ALSO INSIDE: NCURA’S 52ND ANNUAL MEETING THEME ANNOUNCED
You may be familiar with Charles R. Swindoll’s statement, “We are all faced with a series of great opportunities brilliantly disguised as impossible situations”; this seems to be an appropriate description of what Public Law 111-5, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) meant to the academic research community. While most institutions were eager to encourage faculty to apply for ARRA funding, pre-award offices and departments were deluged with a flood of applications in early 2009, requiring some to hire additional staff and others to handle the greatly increased volume with no additional staff. Then, as funds began to trickle in, it became evident that the stringent reporting requirements associated with ARRA funding would add yet another burden to already stressed administrative offices.

In this issue, David Kennedy of COGR shares his “Capital View” of ARRA, including some unexpected dividends that will pay off for future proposals, as well as long-term effects that may pose ongoing challenges. Raina Rose Tagle, Kimberly Ginn, and Ashley Deihrr share insights on ARRA-related audits and how to avoid “findings.” Barbara Frederick shares her perspective on how ARRA affected department administrators and how her department and institution have coped through teamwork and focusing on a shared mission. Kerry Peluso provides her observations on and recommendations for resolving the many challenges of ARRA reporting, and Jo Barnes provides the PUI perspective on ARRA reporting. Ruth Torres discusses the positive effects ARRA has had on the research administration and compliance areas and the possibility of a resulting “new culture of compliance.”

Diane DiEuliis, Julia Lane, and Bill Valdez provide information on the Science of Science Policy Website and Listserv. Eugene Skolnikoff stresses the importance of international scientific collaboration, focusing on cooperation with China, and addresses the challenges U.S. institutions face in dealing with the various export control regulations. David Brady provides a summary of Controlled Unclassified Information.

We have also included Jennifer Crockett’s timely article on handling stress when your circuits are overloaded, as many of ours have been in the past year; and Charna Howson and Cheryl Anderson discuss a new work-related stress condition, “Attention Deficit Trait,” with tips on how to prevent or mitigate it.

There is also information on the PRA Conference July 19-21 in Providence, Rhode Island; a GUIRR Update, focusing on the emerging importance of sensors; Clark McCartney’s report from the spring meeting of the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM); and a preview of NCURA’s 52nd Annual Meeting to be held this fall, back at our “home Hilton” in DC.

We hope that this issue will help you reflect on the lessons that have been learned from ARRA and the opportunities it brought, despite being disguised as a “seemingly impossible situation” early in the year. Research administrators, along with our institutions and federal partners, have risen to the challenge of ARRA and have developed new mechanisms to meet it, as well as future ones.

Good luck with all of your “great opportunities”!

Debbie Smith
Pre-Award Research Administration 4 Conference

Marriott Providence Downtown
Providence, Rhode Island
July 19 – 21, 2010

There was clearly pent up demand for PRA 4! We began to receive registrations for it within hours of the preliminary program launch. The theme of PRA4 is Pro-Active Research Administration. Our sessions will stress the importance of pre-award administration as the first line of defense against an audit finding. As our program cover indicates, we have pictured our profession as a game board with the various squares being the pitfalls we encounter everyday. The goal of this conference is to provide the preventive skill set to avoid those pitfalls as we advance our players.

PRA4 attendees will have the opportunity to attend a variety of different sessions focusing on the hot topics facing pre-award today, such as Effort Reporting, Export Controls, Cost Sharing and Troublesome Contract Clauses. In addition, we will have a strong Federal presence, with presentations from all of our large government sponsors. There will be sessions targeted to newcomers as well as those looking for something more advanced.

Attendees will also find wonderful networking opportunities. In addition to the exhibitors that will be at the conference there will also be a Welcoming reception taking place on Monday, July 19th and an additional networking event scheduled for Tuesday, July 20th, as well as breakfast roundtable discussions which, along with your morning coffee, will be designed to stimulate your brain and introduce you to your colleagues with similar interests.

NCURA is very excited to welcome back the PRA conference. Check out the workshops and session offerings at: http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/sites/pra4/.

So, register now, reserve your hotel room & let the games begin!
We are well into year 2 of ARRA and have three reporting cycles under our belt. I hate to say that all has become routine as that might get mixed up with “this is easy.” However, it is fair to say that colleges and universities rose to the occasion on the front-end submitting grant proposals at an unprecedented volume. Recipients rose to the challenges of complying with new and extraordinary Section 1512 reporting requirements that continue to tax institutional resources.

Asked to comment on what universities have learned from the ARRA experience, university representatives observed:

A “New Game.” ARRA required central, sponsored programs offices and departmental administrators, to work with faculty in a highly coordinated and collegial manner. ARRA compliance was easier to “sell” across each campus, which could have been the result of focused administrative planning and communication, plus the constant message about the importance of accountability and transparency. Regardless of the cause, there was enthusiasm about the “New Game”; however, the challenge going beyond ARRA is to maintain an environment of respect and collegiality.

Good Proposal Development Practices Pay Dividends. At some institutions, automated proposal development systems played a crucial role during the proposal development process. These systems had the potential, and in many cases were able, to contribute to successful proposal submissions. Another unintended benefit of ARRA proposal writing was the opportunity to nurture junior faculty. Even when ARRA funding was not secured for junior faculty, the experience was positive and the proposals developed could be reframed for future submissions.

