialize in the implementation and maintenance of research administration software. Let us improve your department’s productivity with additional proprietary modules which **COMPLIMENT** the current software.

Why struggle implementing or maintaining a cumbersome solution? Don’t invest your valuable time becoming experts in technology or software; **ENGAGE** Moderas to assist you so you can keep focus on your areas of expertise.

**We want to hear your unique story.**

**Find MODERAS at the NCURA Region II Meeting this Spring: Princeton, NJ**

Contact MODERAS for More Information

**email:** info@moderas.org  
**web:** www.moderas.org  
**phone:** 518.698.2446
Region I began 2010 with the first Research Administration Discussion Group (RADG) held February 10. Despite the impending snowstorm that never actually materialized, we had a full house in the midst of the City of Boston Snow Emergency. The topic was “Current Challenges in Research Administration and Compliance in Universities and Medical Centers.” This informative presentation, which touched on trends, regulatory climate, and specific areas of compliance risk, was given by Huron Consultants Laura Yaeger, Rick Rohrbach, and Andy Horner. Thanks to Pat Fitzgerald for organizing this great meeting. Slides from the presentation are available on the Region I website. RADGs are not only an important part of Region I member’s professional development, but also a great chance to network, especially when attending the lunch immediately following the presentation.

I would like to take a moment to thank everyone who participated in the vote in December/January. The ballot which opened in December, proposed the addition of the position of Treasurer Elect, as well as to move procedural information from the Bylaws to the Administrative Policies. I am happy to report that the vote to accept the changes passed with flying colors. Of the 265 votes we had 260 “yeas” and only 5 “nays.”

This means that this year we will have the position of Treasurer Elect on the ballot, and Kevin Brodick from Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, will be our last two-year Treasurer. In his second year of his term, he will have a treasurer-elect to work with him and ease the transition. Please keep in mind nominating any of your colleagues, or consider self nominating for this position.

As you read this article, we will be accepting nominations for the Region I Recognition Awards. Please nominate your colleagues or consider a self nomination. Region I has so many talented and generous volunteers, it is only fair to recognize them for their contributions. The four recognition awards are: Distinguished Service Award, Merit Award, Outstanding Volunteer Award, and an Outstanding New Professional Award. Please visit the Region I website at www.ncuraregion1.org for more information on the awards, eligibility, and nominating/selection procedures.

Spring is just around the corner and the Region I Program Committee, led by Bethanne Giehl and her co-chairs Lee Picard and Tom Egan, have been hard at work. This year’s theme is, “Embracing Change.” The committee promises to offer some very innovative programming and events at this meeting, which will be held April 25-28 at the Sheraton Portsmouth Harborside Hotel and Conference Center. Check the Region I website regularly for preliminary program information. Please contact Kris Monahan, Chair of Volunteer and Membership Committee (VMC) if you are interested in volunteering for the spring meeting or in some other capacity.

This is good time to remind our members about our Region I mentor program. If you are a new member looking for a mentor or a seasoned member who is willing to volunteer some of your time to mentor a newer member, please contact Kris Monahan. The new mentors/mentees will be paired this spring.

The Region I Advisory Committee met for the first time in February, and we have a lot of great initiatives for 2010. These include ways to capture and utilize volunteers more effectively, continued enhancements of the Region I website, looking into CPE’s for workshops at our spring meeting, and the addition of two new travel awards, one for PRA (Pre-Award Research Administration) and one for FRA (Financial Research Administration). PRA, which will be held in Providence, Rhode Island this summer July 19-21, will be the first offering for this travel award. We will also offer an award for FRA XII in 2011, which is usually held in late February/early March. A call for nominations for PRA should go out in early May. Again, please consider nominating your colleagues/staff, or self nominate.

Susan Zipkin is Chair of Region I and serves as the Director of Research Finance, Radiology Research at Brigham and Women's Hospital.
needs. The meeting will start off with four workshops supporting our daily job activities: Reading and Understanding an RFP, Financial Operations of Service Centers, Sponsored Programs at a Predominantly Undergraduate Institution, and A-133 Audits with a Focus on ARRA Funding. We will then move into Monday and Tuesday with concurrent sessions in the areas of Pre-award, PUI, Post Award, Senior Leadership, Departmental Administrator, and even some general sessions thrown in at the request of our community. And yes, our friends from NIH and NSF will be providing us with a federal update. So hang onto your seats, this year’s regional program will be not only educational but fun filled as well.

If all goes well, the proposed changes to Region II’s by-laws and administrative procedures will have been sent out for your acceptance by the time you read this. We are upgrading the by-laws to remove procedural items and placing them in a new procedures document. This will allow us to make updates to procedures year to year easily and efficiently. Examples of these changes include adding a procedural schedule to organizing the regional meeting, adding template emails (travel awards, service awards, call for nominees, etc), and other items. All of this is being done to assist in-coming officers so they don’t have to recreate the wheel when they start their tenure. The procedures document will be a living document (especially in the first couple of years) that can be modified and updated whenever necessary, making each volunteer leader’s job a little bit easier, we hope.

Thank you for taking the time to read this article, and I can’t wait to see everyone in April.

Joseph Sullivan is Chair of Region II and serves as Manager of Preaward Systems and Administration in the Office of Sponsored Programs at Carnegie Mellon University.

REGION III
Southeast
www.ncuraregioniii.com

I’ve seen the lights of gay Broadway,
Old Market Street down by the Frisco Bay,
I’ve strolled the Prado,
I’ve gambled on the Bourse;
The seven wonders of the world I’ve seen,
And many are the places I have been.
Take my advice, folks, and see Beale Street first!

The NCURA Region III spring meeting will be held April 24-28, 2010, in Memphis, TN, the city famous for blues and barbeque. Program Chair and Region III Chair-Elect Jennifer Shambrook, St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, and her committee have put together a fabulous program that includes a selection of 50 different professional development offerings in 12 time slots over the course of five days. All workshops, sessions, and discussion groups will be led by research administration experts.

Arrive Friday evening to take advantage of a variety of weekend workshops, which include offerings on both Saturday and Sunday. We’ve been working hard to offer even more workshops to assist you in your professional development. Options include a full-day NIH Fundamentals Workshop on Saturday, a half-day NSF Fundamentals Workshop on Sunday, and 11 other topics ranging from stress management and subcontracting basics to research integrity. There will also be a review session for the CRA on Saturday.

After the workshops and your CRA study session, you can head out to Beale Street, step into the Memphis Rock N Soul Museum, or visit the National Civil Rights Museum.

Other highlights of the meeting include a keynote address from one of the world’s foremost authorities on the influenza virus, an opportunity to participate in Region III’s Haiti relief effort, and a blues banquet with entertainment provided by NCURA’s inimitable Soul Source and the No Cost Extensions. Rumor has it that the NCURA band may be retiring soon, so be sure to catch them on Tuesday night! The Region III business meeting, led by Region III Chair Jill Frazier-Tinch, University of Miami, will be on Wednesday morning.

In addition to the excellent programming and networking activities, members are sure to enjoy the first-rate accommodations at the historic Peabody Hotel, located in the heart of the Beale Street blues district. Unfortunately the deadline for the $3 per day rate, with just a small extra charge for a fire or a gas light, expired in 1869. However, the hotel is able to offer members a special rate of $185/night for those who book by April 3, and instead of the gas light, 2010 hotel guests get a 42” flat screen and high-speed wireless. Members can download hotel information from the Region III website, or call 1-800-PEABODY (1-800-732-2639). Be sure to say you are with the NCURA meeting to get the special rate.

Please note that there is no overflow hotel this year. Be sure to book your room soon to ensure that you’ll get to stay on site. You will have more opportunities to network with your colleagues, you will be able to take full advantage of all program offerings, and you will not have to spend money and precious minutes hopping in and out of cabs. Staying on site also enables you to enjoy the Region III hospitality suite, where Hospitality Committee chair Rodney Granec, The University of West Alabama, and his crew will provide the usual refreshments, games, and comfortable atmosphere. The hospitality suite is the perfect place to reacquaint with colleagues from other institutions, as well as to reach out to new members and make them feel welcome. Members who stay on site can also look forward to seeing one of our colleagues selected to be the Honorary Duckmaster for the world famous Peabody Ducks, which march to and from the Grand Lobby daily at 11 a.m. and 5 p.m. in a time-honored tradition dating back to 1933.