Unexpected Influences: State Government and the Media. State government demands in the form of centralized Section 1512 reporting and oversight of the ARRA State Fiscal Stabilization Funds presented (and continue to present) management challenges. State oversight continues and hopefully will provide an opportunity to develop a communication network between the state and universities that can be used in the future. Media scrutiny also has created a new source of institutional risk. For example, reconciling PI perspectives on job creation with the actual OMB jobs reporting requirements has resulted in the need to closely manage the media relations function of the institution.

Stress on Internal Resources. While there were cases where internal resources were increased (e.g., increased staffing, salary bonuses, etc.), staff were pushed hard. ARRA funding opportunities, for the most part have expired. However, Section 1512 reporting continues to be an ongoing challenge, and the corresponding ARRA compliance, oversight, and audit scrutiny will remain significant. In addition, accountability and transparency applicable to ARRA and non-ARRA funding most likely will be an ongoing emphasis at the federal level, which could result in further strains on institutional resources.

Unpredictable Research Budgets must be part of Future Planning. Despite the President’s relatively favorable FY2011 budget proposals (see below), the dire state of the federal deficit, possible discretionary spending freezes, and the eventual wind-down of ARRA all contribute to an unpredictable research funding environment. This leads to institutional uncertainty from both a revenue projection and a research building/lab space planning standpoint. The poor status of State budgets and Endowments further contribute to the uncertainty. Colleges and universities will need to be proactive in cultivating alternative funding sources, managing expectations of institution Presidents and Boards, responding to growing compliance and accountability demands, and promoting the benefits of research at the Federal, State, and local levels.

The lessons learned serve as excellent resources to build upon. However, applying lessons learned depends on a relatively stable future, and of course, the future is hard to predict, especially in Washington.

Possibly the two most-asked questions applicable to life after ARRA are: What are the prospects for research funding as ARRA funding begins to wind-down, and what happens to the Section 1512 reporting?

In February, the Obama Administration unveiled its FY2011 budget proposal. Despite significant restraint in the area of discretionary spending, research did relatively well. The President included increases for the National Institutes of Health (3.2% increase to $32.1B), the National Science Foundation (8.0% increase to $7.4B), and the Department of Energy (DOE) - Office of Science (4.6% increase to $5.1B). Other research agencies and programs, including DARPA – the
Department of Defense advanced research program, ARPA-E – DOE’s new advanced research initiative, the National Institute of Standards and Technology Laboratories, and the US Department of Agriculture’s National Institute of Food and Agriculture (formerly CSREES) also fared relatively well in the Administration’s budget. For more information on the Administration’s budget, go to: http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/ostp/rdbudgets/2011.

While the President’s budget is encouraging for research, it is by no means a “done deal.” Research programs represent discretionary spending, and President Obama also has proposed a freeze on non-defense discretionary spending. In terms of the President’s budget, this means that other discretionary programs are proposed at reductions. Congress may disagree with many of the Administration’s budget proposals; and as Washington moves through the often contentious budgetary process, the ultimate fate of research funding is unpredictable.

Congress also may have something to say about Section 1512 reporting. When ARRA sunsets on September 30th of this year and as ARRA research grants close over the next couple of years, Section 1512 reporting will disappear. However, Congress may remain enthusiastic about the transparency and public access available through similar reporting mechanisms. If you recall, the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA) is still a law of the land. In fact, many of the FFATA data elements were incorporated into ARRA. After ARRA, FFATA could be a foundation for extending ARRA-like reporting requirements to all federal financial assistance awards.

Congress still has the potential to wreak havoc in other areas. While Section 1512 jobs reporting was dramatically simplified in the January reporting cycle, the national economy needs to start showing signs of robust job growth. If not, those who have been vehemently opposed to ARRA from the onset will have the traction to shine a damaging bright light on jobs reporting. And let’s not forget the role of the federal Inspectors General (IG) offices – the National Science Foundation IG has begun ARRA compliance reviews at ten universities and the Department of Health and Human Services IG expects to begin visiting universities and scrutinizing NIH ARRA programs in early 2011. Initial feedback from universities suggests, at least in the case of the NSF IG, over a dozen different areas are being reviewed including reconciliation of ARRA reporting to the quarterly Federal Financial Report, subrecipient monitoring, compliance with ARRA terms and conditions, effort reporting, cost sharing, procurement practices, and financial system processes and related internal controls.

ARRA has been a long and winding road, and at least for now, it seems as though it will never disappear. Will ARRA leave a pool of tears? That may be up to Washington.

David Kennedy is the Director of Costing Policies and Studies at the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR). David’s responsibilities encompass monitoring all Federal financial policies that affect the management of Federal research programs. He has been instrumental in developing several COGR publications, including “Policies and Practices: Compensation, Effort Commitments, and Certification” (COGR’s Effort Reporting paper) and “An Analysis of F&A Proposal Review and Negotiation Topics from the DCA Best Practices Manual.” Most recently, his primary focus has been on the reporting and management issues associated with the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009.

David joined COGR in January 2006. Prior to COGR, he spent seventeen years in Consulting working with universities and research institutions on costing-related issues. His primary focus was F&A rate development and negotiation. David received his Bachelors degree in Economics from Lehigh University and his Masters degree in Public Policy Studies from the University of Chicago. He spent his first two years after Lehigh teaching junior high school mathematics in the New York City Public School System.

Call for Traveling Workshop Faculty

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

- Departmental Research Administration Workshop
- Financial Research Administration Workshop
- Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration Workshop
- Sponsored Project Administration Level II Workshop

Faculty appointments are three year terms beginning January 2011. These prestigious positions include a required adult learning styles training this fall and a workshop observation prior to teaching. An honorarium is provided for each workshop you teach. NCURA reimburses all travel costs. More details including the application/nomination and recommendation forms will be available in the upcoming call for faculty email blast or at http://www.ncura.edu/content/educational_programs/workshops/.
Our recent history as a nation has been characterized by a belief that investment in science is a precondition to competitiveness. As Figure 1 shows, this has been matched by government spending; there have been increasing discretionary societal funds to allow both random and organized discovery, to permit the pursuit of serendipitous research and to allow for disconnected parallel learning. The result has been the generation of incredible knowledge, products and capabilities. The balance of seeking knowledge of a fundamental nature versus knowledge and capability in a specified direction is hard to achieve but in richer countries, there has been sufficient funds to do both and a sufficient supply of capable researchers to consume those funds.

But our capacity to continue to invest in science is likely to be challenged. We have always had a seemingly boundless supply of scientists, methods and materials with which to expand the scientific frontier. Now, however, within this decade we will have two economies, China and India, equal to or greater than ours in size, wealth and consumption and competing with us for the inputs into the scientific endeavor. Some of the consequences of this are already evident with the control of rare earths moving to these new giants which affects everything from cell phones to batteries to motors. Even in Japan, the Ministry of Internal Affairs announced last year that they would be a half million scientists and engineers shy of their needs in the next decade and have now allowed companies to begin to bring in Chinese immigrants to fill the void in a cultural change never considered possible.

Another challenge to the advance of U.S. science is the very real possibility that the years of steady funding increases will not continue: a 2010 study by the NRC and NAPA show several scenarios of how the next four decades will look with what we already have on our table and they each make clear the immense pressure the nation will face to fund the science we will need with the new assumptions under which we will operate. In the case of Japan, in 2010, they reviewed and changed their entire budget perspective cutting some programs completely and many by 25-33% to allow for stronger pursuit of research in areas like sustainability, caring for the massive aging population and lessening focus on efforts designed to help basic science with goals too far in the future.

In order for science expenditures to continue to be seen as an investment, science organizations must be able to show the value of the journey in socially viable forms when compared with supporting other demands where the ability to show explicit value is well established and accepted. Other countries have risen to the challenge. For example, Japan and Finland combined forces to examine the future of society in a unique joint study. The Japanese have also aggressively examined the value of their national research programs.

The outcomes of both are amazing and glimpse what others may have to do to show a much more detailed decision process in making and funding R&D choices. They also provide opportunity for valuable conversations between those who research and those who administer their efforts on how this might affect their future endeavors.

1 Choosing the Nation’s Fiscal Future by the Committee on the Fiscal Future of the United States; National Research Council and National Academy of Public Administration, 2010.
2 Foresight for Our Future Society – Cooperative project between NISTEP (Japan) and Tekes (Finland).
3 The Japanese Government Revitalization Unit (GRU) reviewed the Science and Technology budget requests.
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When the President’s Science Advisor, Dr. John H. Marburger III, first described the “science of science policy” in a May 2005 Science magazine editorial and in a speech to the annual American Association for the Advancement of Science’s Washington, D.C. policy forum, he created a great deal of interest in the concept, but he also left many questions unanswered.

Who would lead the effort to develop the science of science policy…academia, the Federal government, industry? Was Dr. Marburger only advocating for a “science” of science policy, and not “technology” policy? Why was there such a heavy emphasis on econometric modeling in Dr. Marburger’s remarks? Where would the data come from that would support more advanced analytical methods?

To respond to these and other questions, Dr. Marburger formed the Science of Science Policy Interagency Task Group (SoSP ITG) within the National Science and Technology Council’s Committee on Science. The SoSP ITG, chartered in October 2006, spent the next two years researching the academic literature, understanding how Federal agencies respond to science policy questions, and publishing a research Roadmap in November 2008 that would create a unified vision of the future of the science of science policy.

That Roadmap and the December 2008 workshop sponsored by the SoSP ITG, marked the beginning of the Federal government’s effort to engage the broadest possible audience in the further development of the “nascent” science of science policy community. The workshop was structured to answer two primary questions: is the Roadmap an accurate representation of the emerging field of science of science policy, and, how should the SoSP ITG prioritize its efforts over the next five years?

After two intensive days of work, representatives from academia, the international community, business, and Federal/state agencies affirmed that the Roadmap is headed in the right direction and helped the SoSP ITG prioritize its future work. Among the major conclusions reached by Workshop participants were:

- The Federal government should lead the science of science policy, not only due to its major funding role, but also because most of the policy drivers (tax incentives, intellectual property regimes, workforce investments, etc.) for science are under the control of the Federal government.
- A data infrastructure should be developed to support an empirical foundation for science policy. In particular, a universal portal should be established for agency wide data infrastructure development; a version of the infrastructure should be made available to the research community within a shared research environment.
- The National Science Foundation should lead, through its Science of Science and Innovation Policy Program, the funding of the basic science necessary to advance the theoretical and empirical underpinnings of science policy.
- All Federal science and technology agencies should work in partnership on the creation of analytical methods that are most...
appropriate for their mission needs. A strong consensus emerged, for example, that agencies should develop pilot standards that would identify ways of measuring the value of knowledge, and that agencies should work together to identify a core suite of measures describing technology adoption and diffusion.