Financial support for our organization is another important reason to stay on site. Organizations like ours must enter into contracts with the hotels that host our professional meetings, and these contracts specify the number of rooms we will book during the conference. If our meeting does not meet our rooming night minimum, we are required to pay more, which in turn strains the resources of the organization. Limited resources are an issue most of us face right now, and we hope members who must implement cost-cutting measures will consider sharing a room onsite. Your support in helping Region III meet the rooming night minimum is greatly appreciated!

Speaking of travel budgets, now is the time to consider nominating a colleague for the $1,000 Region III Travel Award to support his or her participation in the upcoming meeting. Stephanie Smotherman, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, and her committee will be working overtime to select the recipient for this important award. This award is targeted toward newer members who otherwise might not have the opportunity to attend either the national or annual regional meeting.

continued on next page ➤
As always, serving as a volunteer at the regional meeting is a great way to meet your colleagues and get more involved in our organization. Please visit the Region III volunteer page to learn more about the kinds of opportunities that are available: http://www.ncuraregioniii.com/volunteers.htm. There are many roles that require only a small time commitment. Region III is proud of its great volunteer spirit, and everyone’s contributions are appreciated. There are still many opportunities to help out at the Memphis meeting. Anyone who wants to get involved and lend a hand is encouraged to contact Rick Smiley (East Carolina University) at SMILEYR@ecu.edu.

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

Hello Region IV Members,

The Region IV Spring Meeting is fast approaching. The theme for this year’s meeting is “Recovery through Discovery”; the meeting is in Omaha, Nebraska on April 25-28, 2010 at the Embassy Suites Hotel. www.embassysuites.com.

Registration is now OPEN!

The spring meeting program begins on Sunday with six fee-based workshops addressing a variety of topics of interest to research administrators, plus two free “Train the Trainer” workshops: a beginner session in the AM and an advanced session in the afternoon. Monday through Wednesday concurrent sessions are dedicated to a wide range of concurrent sessions, including special case study seminars, senior forum sessions, and faculty perspectives on a variety of administrative topics.

The keynote address will feature Thomas Gouttierre, Dean of International Studies and Programs and Director of the Center for Afghanistan Studies at the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO). For over 45 years, Dean Gouttierre has devoted his life and studies to Afghanistan – as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Kabul, as a Fulbright Fellow, and as Executive Director of the Fulbright Foundation in Afghanistan. He has made presentations on the war in Afghanistan, U.S.-Pakistan relations, international terrorism, and human rights in hearings before such bodies as the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on International Relations, and the U.N. Select Committee on Human Rights. Dean Gouttierre and his associates at UNO have obtained grants and contracts in excess of $80 million for the Center for Afghanistan Studies (CAS) to support technical assistance programs, training, and educational exchanges.

Don’t forget to register early to take advantage of “Early Bird” rates and to make sure you secure a room at the host hotel.

The Region IV Spring Meeting is fast approaching. The theme for this year’s meeting is “Recovery through Discovery”; the meeting is in Omaha, Nebraska on April 25-28, 2010 at the Embassy Suites Hotel. www.embassysuites.com.

Registration is now OPEN!

The spring meeting program begins on Sunday with six fee-based workshops addressing a variety of topics of interest to research administrators, plus two free “Train the Trainer” workshops: a beginner session in the AM and an advanced session in the afternoon. Monday through Wednesday concurrent sessions are dedicated to a wide range of concurrent sessions, including special case study seminars, senior forum sessions, and faculty perspectives on a variety of administrative topics.

The keynote address will feature Thomas Gouttierre, Dean of International Studies and Programs and Director of the Center for Afghanistan Studies at the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO). For over 45 years, Dean Gouttierre has devoted his life and studies to Afghanistan – as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Kabul, as a Fulbright Fellow, and as Executive Director of the Fulbright Foundation in Afghanistan. He has made presentations on the war in Afghanistan, U.S.-Pakistan relations, international terrorism, and human rights in hearings before such bodies as the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on International Relations, and the U.N. Select Committee on Human Rights. Dean Gouttierre and his associates at UNO have obtained grants and contracts in excess of $80 million for the Center for Afghanistan Studies (CAS) to support technical assistance programs, training, and educational exchanges.

Don’t forget to register early to take advantage of “Early Bird” rates and to make sure you secure a room at the host hotel.

The Nominations Committee and Awards Committee will soon be sending an e-mail blast for nominations. Please remember to nominate your deserving colleagues for open Board positions and awards.

The Board is in the process of revising the administrative policies and by-laws to coincide with the National’s policies. The revisions are basically removing administrative procedures out of the by-laws so that it’s easier to make needed changes with notification to the membership instead of a vote. Please be on the look-out for an e-mail requesting your vote to approve/deny these by-law changes.

Networking is one of the key benefits of being an NCURA member. Don’t forget to do it the easy way by volunteering, volunteering, volunteering. If you would like to find out additional information regarding volunteer opportunities, please contact Mindy Weaver at mindy.weaver@uc.edu.

See you in Omaha!

Jaynee Tolle is Chair of Region IV and serves as Senior Grant Administrator at the University of Cincinnati.

Sitting here on this cold dreary winter day, I can only daydream about the warm sunshine and beautiful beach of South Padre Island, Texas, the site of this year’s Region V Spring meeting to be held April 25-28 at the Sheraton Beach Hotel. Marianne Rinaldo Woods, Program Chair, and her Co-chair Reggie Crim, along with the program committee consisting of Melissa Howe, Patricia Allen, Angela Fazarro, Brenda Lujan, Mario Medina, Linda Golden, Mark Davis, Erin Sherman and Marti Trevino, are busy planning a great meeting. This year’s theme is, “Riding the Wave: Research Administration and Economic Recovery,” and the keynote speaker is Dr. Keith McDowell, Vice Chancellor, UT System Research and Technology Transfer. In addition to the regular sessions there are three morning and three afternoon workshops on Sunday. Fun activities and a chance to further network with your colleagues will be offered at the Sunday evening reception and there will be a Luau on the Beach on Monday evening. For more information on the spring meeting, visit the region V website at http://www.ncuraregionv.com/. Hotel registration is now available and the room rates are $129 per night. Every room has a private balcony and a view of the Gulf of Mexico. The cut-off date is March 25, 2010. The meeting registration is also available at our website. This meeting is not limited to just NCURA Region V members or even to NCURA members. It is open to all so please inform your co-workers and colleagues from other schools and your sister institutions about this great opportunity to receive education and training, keep current with what is going on in research administration, and network. It also assists in growing the membership of Region V.
Speaking of growing the membership, I am pleased to report that our current membership for Region V is 571 members an increase of 14% over last year’s total of 500. This represents the largest growth of any of the Regions. It also shows that we are working to meet the goals of our strategic plan.

Another one of our strategic goals was to increase volunteerism. Reggie Crim, our Volunteer Coordinator, has put out a call for volunteers to moderate sessions for the spring meeting. The volunteer form can be found on the regional website. Also look for more opportunities to volunteer at the spring meeting coming soon.

Other activities in the Region include the election of new officers. Hollie Schreiber, Chair of the Nomination Committee, along with members Gary Carter and Trisha Allen, have put out a call for nominations. We will be electing a new Chair Elect, Treasurer, and two Ad hoc Regional Committee members. Be sure to cast your vote in this important election.

Kay Ellis, our immediate Past Chair and Chair of the Awards Committee, has put out a call for nominations for The Quinten S. Mathews Travel Scholarship Awards and the Distinguished Service Award. There are two awards in the amount of $750 each to be awarded; to be eligible, the individual should be new to research administration and have been in the position less than three years with preference given to an individual who has never attended a regional or national meeting. The committee is also accepting nominations for the Distinguished Service Award. This award will be presented at the Monday evening Luau at the Spring meeting. Eligibility information and nomination forms can be found at the Region V website under the Administration tab. Deadline for both awards is February 26, 2010. The committee will be reviewing the applications and informing the recipients in plenty of time for them to meet the hotel registration deadlines.

I look forward to seeing you all on South Padre Island.