Perhaps the most important outcome of the December 2008 Workshop was the new focus on engaging non-Federal organizations in the science of science policy. Participants were considerably interested in establishing mechanisms, such as community websites, that would promote discussion and analysis. There was also great interest in following up on the initial Workshop with a series of more highly focused meetings that would examine issues such as technology adoption, data set creation and other high priority issues.

In keeping with the goal of building a community of practice, the Science of Science Policy ITG partnered with NSF’s Science of Science & Innovation Policy (SciSIP) program 1 to develop a listserv and a website. The listserv is now “the” place to exchange ideas on science and innovation policy, with over 600 active participants from the practitioner, academic and international communities. The website provides a more formal virtual space where the academic community can interact with the practitioner community. Information about science policy can be found in a number of ways. One is through the search engine, another is through the clickable “tag clouds,” and another on the wiki. There is also information about upcoming workshops, conferences, and both national and international events. As the science of science area grows, it can only be expected that the listserv will grow in size and vibrancy.

Another key feature of this website is that it has profiles of each SciSIP grantee, together with their areas of specialization, related publications, and key “findings” related to SciSIP research. Those findings are two or three sentence summary statements, backed up by working papers, publications, websites, code, or datasets. The website, and information on how to join the listserv, is accessible at http://scienceofsciencepolicy.net.

Remarkable progress has been made since Dr. Marburger first discussed the science of science policy in May 2005. To put this effort into perspective, a similar effort to develop a rigorous analytical and empirical framework for understanding the labor market was undertaken over 30 years ago by several Federal agencies. That effort, which has been acknowledged as contributing to our current ability to understand labor demand and supply, was based on developing a strong data infrastructure and creating new analytical tools and models that could be used not just by the Federal agencies, but also by academia and private industry.

2 Science and Technology in America’s Reinvestment Measuring the Effect of Research on Innovation, Competitiveness and Science.

Continued on next page
That model of data and tool development is exactly the course that the science policy community is now embarked upon. It may take 10–20 years to fulfill the vision that Dr. Marburger articulated in 2005, but the end products will give science policymakers access to rigorous and reliable analytical frameworks that will explain the contribution of investments in science and technology to our Nation’s economic and social well-being.

A major impetus has been provided by ARRA which has required science agencies, and recipients of science funding, to provide American taxpayers with precise information on the value of their investments. The Science of Policy Interagency Group has responded by creating the STAR METRICS project—a broad partnership of Federal Science and Technology funding agencies based on a shared vision for developing data infrastructures and products to support evidence based analyses of S&T returns on investment, as well as to inform policy making. The initial goal of STAR METRICS is to provide reliable and consistent mechanisms that will allow participating federal agencies and universities to account for the number of scientists and staff that are on research institution payrolls and supported by federal funds. In subsequent generations of the program, it is expected that STAR METRICS will allow for measurement of science impact on economic outcomes (such as job creation), on knowledge generation (such as citations and patents), as well as on social and health outcomes. As such, it should provide a firm basis for advancing the science of policy.

Diane DiEuliis received her Ph.D. in biological sciences at the University of Delaware. She then completed a research fellowship at the National Institutes of Health intramural research program in cellular neurobiology, focusing on the molecular and morphological features of neuronal cells. She specialized in light, confocal, and electron microscopy techniques. She completed a fellowship at the University of Pennsylvania, studying the cellular aspects of Alzheimer’s and Parkinson’s diseases, in particular, the role of alpha synuclein in the Parkinson’s disease pathway. Following her laboratory research, Dr. DiEuliis became a program director at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, where she began managing the Alzheimer’s and Parkinson’s disease portfolio of research grants and programs. She developed several strategic research plans for Parkinson’s disease, coordinating with the Department of Defense and Veteran’s Administration programs, which helped to expand and diversify the field of federal research on Parkinson’s. She now maintains many of these planning programs annually, and manages the Udall Centers program. Currently Dr. DiEuliis is also working as a senior policy advisor in the President’s Office of Science and Technology Policy. Her policy focus is within the life sciences, and she is the staff director for several subcommittees within the Committee on Science, including research business models, human subjects research, and the science of policy science.

Dr. Julia I. Lane is the Program Director of the Science of Science & Innovation Policy program at the National Science Foundation. Her previous jobs included Senior Vice President and Director, Economics Department at NORC/University of Chicago, Director of the Employment Dynamics Program at the Urban Institute, Senior Research Fellow at the U.S. Census Bureau and Assistant, Associate and Full Professor at American University. Julia has published over 60 articles in leading economics journals, and authored or edited six books. She became an American Statistical Association Fellow in 2009. She has been the recipient of over $20 million in grants; from foundations such as the National Science Foundation, the Sloan Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, the Spencer Foundation, the National Institute of Health; from government agencies such as the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Health and Human Services in the U.S., the ESRC in the U.K., and the Department of Labour and Statistics New Zealand in New Zealand, as well as from international organizations such as the World Bank. She has organized over 30 national and international conferences, received several national awards, given keynote speeches all over the world, and serves on a number of national and international advisory boards. She is one of the founders of the LEHD program at the Census Bureau, which is the first large scale linked employer-employee dataset in the United States. A native of England who grew up in New Zealand, Julia has worked in a variety of countries, including Australia, Germany, Malaysia, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco,Namibia, Sweden, and Tunisia. Her undergraduate degree was in Economics with a minor in Japanese from Massey University in New Zealand; her M.A. in Statistics and Ph.D. in Economics are from the University of Missouri in Columbia. She is fluent in Swedish and German and speaks conversational French.

Bill Valdez is the Director of the Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists within the Department of Energy’s Office of Science. His responsibilities include developing workforce strategies for the Department’s scientific and technical workforce, and creating opportunities for students and educators to participate in the Nation’s research enterprise as a means to improving the competitiveness of U.S. industry and overall scientific literacy. Previously, Mr. Valdez was the Director of Planning and Analysis at the Department of Energy’s Office of Science. His responsibilities included corporate strategic planning, R&D evaluation, and Federal S&T policy development. Mr. Valdez was awarded the Presidential Rank Award (meritorious) in 2007, was elected as a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 2006, and is Vice Chair of the Senior Executive Association’s Board of Directors. Prior to working at DOE, Mr. Valdez worked as a Senior Project Manager in private industry where he provided strategic planning services to Asian and European multinational corporations. Mr. Valdez received a Bachelor of Arts from the University of Texas and his Master of Arts in International Economics and Energy Policy from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.
Scientific Cooperation with CHINA in the Face of

By Eugene B. Skolnikoff

Technology export controls have bedeviled American science, trade, and international industrial relations for many years. Originally intended to prevent American technology from reaching unfriendly hands where it could be used against the U.S., the controls were largely a response to the Cold War confrontation with the Soviet Union. The controls have not been significantly eased since the end of the Cold War, with terrorists in general and China specifically (among some officials) providing the continuing rationale. Visa restrictions on foreign scientists and students, made considerably more stringent after 9/11, have also had a negative effect on scientific relations with other countries, though the student and professional interactions with China appear to have largely recovered. It is the controls on the export of scientific and technological information and products that today have the greatest impact on cooperation with China.

Evaluation of the role of export controls must be seen in the context of a significant evolution over the past decade or more in the international political system. China, and some other developing nations notably India and Brazil, have become much larger economic, and thus political, players. China in particular has been growing economically at unprecedented rates that are continuing even in the face of the global recession. Along with, and largely a product of, its expanding economic strength, China’s international posture has become more assertive as it increasingly takes positions in negotiations that do not follow or accept U.S. or other Western nation’s preferences; the U.N. negotiations over Iran and nuclear weapons are a vivid example, and climate change another. China’s moves to invest substantially in energy resources, particularly oil, around the world have aroused the concern (often exaggerated) of other nations also dependent on imported energy resources.

Domestically, China has been moving to become not just a rapidly developing economy, but also one that is leading the way in adoption of the latest technologies and taking the steps to become a leading scientific nation. Its installation of high-speed trains, use of new building materials, construction of modern nuclear plants, and emphasis on the latest low-emission coal technology in its enormous investment in electricity generation, are indeed impressive. These investments are in the face of continuing major problems of pollution, poverty, and political unrest which have not, however, deflected China from attempting to achieve technological excellence at the same time.

For the long run, and of the greatest significance to American science and technology, is the Chinese investment in their universities and particularly in scientific research. China has sharply increased its proportion of citizens attending universities and graduates more scientists and engineers than does the US, though the quality of the education makes direct comparisons difficult and often misleading. Between 1995 and 2006, China’s gross expenditure on R&D grew at an annual rate of 18 per cent. China now ranks third on that measure, just behind the U.S. and Japan and ahead of any
Controls on Technology

individual European Union state. Its output of scientific papers, some 112,000 peer-reviewed articles per year according to Thomson Reuters is one-third of the American total, but rising much more rapidly. The Chinese are well aware that the growth of their paper output may not mean as much as it appears, for they realize their papers do not have the scientific impact they seek. Whatever the comparisons today, the breadth and scale of resources devoted to education and R&D clearly indicates China’s ambitions and serious commitment.

At first blush, it would seem that the investment China is making in science and technology, which will inevitably hold significant long term economic and military implications, should make the U.S. even more concerned about maintaining control over science and technology that could be valuable to China. Whatever justification for that position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in the past, the situation today with China dictates the opposite. The growth of scientific competence throughout the world, making the U.S. but one of the world’s leaders in science, not the dominant scientific leader, has fundamentally altered the landscape.

Now, it is critical for the health of U.S. science, as well as for national security, that the country stay abreast of research wherever it is conducted. That is as essential for maintaining scientific excellence as it is to protect against unwelcome surprises. Moreover, in such an environment, scientific knowledge cannot long remain secret; even details of technology will eventually migrate or be developed elsewhere. This does not mean that no controls over export of technology may ever be warranted, but they must be minimal and targeted only on subjects that have an immediate bearing on security (e.g. technology for operation control of weapons). For, quite quickly, the unique military value of a particular technology will erode, and unnecessary controls will have the anomalous effect of reducing security by undermining the strength of the American scientific and technological enterprises.