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

REGION VI
Western
www.ogrds.wsu.edu/r6ncura

Spring greetings from Region VI! Writing this article is one of my enjoyable duties as the Chair of Region VI, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank our Immediate Past Chair, Julie Guggino, Central Washington University, for her dedication and leadership in 2009. Thanks, also, to our Immediate Past Treasurer, Sue Abeles, and our Immediate Past Secretary, Anne Hannigan, for their hard work in supporting the Officers and the members of Region VI. I’d also like to thank all of Region VI’s many volunteers, including our officers and standing committee members, who work tirelessly to provide excellent educational information, promote networking, and make other contributions to the Region membership needs.

Spring is just around the corner! The Track Leaders and Program Committee are working very hard to put together an excellent program for the Region VI and VII Spring meeting in Newport Beach, California, April 18-21, 2010. The Spring Meeting Registration Form is now available on the Region VI website: http://www.ogrds.wsu.edu/r6ncura/meetings.aspx. Please visit our Region website to view the most up-to-date information about our Spring Meeting and to check out the volunteer opportunities for Region VI. These volunteer opportunities don’t often require a lot of time commitment and they are a wonderful way to get involved and to get to know your colleagues. Volunteers are always needed and appreciated. Also, please don’t forget to register for the hotel and conference early to take advantage of the Early Bird registration fee.

The new year brings new members to serve on our many committees. Along with myself as your new chair, your new officers are: Csilla Csaplar, Stanford University, Treasurer, and Maggie Griscavage, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Secretary. We would like to welcome the following new committee members who began serving effective January 2010. Charles Greer, University of California, Riverside, is a new member on the Regional Advisory Committee. Ted Mordhorst, University of Washington, will serve as Chair of the Nominating Committee. Virginia Anders, University of California, Los Angeles, is a new member of the Nominating Committee. The Awards Committee has two new members: Maren Boyack, University of Alaska Fairbanks, and Casi Heinztman, University of Washington. The Education and Professional Development Committee also welcomes its new member, Helen Powell, University of Washington. At the NCURA national level, Dan Nordquist, Washington State University, is now vice chair of the NCURA Professional Development Committee.

The Awards Committee has selected two regional members to receive a Travel Award to attend the Financial Research Administration (FRA) Conference in March, 2010. The winners are Becky Martinez, University of California – Merced, and Kirsten Torguson, Beckman Research Institute of the City of Hope. The Committee also selected four applicants as winners of Travel Awards for the Region VI and VII Spring Meeting. These winners are: Ella Taylor, Western Oregon University; George Hopwood, University of California - Santa Barbara; Stephanie May, University of California - Santa Barbara; and Andrew Nunn-Miller, San Diego State University Research Foundation. Congratulations to you all!

The Education and Professional Development Committee (EPDC) is working very hard to put together a number of workshops around the Region. More information about these Professional Development workshops will be posted on the Region VI website as they become available. The Mentors and Mentees of the EPDC LEADME programs are working to achieve their first goal of the program, which is a poster session and presentation of their works at the 2010 Spring Meeting. More information about the LEADME Program can be viewed via Region VI website.

Lastly, a brief membership update: Region VI now has 1,005 members which represents about 14% of the national organization membership. Let’s keep growing!! Please encourage your colleagues to join and attend the upcoming Spring Meeting. Please feel free to contact me with questions and suggestions for improving our Region membership experience. I will be working very hard to uphold the high professional goals for our Region, and I look forward to hearing from you, and seeing you at the 2010 Spring Meeting in Newport Beach, California!!

Sinh Simmons is the Chair of Region VI and serves as the Associate Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Washington.
Nonviolent Communication (NVC) is a way of communicating that can help deepen and improve relationships on a personal and a professional level. NVC is a powerful tool for developing the trust and respect that are essential for effective leadership. Clinical psychologist Marshall B. Rosenberg developed the NVC process in the 1960s, in response to his observation that humans are naturally compassionate and his lifelong contemplation of two related questions: What happens to make a person turn away from his compassionate self and become violent? Why do some people remain compassionate even under very difficult circumstances?

In chapter one of his book, *Nonviolent Communication: A Language of Life*, (2003) Rosenberg explains what he means by nonviolence and outlines the elements of NVC. He says that he uses the term nonviolence as Gandhi used it – “our natural state of compassion when violence has subsided from the heart.” Rosenberg was struck by the role that language plays in one’s ability to remain compassionate. We don’t think of language as being violent, but our words often hurt and bring pain to others. If we both speak and listen by giving from the heart, we enable our natural state of compassion – when violence is absent from our hearts – to take root, and we are more likely to get the results we are seeking. What does it mean to give from the heart? According to Rosenberg, “When we give from the heart, we do so out of a joy that springs forth whenever we willingly enrich another person’s life. This kind of giving benefits both the giver and the receiver.”

At the LDI closing retreat in Washington in October, the 2009 class explored the concepts of Nonviolent Communication and how NVC can be used in the context of research administration. We learned that there are six principles that frame the NVC process: (1) all human beings have the same universal needs; (2) all behavior is an attempt to meet these needs; (3) our feelings are messengers of met and unmet needs; (4) disconnections between people are tragic expressions of unmet needs; (5) we are each responsible for meeting our own needs; and (6) by focusing on our needs and differentiating these from the strategies used to meet our needs, we can better prevent, reduce, and resolve conflicts. The NVC process can be summed up using the acronym OFNR – Observation, Feeling, Needs, and Request.

Step one, **Observation**, refers to making a non-judgmental observation about concrete actions that are affecting our well-being. Consider the following hypothetical situation: Professor Plum is submitting a proposal in response to a federal RFP that lists a number of contract clauses to be incorporated into a contract, if awarded. The Research Administrator has reviewed the proposed clauses and realizes that some are unacceptable; she will need her legal office to help her prepare a list of contract exceptions for the proposal, due in two days. She has left three voicemails and sent two emails in the past week without any response. Remembering her NVC training, the Research Administrator modifies her approach. Her next message begins, “I have called you three times and sent you two emails about these contract clauses and you haven’t contacted me.” There is no evaluation of the legal office’s behavior, no judgment being rendered.

The second step in the process refers to how we are **Feeling** in relation to what we are observing, and that usually involves emotions: I feel happy/ sad/ relieved/ angry/ optimistic/ nervous. Feelings differ from thoughts in that the latter express what we are thinking and are often introduced by “I feel like” or “I feel that.” If the Research Administrator were to say, “I feel like you are ignoring my requests,” she would be making a statement about how she thinks her legal contact is behaving. NVC practitioners stress that if we keep our emotions bottled up inside, we lose our ability to connect with ourselves and others. Consequently, the ability to express our feelings to others is an important facet of conflict resolution. In the above scenario, the Research Administrator would express her feelings by adding, “I feel nervous when I don’t receive any response from you for a week.”

Step three is the **Needs**, values, and desires that create our feelings; everyone has needs, and whether or not our needs are met determines how we feel. We often mistakenly believe that the actions and words of others cause us to feel the way we do, good or bad; but NVC teaches us to take responsibility for our feelings and to be aware of our needs. If we ignore our needs, they go unmet and we become uncomfortable, and then we start to lose our connection with ourselves and others. When our needs are met, we are in a better position to connect with others and give from the heart. Thus, it is important that we express our needs when we communicate with others; too often, we ignore our own needs. In our hypothetical situation, the Research Administrator would say, “I need your help in preparing the contract exceptions because they must accompany Professor Plum’s proposal that is due in two days.”
The fourth step in the NVC process is Request. Making specific requests is how we meet our needs. If the Research Administrator says, "Please contact me as soon as you can," she may not get a response until next week and that will be too late; but the legal office may not know that. She needs to let them know that this proposal is due in two days and that she needs help now. Otherwise, the list of exceptions will have to be sent without legal guidance, the Research Administrator will be dissatisfied, and there will continue to be conflict in this relationship. A request that conveys what she wants from the legal office would be, "Please call me this morning so that we can set up a time to meet later today or tomorrow to prepare the contract exceptions."

Having NVC skills and using them on a daily basis can be an asset for Research Administrators because we spend most of our work day interacting with others, and these interactions require productive communication. As Research Administrators, we work with internal customers – faculty, department administrators, business office personnel, deans, as well as external customers – primarily sponsors and collaborating institutions. Each party has its own needs and agenda, sometimes in conflict with one another; and it is left to the Research Administrator to make peace and keep everyone happy.