Scientific cooperation in today’s world is not a zero-sum game (if it ever was); both sides benefit. The stronger China becomes in science and technology, the more important it is to be working with Chinese scientists and their growing community and resources. But the export controls presently in place in the U.S. militate against open cooperation. Any subject that might be on the “munitions list” (not necessarily known in advance) that could be weaponized, requires prior license before it can be disclosed to a foreign national. The licensing process can be long and arduous, and the outcome is often uncertain. The American corporate world has been most directly hurt, with loss of contracts and creation of incentives for emergence of competition in other countries where none existed before. The American space satellite industry in particular has been eviscerated by the export control impediments put in the way of corporate involvement in international space collaboration. But, scientific cooperation has been deeply affected as well and will be more so as long as the present controls are in place.

The effects of the controls have potentially been made more draconian by the concern over “deemed” export. A report of the Inspectors-General of six Federal agencies in 2004, asserted that giving information that might be on the controlled list to a foreign student or scientist in the U.S. is tantamount to exporting the information out of the country. Information that is covered explicitly includes the technology used in research, not just the subject of the research. If rules were promulgated to require licensing of potentially controlled information before sharing with foreign students, it would in effect turn American research universities into fragmented laboratories requiring prior vetting of foreign students or scientists for each laboratory. It would be an intolerable burden on the universities and on any open movement of science. Such rules were actually proposed in March, 2005 for 60-day review before promulgation in the Federal Register, but were withdrawn when cooler heads prevailed and in the face of vehement protests.

Nevertheless, the export control situation has become such an albatross around American scientists and corporations that President Obama in his January 2010 State of the Union address announced his intention to review the subject, and the administration has begun publicly to indicate the need for change. Discussions were held with Congressional leaders in January with the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Adviser and other senior administration officials making clear their dissatisfaction with the current legislation and control process. It is an open question as yet as to how the controls will be changed or if they will. Senior
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As a departmental administrator, I am charged with accomplishing the business operations of the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine at The University of Tennessee Center Health Science Center in Memphis, Tennessee. A simple enough concept, but that phrase, “business operations,” incorporates a multitude of varied duties and tasks that can keep anyone occupied at least eight hours a day. And then came the stimulus!

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, or ARRA, provided an economic stimulus intended to create jobs and promote investment and consumer spending. For universities, this meant much-needed and much-sought-after research dollars available from the government to promote hiring of research personnel and purchase of laboratory supplies and equipment. The ARRA also allowed university personnel to retain their jobs which might otherwise have been on the chopping block.

 Universities, especially state institutions, have been hit hard by this economic downturn as a result of sliding state revenues. Though the middle-level administrators at my university have been warned that “reductions in force” will occur, we don’t know when it will happen or how many employees will be targeted. We will ALL be affected, as most of us are working with skeleton crews as it is.

So what is a Departmental Administrator to do in the midst of all of this turmoil? This situation is like nothing we’ve seen before. Sure, we’ve had to lay off folks in the past due to the ending of a grant budget, or a slight downturn in state revenues; but never have we had to use our management skills more than in the last year or two. We have a greater number of duties and tasks to be performed and fewer workers to accomplish the job. We have employees who are frightened that they may lose their jobs, their health care insurance, and their retirement contributions. Last summer was a mixture of golden opportunity and outright chaos as every researcher in the land competed for the ARRA funds. My staff and I filled out more technical government forms and created more budgets in a limited amount of time than ever before. Our faculty scientists, working primarily on cancer research, updated their biographical sketches and described their scientific procedures and goals with great anticipation. We managed to meet the deadlines and ended up with two ARRA-sponsored grants. For a department with a research faculty of only eleven, we are very proud of those two grants!

For the departmental administrator, submission of grant applications and administering the grant once it is received is just one of many responsibilities of the job. Besides grant administration, I am also responsible for all human resource functions of my department, all accounting and finance issues, visa and immigration tasks, PR and special projects, supporting the student and residency education programs of the department, as well as all other faculty needs, and last but not least, personal and professional counseling for anyone who walks in the door with a problem.

Am I an expert? Only if you believe this quote from P.J. Plauger, “My definition of an expert in any field is a person who knows enough about what’s really going on to be scared.”

We all want to follow the rules and protect our institutions from harm. We want to represent our faculty and our departments with numbers that are true and information that is accurate. We’ve all heard the horror stories of institutions who unknowingly or even maliciously report false data. It’s MY job, along with that of the compliance officers on campus, to make sure that doesn’t happen in my department. Yep—it can be scary! I take that responsibility very seriously.

I realize that some institutions are large enough that they actually have “Grant Managers” in each department who are dedicated to overseeing the grant process from start to finish. How envious I am! People like this have the OMB Circular A-21 memorized. These folks are the ones with the big white boards on their office walls, with flow charts that show each grant application and where it is in its creation and routing process. I don’t even have time to hang the board!

I am fortunate, however, to oversee a wonderful staff who share the excitement of chasing the grant dollars and supporting our faculty in their cancer research. Though small in numbers, the staff members are dedicated with their time and energy to assist each researcher and me to ensure a quality application each and every time. Our university has an extremely efficient and knowledgeable Office of Research Administration with a staff that answers our questions, guides us in the abyss, and soothes our tempers when time is running short.
As for administering the grant once it has been received, our Office of Sponsored Projects is also supportive with expertise that has been built through years of experience. These folks know the rules and regulations of the NIH and other granting agencies and are fluent in the policies and procedures of our university.

Though we’re not allowed to buy them actual gifts or tokens of our appreciation as state employees, we’ve learned to let the Research Administration and the Sponsored Projects folks know that we recognize and value their work on our behalf, sometimes with a word and occasionally with a hand-written note or email. Every good southern girl (and guy) knows the value of a hand-written thank-you note!

In other words, no administrator is an island. In fact, through these tough times—as one would expect—we have built a stronger team with a more-defined mission and better skills. We have created bonds with other staff and faculty members in different departments as our researchers collaborate with faculty in other areas. Our organizational chart has never been a pyramid, but now is even more circular than ever as the lines of communication and supervisory reporting are all-encompassing.

The reports for the stimulus grants are submitted through our Sponsored Projects office quarterly. When it’s time for the numbers, they contact me. I sit down with my budget assistant, and we run the numbers. Our accounting system, IRIS, is flexible enough to let us design reports that make it easy to get what we need, both in accounting and human resources. We can run an all-posting list for the period we are reporting to discover the vendors used and amounts of the expenses. I can run payroll summaries or employment authorization reports to follow hiring data. The researchers write a short summary of their progress. I prepare the preliminary information in the acceptable format, submit it to the team in Sponsored Projects, and they assemble the final report for the entire campus.

For my department, this report is not terribly time consuming, but the information is valuable. I am proud to say that we have both retained and created new positions as a result of our two stimulus grants.

There is one other person who is instrumental in helping me maintain my cool as my university world spins around me: the Chair of my department. I’m one of the lucky departmental administrators who has a boss who is truly a visionary. He has a dream that has inspired our faculty and staff to “go for the gold.” We believe we can do anything as a result of his trust and faith in us. We will continue to submit grant applications—stimulus or not—that will enable us to do the research that will eventually help cure one of the most devastating diseases on our planet: cancer. We will continue to study, learn, and share because what we are doing is important.

Barbara Frederick. Master of Public Administration, is the Business Manager for the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine at The University of Tennessee Health Science Center in Memphis. She has served this department since 2004. Previously, she worked in the Department of Surgery as Assistant Manager for seventeen years and seven years as the Administrator for a local anesthesia private practice group, Metropolitan Anesthesia Alliance. The Department of Pathology has a faculty of approximately seventy paid and volunteer members, with additional postdocs, research assistants, and office staff. The department includes student and residency education and teaching programs as well as a recently-created Division of Experimental Pathology housed in the new Cancer Research Building. The Department works closely in research, teaching, and patient care with the Methodist University Hospital, the Veterans Administration Medical Center, LeBonheur Children’s Medical Center, and St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital.

Barbara is active on the UTHSC campus, serving on various committees, i.e., the Postdoctoral Advisory Committee. She is a member of the National Council of University Research Administrators and the American Association of Pathology Chairs. She is also active in the Memphis community, singing with the Memphis Symphony Chorus and serving on various boards within the classical music community.

**NCURA Magazine Seeks Articles for Special “Green” Issue**

The NCURA Magazine seeks articles for a special, electronic-only, issue focusing on the “greening” of research administration. This issue will be published in Summer 2010 and will only contain feature articles.

Responsive articles will focus on the “greening” of research administration and/or the furthering of electronic research administration (eRA) in the workplace. The entire field of research administration is open to this special issue, whether central or departmental, domestic or international, financial or non-financial, etc.

Individuals interested in submitting articles for this special issue should email their specific idea to Jim Casey, Magazine senior editor, at james.casey@utsa.edu. The deadline for submission of articles is July 1, 2010.
NCURA raised $1,200 for Haiti Relief in a raffle! Jane Youngers and Dave Richardson present raffle winner Jerry Fife with his winnings: one free registration to NCURA’s 52nd Annual Meeting!
(For more information on the 52nd Annual Meeting, please turn to page 15)
FRA Co-Chairs Tracey Fraser and Cindy Hope are pleased to report that the eleventh Financial Research Administration conference was a huge success with an attendance of over 700! Located in the heart of San Antonio, attendees were able to come together to hear about the latest developments in the field of Research Administration and to discuss technical issues and practical solutions with peers, while taking advantage of various networking opportunities.

This year’s conference offered sessions on a variety of topics, including Post Award issues, Clinical Research/Hospital topics, F&A and Costing, Audit and Compliance, Federal issues, Policy and Resource Management topics and Special Interest topics. The program also included 16 workshops and 4 senior level seminars.

Dr. Julia Lane, Program Director for the Science of Science and Innovation Policy at NSF and Dr. John Voeller, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Representative to the STAR (Science and Technology in American’s Recovery) delivered an outstanding plenary lecture discussing the best means by which to measure the larger community impact of federal investment in scientific research. It was easy for the audience to stay and engaged and the high level of audience participation and the quality of the feedback and suggestions welcomed by Dr. Lane and Dr. Voeller was especially refreshing!

Attendees were pleased with the conference overall and are looking forward to next year!
Richards and Associates... we make your research enterprise train stay on track and run with timely precision.