When we interact with faculty as Research Administrators, our needs become the needs of the institution and the sponsor (i.e. adherence to institutional and sponsor policies and procedures). On the other hand, when we interact with non-faculty institutional personnel, our needs become those of the faculty – to implement our project with a minimum of roadblocks. Finally, when we communicate with sponsors, our needs are those of the faculty and the institution; e.g., retaining intellectual property rights and having an adequate budget with some flexibility in spending. To say one needs to be nimble in these interactions is an understatement, and a magician, only a slight exaggeration.

Successful interactions with constituents are critical to Research Administrators, successfully handling their responsibilities. Leaders, in particular, need to be able to communicate effectively with internal and external customers. Adopting the four-step process of Nonviolent Communication as a tool to help manage conflict can be a productive strategy. The key is to communicate observations free from any evaluation or judgment (O); express our feelings in order to enhance our ability to connect with ourselves and others (F); state our needs and thereby take responsibility for our own feelings (N); and make specific requests about what we want (R).

For more information on Nonviolent Communication, please see:
The Center for Nonviolent Communication (http://www.cnvc.org/)
Bay Area Nonviolent Communication (http://www.baynvc.org/)

Cheryl Anderson is the Director of the Office of Research Grants and Contracts at the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas; Carolyn Elliott-Farino is currently the Director of Grants and Contract Administration at Kennesaw State University; and, David Ngo serves as UW Effort Administrator & ECRT Manager, Office of Research & Sponsor Programs, University of Wisconsin.

Advertisement

We’ve changed (sort of).

For over 30 years, you’ve known us as Beers + Cutler, a leading accounting and consulting firm serving higher education and research institutions nationwide. We have now joined forces with Baker Tilly. And while our name is changing, our level of commitment to our clients and people remains the same. Our team of professionals is dedicated to providing sponsored research compliance and process consulting services to our clients.

Together with Baker Tilly, our combined industry expertise will provide greater resources and services to meet your needs into the future.

Baker Tilly
Accountants and Advisors
Connect with us: bakertilly.com
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My first exposure to the concept of interdisciplinary research was as Grants Manager of the Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Antimicrobial Resistance (CIRAR) at Columbia University School of Nursing. This center was one of 21 centers initially funded by the National Center for Research Resources through RFA-RM-04-004, “Exploratory Centers (P20) for Interdisciplinary Research,” under the National Institute of Health (NIH) Director’s Roadmap Initiative. Seven years later, it’s ironic to think of the idea of an interdisciplinary research center as “exploratory.” Interdisciplinary research, defined by the CIRAR team as, “any study or group of studies undertaken by scholars from two or more distinct scientific disciplines,” would seem to have always been an intuitive way of approaching complex biomedical problems.

Today, as a result of targeted initiatives released by the NIH, the National Science Foundation, and other agencies, interdisciplinary research is strongly encouraged. The implementation of multiple principal investigators (PIs) on NIH grants in 2007, also established through the NIH Roadmap, was created to facilitate interdisciplinary and translational research and maximize the potential of “team science” efforts. While the NIH has acknowledged the existence of administrative barriers created by such campaigns, it has resolutely left the job of finding solutions in the hands of each institution. The benefits of interdisciplinary research to science and public health are many, but its very nature sets up a “perfect storm” of administrative challenges and formidable barriers to its success.

The Journey Begins

Being a team member of CIRAR has been the most professionally challenging — and personally rewarding — journey of my career in research administration. The road traveled to ensure CIRAR’s success was not always a smooth one, posing administrative barriers and challenges that none of us could have imagined. At the outset, even compiling the P20 application proved to be a daunting task, with co-investigators, faculty members, and collaborators from both the medical center and the downtown graduate campus of Columbia University, including team members representing over 20 departments and divisions. Just obtaining administrative approvals from deans, chairs, and department managers was a logistical nightmare, and scheduling a team meeting when all members were available became a weeklong task. As a team member since CIRAR’s inception, I witnessed firsthand its struggles for unity, questions of leadership, and need to define itself. One of the first articles published by the CIRAR team acknowledges these challenges stating, “despite the recognized need for interdisciplinary collaboration in biomedical research, there are structural and cultural disincentives within the academic setting that must be overcome.”

As Grants Manager, I was faced with overcoming several administrative barriers that were new to our health sciences campus. Which academic department is “home” to CIRAR? Will Deans appropriately acknowledge their faculty members who serve as CIRAR co-investigators even when the grant isn’t assigned to their department? Should facilities and administrative (F&A) revenues (also known as indirect costs) be allocated between academic departments? If so, what formula should be used to calculate the distribution of these revenues? And how can we accomplish this allocation within our current archaic accounting system? I was enthusiastic about the scientific methods proposed by this diverse biomedical research team, but dreaded the work that lay ahead from an administrative perspective.

The Challenges

Research administrators tend to have a love/hate relationship with interdisciplinary research. They realize the strength of these interdisciplinary proposals, which are capable of groundbreaking advances in medicine and public health, and wholeheartedly support the faculty’s efforts to branch out into this brave new frontier. But research administrators also see the obstacles lurking around every corner, cringing at the extra hours of work that lie ahead. Every institution that conducts interdisciplinary research for the first time is faced with a steep learning curve and has to be willing to bend its long-standing, inflexible administrative systems in order to accommodate the needs of the interdisciplinary research team.

As early as 2004, the National Academy of Science Committee on Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research recognized “the need for change in institutional traditions and administrative policies that impede interdisciplinary research” by highlighting it as one of the 15 primary findings in their executive summary. University task forces have been convened specifically to address the administrative barriers to interdisciplinary research; in the case of the University of Iowa, the issue of “shared credit” was identified as a critical issue. Indeed, the size and scope of barriers is daunting, especially if there are no university policies already in place to manage this new frontier.

When an interdisciplinary grant with multiple PIs is funded, one of the first questions is “Who is responsible for managing the accounts?” Decisions must be made regarding which department should provide the necessary administrative staff to support the project. A flood of important but not easily answered questions quickly surface: Are faculty members with joint appointments to be treated differently in the scenario of the interdisciplinary research team? Should F&A revenues be shared between departments, divisions, or laboratories? How should space and other resources the project will use be allocated? If a split of F&A revenues is not specifically agreed upon before the grant is submitted, what do we do once the grant is received? Should
authorship be negotiated from a different perspective? Even at the level of the sponsor, one has to wonder if multiple departments are being appropriately “credited” for grant funding, such as in the new NIH RePORTER tool.

Special Considerations for Academic Medical Centers

Administrative barriers to interdisciplinary research such as the ones outlined here are universal, prominent issues in all types of colleges and universities. But the nature of academic medical centers makes them susceptible to a wider variety of challenges. For example, typical academic medical centers have two core components: the university (education mission) and the hospital (patient care mission) that the faculty, post-docs, residents, and staff serve. The university and hospital are often treated as two separate but related entities by administration, a distinction that results in the need for multiple levels of institutional approval to initiate a new research endeavor, whether grant funded or not. Unique situations arise regarding the sharing of biomedical resources and space, such as basic science laboratories, use of hospital clinics and patient populations, and additional human subjects IRB approvals. Subcontract agreements are often required for collaborating institutions which involve multiple levels of administrative approval and more “busy work” overall. I have to admit that my typical reaction when presented with a possible collaboration with hospital employees is a long, deep sigh. It’s no wonder that the decision to simply “drop” that element of the proposal to avoid the headache is often the end result. But should administrative barriers ever be an acceptable reason to sacrifice the quality and range of scientific research?

Strategies Needed for Solutions

While some researchers claim that interdisciplinary research “is becoming the dominant model for understanding complex health issues,” other experts in the field question whether this is simply a passing “trend.” Whether a trend or more permanent transition, an institution’s administration is uniquely poised to help bridge the gap that makes interdisciplinary research less than appealing. What can we, as research administrators, do to encourage our faculties to continue to pursue interdisciplinary research collaboration in the face of so many hurdles?

As Dr. Phil tells guests daily on his TV talk show, “You can’t change what you don’t understand.” the first steps to overcoming these multi-faceted barriers are to recognize they exist and enumerate them. The barriers mentioned in this article might be a good place to start, but they need to be tailored for each individual institution planning to tackle this problem. The sponsored projects office should work together with school, department, and division administrators, senior research faculty, and hospital affiliates to develop these lists, assess the scope of the barriers, and strategize an approach for overcoming them. Don’t wait until faced with the challenge of devising a solution; plan ahead for when the inevitable happens. With CIRAR, we were able to find “backdoor” methods within our accounting and other systems to overcome administrative obstacles. But eventually our medical center, as a whole, will need to cooperatively develop policies and approaches to change the administrative climate into one which not only encourages, but embraces interdisciplinary collaboration in biomedical research.

The Rewards

By working closely with the Office of Sponsored Projects and executive leadership across departments and campuses, and adding a dash of creativity, CIRAR found the recipe for success. Lessons learned also enabled us to apply our formula in similar circumstances, such as setting up R01s with multiple PIs in separate departments that share F&A revenues. Despite the challenges, CIRAR has continued to thrive even after its initial P20 federal funding ended. CIRAR is now an established school-supported center entity which includes four initial consortium projects chosen for funding by the National Institute of Nursing Research and eleven additional projects from multiple departments and with varied sources of federal funding, all under the CIRAR “umbrella.” CIRAR affiliates have published and/or presented over 75 articles, posters, abstracts, and oral presentations since 2004, and the global problem of antimicrobial resistance is being addressed in ways that wouldn’t be possible without this interdisciplinary collaboration.

I have participated in many facets of CIRAR, including its T90 institutional training grant, subsequent related grant applications (including a fantastic conference grant), and I design and maintain its web site (http://nursing.columbia.edu/CIRAR/). In addition, my experiences with CIRAR led to my first Case Study presented at NCURA’s 50th Annual Meeting on sharing F&A revenues between departments. As a result, CIRAR’s PI and the Associate Dean of Interdisciplinary Programs at the School of Public Health asked me to co-author a manuscript on policies for sharing F&A revenues which we plan to submit to Academic Medicine. These are exciting opportunities I would have never dreamed possible.

Today, CIRAR is preparing an application in response to an NIH ARRA-funded RFA to expand its ongoing activities, fund new projects, and hopefully become a federally funded center again. I look ahead to our March deadline for the application submission with less “cringing” and more confidence. Without a doubt, the benefits reaped from interdisciplinary research, even from this research administrator’s point of view, far outweigh the challenges.
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BACK BY POPULAR DEMAND…PRA4!
In deference to the financial constraints we are all experiencing, PRA was not held last summer. We have heeded your protests, however, and are pleased to announce that PR4 WILL BE HELD ON JULY 19TH THROUGH JULY 21st in Providence, Rhode Island.

If you think you can’t afford to come to the PRA summer conference, think again! Federal dollars continue to flow: ARRA funding has increased the number of proposals we submit, the amount of money we need to spend properly and the amount of scrutiny we will receive by the Inspectors General. Well-trained research administrators can save their institutions millions of dollars by preventing audit findings through the implementation of best practices. You will benefit from this program whether you are from a department, a PUI, a medical school or a central sponsored programs office. The PRA Program Committee is in the process of gathering the best in the field to help to prepare you for what is proving to be a most challenging time for the research community.

Our theme is Proactive Research Administration (PRA – get it?), stressing the tried and true notion that a properly prepared proposal and budget set the stage for good compliance and fewer post-award problems. The conference will begin with half day afternoon workshops followed by a day and a half of concurrent sessions, discussion groups and roundtable talks.

We have studied your comments from both the Annual Meeting and PRA3 and have chosen the strongest presenters to teach the topics you were most interested in learning about. In addition to the tracks you are accustomed to seeing, we have created a track called “Soup to Nuts” which is a sequential series of offerings for less experienced research administrators which when attended in its entirety will give a basic introduction to our profession.

With those shrinking travel budgets in mind, NCURA has negotiated a very inexpensive room rate in a very up and coming city which is served by both a major airport and Amtrak as well as being within easy driving distance for most Northeasterners. Apart from its many local attractions, it is an easy post-conference trip to some of the most beautiful beaches in the world.

As we continue to celebrate the science, remember what this country's founding scientist said, “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure”.

See you in Providence!

PRA IV Co-Chairs
Marti Dunne, New York University
Brian Squilla, University of Pennsylvania

PRA IV Program Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairs</th>
<th>Federal Track</th>
<th>Senior Level/Open Forum Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marti Dunne, New York University</td>
<td>Jean Feldman, National Science Foundation</td>
<td>Penny Cook, Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Squilla, University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Regina White, Brown University</td>
<td>Marianne Woods, University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts/Compliance Track</td>
<td>Medical Track</td>
<td>Discussion Group Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Richardson, University of Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>Jaime Caldwell, Loyola University of Chicago at the Medical Center</td>
<td>Tammy Custer, Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Sedwick, University of Texas</td>
<td>F. Edward Herran, Consultant</td>
<td>Lisa Gentry, University of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Track</td>
<td>Soup to Nuts Track</td>
<td>Heather Offhaus, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Dilanni, University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Michele Codd, Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Ronald Polizzi, Thomas Jefferson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Callahan, Miami University</td>
<td>Erica Kropp, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUI Track</td>
<td>Speaker Care</td>
<td>Workshop Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Seaton, Western Illinois University</td>
<td>Denise Clark, University of Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>Richard Seligman, California Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy White, Belmont University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christa Johnson, Southern Illinois University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registration and Program Materials will be available in mid March at www.ncura.edu
Over the past decade, the field of research administration has seen a significant increase in the number of formal financial compliance programs being established. With the large increase in federal audits in areas related to financial compliance and, in many cases, significant findings resulting from those audits, the attention to building strong financial compliance programs has been a high priority for research institutions. While many institutions have formed these programs – others due to limited resources or the limited size of their research programs – may still be looking towards developing similar programs or, at a minimum, increasing their focus on financial compliance. For those who are beginning the process towards establishing a financial compliance program, it may not be clear where to start the process. How these programs have been established varies greatly by institution; but many of the practices, tools and guidelines used remain consistent. The department designated as responsible for the administration of a financial compliance program varies greatly from institution to institution. Some Universities find that these programs work best as part of their Research Compliance Office (if they have one) while others find that this is a responsibility best handled by the University’s Internal Audit Program. Others have established these programs as part of their Post-award Offices. In these cases, where the focus will be primarily on monitoring the financial compliance of departments and/or schools, it is important to ensure that there is alternative oversight in place for the review of the processes handled within the Post-award Office. In its strongest form, a financial compliance program should be an organized partnership of several departments with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Generally, one area will house the main responsibility for oversight of the program.

Once the responsible department(s) is identified, the framework of the program must be established. It is recommended that a committee be formed with representatives from various areas of the university. Representation from internal audit, general counsel’s office, research compliance, and both pre- and post-award offices should be included on the committee. These committees may also include representation from the school’s senior business officers. As you begin to design the framework of the program, you should ensure that everyone on the committee is familiar with the relevant guidelines and resources for this process.

Available Guidelines and Resources for Financial Compliance Programs

The starting point for any compliance program generally begins at the Federal Sentencing Guidelines Manual (Chapter 8, Part B). The 2009 version can be accessed at http://www.uscc.gov/2009guid/8b2_1.htm. These manuals were first issued in 1991 by Congress, acting through the United States Sentencing Commission. The section entitled “Effective Compliance and Ethics Programs,” identifies a framework of seven core elements that are considered to be the minimal requirements to ensure that an organization has met its core obligations to, “exercise due diligence to prevent and detect criminal conduct and otherwise promote an organizational culture that encourages ethical conduct and a commitment to compliance with the law.” While these do not apply specifically to financial compliance programs, they provide a starting framework and are the recommended structure for financial research compliance programs. These core elements outline the areas of consideration in the development of any compliance program and emphasize the requirements for institutions to have an effective compliance and ethics program while exercising due diligence to prevent and detect criminal activity while promoting an organizational culture that encourages ethical conduct and a commitment to compliance with the law. While it states that specific individuals within the organization shall be delegated day-to-day responsibilities for the compliance and ethics program, it emphasizes that high-level personnel of the organization must provide oversight and ensure that the institution has an effective compliance program in place. The program must have monitoring and communication components in place, and any infractions must be managed appropriately.

Another equally important document for establishing a financial compliance program in a college or university was issued by the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services and is entitled, “Draft OIG Compliance Program Guidance for Recipients of PHS Research Awards,” which can be accessed at http://oig.hhs.gov/fraud/docs/complianceguidance/PHS%20Research%20Awards%20Draft%20CPG.pdf. While the principles outlined in this document were designed to provide recommendations for programs focused on financial and regulatory aspects of federally sponsored research and service awards, the principles outlined serve as an excellent guide for the development of programs overseeing broader activity areas (including non-federal areas).

continued on next page
Financial Compliance Program continued

Many of the ideas emphasized in this document are similar to those include in the Federal Sentencing Guidelines. The OIG outlines the purpose of their document as being “to encourage the use of internal controls to effectively monitor adherence to the applicable statutes, regulations, and program requirements.” Emphasized in this document is that the purpose of the document is not to provide rigid standards for a compliance program but rather to provide a set of recommendations and suggestions for institutions to consider when establishing a compliance program. Similar to the Federal Sentencing Guidelines, this document also emphasizes written standards, policies and procedures, well-defined roles and responsibilities in the compliance structure, education and training programs, effective communication structure, monitoring programs, and consequences for identified violations.

Another resource, perhaps the most valuable, in developing a financial compliance program is COGR’s publication entitled “Managing Externally Funded Programs at Colleges and Universities: A Guideline to Good Management Practices.” Information on obtaining this document may be accessed at http://www.cogr.edu/Pubs_EffectiveManagement.cfm. This document is the most detailed of the three documents mentioned, providing specific sets of performance standards, best practice recommendations, and examples of “compliance indicators” for the various areas of risk. In addition to providing effective compliance practices and specific information on sponsored program management, the document provides a section specifically covering financial administration which covers the topics of financial accounting and reporting, cost accounting standards, institutional rate agreements, proposal costing, allowable costs, compensation, cost sharing, cash management, specialized service/recharge centers, and project closeout, as well as a section on the management of capital equipment.

An additional resource available from COGR is the document entitled, “Compensation, Effort Commitments and Certification,” available at http://www.cogr.edu/Pubs_Financial.cfm. This document carefully details and outlines the issues surrounding the areas of compensation and effort commitments/certification. This document includes “hot buttons and key considerations” as well as best practice recommendations.

For further information on financial compliance topics, please visit NCURA’s FRA Neighborhood, available to all NCURA members from the NCURA website.

After a careful review of these documents, the following areas need to be considered in the development of any financial compliance program:

1. Oversight, organizational, and leadership issues – It will be necessary to understand who will be responsible for the development and management of the program. As noted previously, this varies by institution and there is no single best practice to assign this responsibility. However, it is essential that the roles and responsibilities of those involved are clearly outlined. The roles of the internal audit and general counsel’s office should be considered in addition to those directly involved in the administration of research at the University.

2. Compliance risk assessment process – It is important that the institution develop a formal process for identifying potential risks to the University in the area of financial research compliance. This can be accomplished through a variety of methods including interviewing (individually or via a survey) those who are involved in the administration and conduct of University or by conducting a review/audit of nationally identified high risk areas.

3. Compliance monitoring process – It is equally important that processes are put in place to monitor compliance. This can be conducted via audits or reviews of various areas, the utilization of specific exception reports to identify potential areas of non-compliance, or other methods including the establishment of a hotline for reporting financial compliance concerns.

4. Formal standards, policies, and procedures – Every institution should have a process by which it ensures that the appropriate standards, policies, and procedures are documented, available, and regularly reviewed/updated.

5. Training, education, and communication – Any financial compliance program should include a component that evaluates whether the appropriate training and education is available to those involved in the administration and conduct of research. Recommendations for further training and areas of emphasis should be provided from results of compliance monitoring assessments. Evaluating whether communication regarding financial compliance issues, including changes in guidance and requirements is occurring effectively, is very important.

6. Reporting and corrective/disciplinary action – Each institution needs to have a plan in place for handling the reporting and required corrective or disciplinary action for any discovered violations.

The need for effective financial compliance programs has become abundantly clear over recent years. At the same time, the administrative burdens put upon research administration offices have significantly increased, while the budgets in many of these offices have decreased. Developing a strong financial compliance program can be particularly challenging with consideration to all of the other challenges that today’s research administration offices face. However, the cost of not ensuring appropriate oversight for an institution’s financial compliance program can be very high. As with many initiatives, taking time to review how some other institutions have approached this process can be very worthwhile and provide some concrete ideas to consider in the development of a program.

Kerry Peluso is Associate Vice President for Research Administration, Emory University.
Surviving an Audit: The Basics

When you get a notification that your department will be audited, what is your first thought? Is it, “Wait, who is coming? Why my department? What will I have to do? And how long is this going to last?”

Welcome back to our three-part series on working with internal audit, including some insight into these questions and hints for staying out of trouble. In the first article, we discussed the past, present, and future of the internal audit profession and how certain types of internal audits can actually be helpful. In this second article, we share with you the nuts and bolts of the internal audit process and provide terminology for “talking the talk” when interacting with internal auditors. Look for our third article, offering specific ideas for leveraging internal audit to help your department, in an upcoming issue of NCURA Magazine.

Like many disciplines, internal auditors are guided by a professional association that promulgates standards, provides certifications, and shares best practices for the profession (see the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) website at www.theiia.org). While common components comprise most internal audit processes, HOW the audit process unfolds will be impacted by your internal auditor’s mentality (e.g., “gotcha” versus helpful ally) and can be greatly influenced by your taking proactive steps to make the process go more smoothly. To arm you with knowledge and tactics to enhance your experience with internal audits, we outline participants in the audit process, the typical phases in the process, approaches for addressing prevalent challenges, and key terminology.

Most internal audits involve four phases:

1. **Phase 1 - Audit Planning**
   - Determine the audit objectives, scope, timing, and necessary resources to conduct the audit.

2. **Phase 2 - Assess Design of Internal Controls**
   - Gather information about the process to be audited, and assess the adequacy of internal controls.

3. **Phase 3 - Test Transactions and Analyze Results**
   - Conduct interviews, test transactions, analyze the results of the testing, and formulate preliminary observations and findings.

4. **Phase 4 - Reporting**
   - Communicate the results of the audit to the department, management, and the audit committee.

Participants in the Audit Process

A solid first step in surviving an audit is understanding where you fit into the process. Depending on your institution and the audit scope, there could be a handful or more than a dozen of individuals participating in the audit process, typically including the following:

- **Audit Committee**: This Board of Trustees committee oversees the performance of the internal audit function, approves the annual plan drafted by internal audit, and reviews the audit results. Internal audit’s ultimate fealty is to the audit committee.

- **Executive Leadership and Management**: On a day-to-day basis, internal auditors report administratively to one or more members of the institution’s executive leadership, such as a chief financial officer or an executive vice president. Internal audits should work collaboratively with executive management on annual audit planning, and should share audit results with management before reporting to the audit committee.

- **Department**: Each internal audit addresses the activities of one or more departments – either an academic area (such as biology or mechanical engineering) or a functional area (such as sponsored research or procurement). Ideally, internal auditors gain context for the audit by discussing the department’s strategies and operations with the head of the department, and collaborate with department administration to accomplish the audit.

- **Process Owner**: Internal auditors work with “process owners” to understand policies, procedures, and internal controls at a detailed level. For example, the head of the accounts payable function may be the process owner for payment of vendor invoices.

The Audit Process and How You Fit In

So, you may be asking, “How can I help in this process?” Or, perhaps more likely, “How can I make this process easier for me?” Well, start by understanding the overall audit process and specific actions that you can take to minimize the pain involved in an audit.
In the following sections, we outline challenges that you may encounter when you’re being audited and related ways to influence the audit process for the betterment of the audit, your department, and your institution.

**Phase 1 – Audit Planning**

In the Audit Planning phase, the auditors determine their objectives, scope, timing, and resources needed for the audit. At this point, the auditors have decided broadly what they are going to audit (e.g., the effort reporting process). However, the specific faculty and staff, time period, department, and other foci may not yet have been decided, and this is where you can provide input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Challenges</th>
<th>Suggested Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inefficiency and Disruption to Operations: The auditors do not know whom to ask for what types of information, so they ask everyone for everything, resulting in duplicated effort (on your part!).</td>
<td>Designate an Audit Liaison: Assign an audit liaison from your department to work directly with the auditors, enabling more direct and effective communication. Likewise, ask your internal audit team to designate a main point of contact for your department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscommunication: The auditors ask for something (using their terminology, not yours) and you try to respond, but give them the wrong thing.</td>
<td>Educate the Auditors: Take the time to teach the auditors how you describe your department so that you are speaking the same language. Educate Yourself: Understand and use audit lingo to bridge any communication gap (and re-read this article!).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Issues: The auditors are asking for large quantities of documentation, but your staff is busy with month-end reporting.</td>
<td>Proactively Share Conflicts: Provide your schedule and any timing constraints to the auditors as soon as you are notified of a pending audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No New Information: The auditors have a bunch of findings, but you already knew about all of them. Now they have wasted your time and the institution’s resources by taking your watch to tell you what time it is.</td>
<td>Disclose Known Issues: Outline your department’s strengths and weaknesses so that the internal auditors will spend less time finding things that you already know and will potentially allocate more time to collaborating with you on practical solutions to address your department’s issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion about the Audit’s Purpose: You don’t understand why your department was selected and why you have to do what amounts to a second job in supporting the audit.</td>
<td>Ask Questions: To increase your ability to provide the auditors with what they need, ask the auditors how the audit area was selected. It could be the result of a theft of petty cash, a process new to your institution (such as automated effort reporting), an area of focus for government auditors (such as human subject privacy or direct charging of administrative costs), or a request from the audit committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2 – Assess Design of Internal Controls**

In this phase, the auditor gathers information about the process to be audited and assesses the adequacy of internal controls. Auditors use the information learned through the first two phases to design the audit work program, including any transaction testing procedures that they may plan to perform in order to assess compliance with your specific policies, procedures, and/or sponsor requirements.

**Misunderstanding of Your Processes and Controls:** The auditors can’t seem to understand how your processes work.

**Illustrate:** Use real life documents to show exactly how the process works. Invite the auditors to sit with you and observe as you perform your responsibilities that relate to the audit.

**Describe the Department’s Activities:** Remember that auditors are generally not scientists. Walk them through the scientific aspects of your programs at a high level to enable them to understand better the purpose of your research and the related financial transactions. For example, the auditors may question non-travel-related food items that are not typically allowed to be charged to a grant. If you have explained that your human research subjects donate blood, then the auditors will be more likely to understand the appropriateness of charging the cost of cookies and orange juice to a grant.

**Review the Work before Conclusions Are Made:** Ask to review the draft documentation that the auditors create of your processes and controls to ensure their accuracy before the auditors design testing plans, or report control weaknesses, based on this documentation.
**Phase 3 – Test Transactions and Analyze Results**

This phase can include gathering documentation, conducting interviews, performing testing procedures, analyzing the results of the testing, and formulating preliminary observations and findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excessive Documentation Requested: The auditors are asking for WAY too much documentation for your department to handle, or are asking for unnecessary documentation.</th>
<th>Confirm the Need Before Providing Documentation: Discuss with the internal auditor in detail the intended use of requested documentation before you begin to gather it. Channel all requests for information through your department audit liaison, who can then coordinate the responsibilities for gathering the documentation within the department.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions, Questions, Questions: The auditors keep coming back to you with follow-up questions on the documentation provided.</td>
<td>Organize: Clearly label and organize the documentation that you provide. Ask a colleague to double-check the completeness, accuracy, and organization of the information before you provide it to the internal auditors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Documentation: Oh no! I can’t find supporting receipts for travel.</td>
<td>Schedule Regular Check-ins: Encourage the auditors to ask you follow-up questions in a structured way. For example, hold a weekly status call or ask the audit team to send questions via email only when they have amassed a number of questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridiculous Audit Findings: The auditors are being overly critical and have many findings.</td>
<td>Explore Alternatives: If you cannot locate certain source documentation, let the auditors know before you spend 30 hours looking for a taxicab receipt. Quite possibly, the auditors can perform alternate procedures or will accept another type of documentation. Think creatively about what might substantiate a particular transaction (e.g., an internal travel itinerary combined with a credit card receipt to support an airfare expense).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 4 – Reporting**

The objective of this Reporting phase is to communicate the results of the audit to the auditee, management, and the audit committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surprise Findings: The final report includes observations and recommendations that you’ve not heard previously.</th>
<th>Review the Draft Report: Encourage the auditors to allow you to review a draft of the report before it is shared with management. This will enable you to discuss key issues that were not brought to your attention, as well as correct any factual errors regarding your processes, controls, or findings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrealistic Recommendations: They want us to do what?</td>
<td>React Timely: Instead of ignoring the auditors and then complaining when the final report doesn’t reflect your input (or the facts!), provide feedback to the auditors on the draft report within the requested timeframes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urge Practicality: When you review the report, pay particular attention to the recommendations made by the auditors. Speak up when you know that these recommendations will be difficult to implement in your department. The auditors may be able to alter the recommendations, or suggest changes outside of your department to facilitate implementation. For example, if you are asked to perform monthly financial reviews of a researcher’s accounts, auditors can state in the report that you should be given access to those reports online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued on next page*
You have probably noticed that communication is a pervasive theme throughout this article, both by the auditors and by the audit participants. If you feel out of the loop, contact your internal auditor as soon as possible. Remember that internal auditors are people, too (hey, we know what you’re thinking!). Your proactive attention and engagement can go a long way toward making an audit more useful, and less painful, for you and your department.

Raina Rose Tagle is a Partner at Baker Tilly/Beers + Cutler. Kimberly Ginn is a Senior Manager at Baker Tilly/Beers + Cutler. Ashley Dehhr is a Manager at Baker Tilly/Beers + Cutler.

---

### Key Terminology

The following table summarizes the key activities and “buzz” words related to the audit process, organized by phase of the audit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 - Audit Planning</th>
<th>Phase 2 - Assess Design of Internal Controls</th>
<th>Phase 3 - Test Transactions and Analyze Results</th>
<th>Phase 4 - Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment: The process of reviewing an institution's operations and determining the areas of greatest exposure.</td>
<td>Interviews: Meetings with knowledgeable personnel to better understand the processes and operations of the department.</td>
<td>Fieldwork: Action steps necessary for internal audit to carry out their work to achieve the objectives of the audit.</td>
<td>Draft Audit Report: The result of internal audit's work, typically in a memo form at detailing the audit's background and scope, work performed, summary of observations, and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Plan: The annual blueprint for what areas will be reviewed by internal audit, created based on the results of the Risk Assessment.</td>
<td>Process Documentation: Visual representation of the flow of information or work steps involved in completing specific processes.</td>
<td>Testing Procedures: Processes for determining the effectiveness of controls and existence of risk(s), may include sample selection, interviews, process walkthroughs, and transaction testing.</td>
<td>Closing Conference: Review of the draft report with department management and/or process owner(s) to ensure understanding and agreement among both parties before information is shared with executive management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Conference: The initial meeting between internal audit and department management and process owner(s), discussing the audit work to be performed.</td>
<td>Internal Control: A process, including policies, procedures, monitoring techniques, and attitudes, that helps to achieve a desired result.</td>
<td>Audit Findings: Observations noted during fieldwork that are inconsistent with proper practices; findings typically highlight an increased risk to the institution/organization or a failure of controls.</td>
<td>Management's Response: Management's reaction to the audit report, and its plan for addressing the observations and recommendations raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Scope and Approach: The areas that the audit will address (Scope) and the related audit activities (Approach).</td>
<td>Design of Controls: How well internal controls would address related risks if the controls operated as intended.</td>
<td>Recommendations: Suggested changes or enhancements to policies or processes to strengthen internal controls or improve efficiency and effectiveness.</td>
<td>Final Audit Report: Version of the audit report, including Management's Response, which is presented to the Audit Committee and signifies the completion of the audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Request: List of files, policies, procedures, or other information that internal audit will need to complete its work.</td>
<td>Risk Mitigation: Actions taken to reduce the exposure/impact of what could go wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What does the Nominating and Leadership Development Committee (NLDC) do on behalf of the NCURA membership?

The purpose of the NLDC is to identify, select and develop leaders for NCURA. This includes actively soliciting from the NCURA membership the names of NCURA members who may wish to be considered for the positions of Vice President/President-Elect, Secretary, Treasurer-Elect, and national At-Large Member of the Board of Directors, and also selecting and submitting to the Secretary a slate of two candidates for each of the open positions. In addition, the NLDC manages the NCURA recognition and awards programs and plays a primary role in leadership succession planning and leadership development – for example, the Leadership Development Institute (LDI).

That’s very important to the organization and its membership. What NCURA officer and Board positions are open this year for nominations?

This year we seek nominations for Vice President/President Elect and two At-Large Board members for terms to begin January 1, 2011. We encourage NCURA members to self-nominate and/or nominate others you believe should be considered for these important positions.

How do I find out more about these positions and the responsibilities?

The position descriptions for these volunteer positions are available at http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/opportunities/ and include information about the duties, the responsibilities, and the term of service.

How does one nominate an individual for one of these positions?

Nominations may be emailed to nominations@ncura.edu on or before May 21, 2010, and should include a statement of interest and resume/vitae from the nominee. We welcome self-nominations as well.

What NCURA awards are available?

The NCURA awards provide members an opportunity to recognize colleagues for their contributions. We hope members will consider nominating a colleague for one of these prestigious awards:

- Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award
- Distinguished Service Award
- Joseph Carrabino Award
- Catherine Core Minority Travel Award

What’s happening within the Leadership Development Institute?

The LDI was implemented in 2003 to support the identification and development of future leaders for NCURA and the research administration profession. Fifty-nine NCURA members have graduated from the program and have served NCURA regionally and nationally in a multitude of roles.

As occurs with all NCURA programs, a review of the current LDI program, in conjunction with NCURA’s current and long-term strategic plans, was performed in 2009. The result was a slightly different class for the 2010 program. This year’s class is comprised of both traditional students beginning their leadership journey and more experienced NCURA members already engaged. The NLDC is excited about this new composite 2010 class.

Are there other initiatives the NLDC is, or will be, working on this year?

Each year the NLDC receives charges from the current NCURA president that guide our agenda. President David Richardson and last year’s President Denise Clark have worked closely with the NLDC to coordinate these initiatives. The NLDC is working on several for this year, one of which is the creation of a leadership experience for members, different from LDI but dedicated to developing leaders for NCURA at the national level. Focus groups are planned to ensure we receive input from our many stakeholders.

There will not be a call for self-nominated applications for a 2011 LDI class, but please do stay tuned for exciting news later this year!

It sounds like the NLDC has a very busy year ahead. Who are this year’s members of the NLDC?

We are joined this year by:

- Gary Smith, Massachusetts General Hospital – Region I
- Ann Holmes, University of Maryland College Park – Region II
- Cathy Snyder, Vanderbilt University – Region III
- Diane Barrett, University of Wisconsin-Madison – Region IV
- Kay Ellis, University of Texas at Austin – Region V
- John Carfora, Loyola Marymount University – Region VI
- Winnie Ennenga, Northern Arizona University – Region VII
- Denise Clark, University of Maryland College Park, Immediate Past President and Ex-officio member

Thank you, Pam and Vivian. This is great information! May the NLDC receive many nominations for these important positions and awards, and we wish you much success as the NLDC works toward the future NCURA leadership program.
2010 Call for Officer and Board Nominations

The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee is pleased to present the opportunity for all members of NCURA to nominate (or self-nominate) candidates to serve as the next leaders for our organization. We urge you to consider individuals for the following important positions:

- Vice-President/President Elect
- Two At-Large Board Members

NCURA provides many opportunities to volunteer within our professional organization—currently at a membership that exceeds 7000! By expanding your involvement, you are afforded a wealth of enriching experiences. Being active and involved in NCURA can be as simple as considering whom to nominate for these positions and then making that nomination. In addition, if you are interested in these positions and would like to submit your name for consideration, we are waiting to hear from you.

Terms of these positions will begin on January 1, 2011. Please email nominations to: nominations@ncura.edu.

All nominations and supporting materials (candidate’s statement of interest and current resume/vita of 1-3 pages) from the nominees must be received electronically on or before May 21, 2010.

For a detailed description of the current responsibilities of these positions, please visit http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/opportunities/.

2010 NCURA Awards: Nominations Being Accepted

Recognizing the contributions of our colleagues is one of the highest honors we can bestow. Additionally, nurturing diversity expands the energy and creativity of our membership and builds a stronger volunteer organization. Now is the time to acknowledge an extraordinary mentor, collaborator, or friend, and identify a candidate for the minority travel award.

Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration
This award is given annually to an individual who has made a significant contribution to the profession of research administration.

Deadline for nominations: May 28, 2010

Distinguished Service Award
This award is given to up to five individuals who have made significant contributions to NCURA.

Deadline for nominations: May 28, 2010

Joseph Carrabino Award
This award is given to a federal employee who has made a significant contribution to research administration, either through a single innovation or by a lifetime of service.

Deadline for nominations: May 28, 2010

Catherine Core Minority Travel Award
This program supports travel-related costs to the NCURA Annual Meeting for up to four individuals from under-represented groups who would not otherwise be able to attend this conference.

Deadline for applications: May 28, 2010

For more information on these awards, please visit http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/awards/index.php

Get involved... Stay involved.
As I write my first article as your Regional Chair, I am looking out the windows of my office and enjoying the cool sunshine (cool for me is 60 degrees) with a few rain drops – it will be summer before we know it. This is an exciting time, and I look forward to working with each of you in the coming year. It’s a great time to look for new ways to volunteer in our organization and support each other in our common interests. As we get closer to moving into the spring season, I hope you will think of the many good things going on in our Region. For me, I want to take this opportunity to look back and to send a special thanks to the people who made the last year so very special for us – Dianne Horrocks, Idaho State University, for shepherding us through the past year as the Chair of our Region, as well as Past Regional Chairs, Winnie Ennenga, Northern Arizona University; Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State University; Denise Wallen, University of New Mexico; and Judy Fredenberg, University of Montana, for their continued guidance and support.

I hope that you have already begun making plans to join us for the Region VI/VII Spring Meeting in Newport Beach, California April 18 – 21, 2010. You should be checking the website for Early Bird Registration information and lock in your meeting and hotel reservations as soon as you can. An advance peek at the program will be posted to our website and the Region 6 website by the time you receive this announcement. Our meeting will be held at the Newport Beach Marriott Hotel & Spa, and our conference hotel rate is $179.00 per night. The hotel has more than 40,000 sq. ft. of event space, newly redesigned hotel rooms, and very nice amenities for our meeting. The location boasts nearby attractions such as Fashion Island, Laguna Beach, and Balboa Island.

We are working diligently with our counterparts in Region VI to plan an outstanding program for you and we are looking forward to hearing from you as we put the finishing touches on the program and the venue. If you have last minute suggestions for us to consider, you may send those to me directly, or you may contact the responsible track leaders. Contact information for the track leaders is available at: http://www.ogrd.wsu.edu/r6ncura/meetings.aspx. The Program Committee consists of representatives from both regions. Chair of Region VI, Sinh Simmons of the University of Washington and I are co-chairing the committee.

This year Region VI will take the lead in site arrangements and registration; and Region VII is taking the lead for developing the meeting program. Regional track leaders include: Candyce Lindsay, Arizona State University – Pre-Award; Randall Draper, University of Colorado – Sr. Forum; Dianne Horrocks, Idaho State University – Government; Elizabeth Boyd, University of Arizona – Compliance; Winnie Ennenga, Northern Arizona University – Compliance; Lisa Mosley, Arizona State University – Departmental Administration; Avery Wright, Arizona State University – Evaluations; and Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State University – Financial.

Thanks to all of you who are submitting ideas for sessions and workshops and for volunteering your time and energy to our efforts. Please be sure to watch for announcements on our Region VII website. We are all in this together, and I appreciate everyone’s support.

I bet you thought I forgot the most important thing: I am thankful for each of you, our members, and all that you contribute. I hope to see you at the beach!

Debra Murphy is Chair of Region VII and serves as the Director, Office of Research Integrity and Assurance at Arizona State University.
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