When you need quality professional assistance in any area of the research enterprise, Richards & Associates can solve your problem. We have decades of university, consulting, NACUBO faculty, and federal government experience (former DCA negotiators) coupled with a “can do” attitude.

- F&A Cost Rate Proposal
- Composite fringe benefits
- Rate negotiation
- Space survey including funcitonalization
- Effort reporting
- Pre-award proposal and award tracking control
- Streamlining, quality assurance, policy and procedure development
- Reach us for more...

Richards & Associates

John Richards, Principal

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

909-214-1523

The first Master of Science in Bioethics with a specialization in Research Ethics

Designed for professionals in the biomedical and related academic fields who are interested in research ethics; including IRB and CRO professionals, pharmaceutical and biotech researchers, and compliance officers.

A hybrid online/onsite program that offers an overview of the philosophical, ethical and legal frameworks for approaching the design, conduct and oversight of clinical trials, as well as hands-on experience through innovative online and onsite practicums.

The Bioethics Program

For information contact Ann Nolte, Assistant Director
The Bioethics Program
518-631-9860
bioethics@uniongraduatecollege.edu

UNION GRADUATE COLLEGE
MOUNT SAVANNAH SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
At the Confluence of Creation and Collaboration

52nd Annual Meeting

The program for NCURA’s 52nd Annual Meeting (AM52) is shaping up beautifully! The meeting theme, “At the Confluence of Creation and Collaboration” represents the interdependent relationship between the researcher and the research administrator. Many offerings will touch upon the job of the research administrator as being one of facilitation and “going the extra mile” to advance the research enterprise at our respective colleges and universities.

With concurrent presentations and interactive, small group “solution discussions” identified in tracks such as pre- and post-award, compliance, and departmental, plus offerings for industry, international, and clinical settings peppered throughout, the program will celebrate the multi-faceted arena of research administration where every day is different and career-long learning opportunities abound. Yet often at the root of what we love about our work is the collaboration with researchers. Few professions allow such opportunity to be “in the know” and connected with life-changing and cutting-edge research.

A Sense of Community

When asked what our major goal for this year’s meeting was, Judy, Craig and Diane had exactly the same thought: community. One of the greatest perks of being an NCURA member is the connections we build with each other. These connections occur in different ways: connections with colleagues who can help us with issues they have dealt with, connections with our federal partners and connections through friendships that are formed and continued. We wanted to provide as many opportunities for connections with each other and, as a result, have made some major changes this year.

As you read on, you will see that this is a meeting of change, and you will see changes in more ways than one. First, we are back home at the beautifully renovated Washington Hilton. Come see what a $140 million landmark restoration project looks like. You will be amazed. A few items of interest: a Starbucks in the lobby area, the small conference rooms have been reconfigured and now have state-of-the art technology and audiovisual capabilities, the pool area has been totally refurbished and moved, and the exhibit space has doubled. There is an elegant new bar in the lobby next to the Capital Café, which has also been refurbished and renamed The District Line. All 1,070 guest rooms have been updated. This is just the beginning. Ladies, there are now 79 bathroom stalls near the meeting areas!

Our meeting hotel is not all that has changed. Keep reading!

Welcome to the NCURA Tailgate Reunion!

Following the Sunday Workshops, AM52 will officially begin with a dinner event, as it has in years past. We will gather in the ballroom as usual, but in this case “ballroom” means a large room with balls. Footballs. You read that correctly – we are having an NCURA Tailgate Reunion! Gone is the formal banquet. Come hungry to meet and mingle, while enjoying a variety of “tailgate” food. Plan to dress casually and wear your school colors. This event will be an ideal opportunity to reconnect with old friends and make new ones in an inclusive, relaxed and enjoyable forum. There will be no formal entertainment, though we may have a surprise or two in store. Look for your Program Committee in their football finery. More details will be forthcoming.

Keynote Address

We are very excited about our keynote speaker this year. Daniel Pink is the author of the book Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us. This book uses 40 years of behavioral science to overturn the conventional wisdom about human motivation and offer a more effective path to high performance. You may have seen the book in your local bookstore: it hit the New York Times bestseller list in the first month of publication. While at the bookstore, you might also have seen Pink’s A Whole New Mind: Why Right-Brainers Will Rule the Future. It also has been on the New York Times and BusinessWeek bestseller lists and so far has been

Continued on next page
translated into 21 languages. Does that sound dry? Not on your life. Is it important to me? Absolutely. In this time of incredible budget constraints, Pink addresses how to use rewards – and how not to use them – to improve performance. He is a person you will want to listen to. He is entertaining and has fascinating information, information that will change the way you think about your work and maybe about your life.

Regional Reunions

In recognition of the vital role our regions play in the NCURA community, time has been scheduled on Monday after lunch for regional reunions. This format will give the regions a scheduled opportunity to connect with new members and discuss regional matters. Members can expect to be updated on regional initiatives, introduce and welcome new members, and engage the regional membership in conversation about strategic plans, volunteer initiatives, etc. Your regions are there for you, so meet for dessert, and chat about how your region is better than all of the others.

Dinner Groups

The ever-popular dinner groups will meet on Monday evening as usual. The NCURA National Office always has a great selection of restaurants to choose from. The difficulty is making a decision! Menus will be posted early with the sign-up sheets. Most of the restaurants are within a short walking distance, and it is another opportunity to meet some folks and spend some time together while sampling a bit of what Washington has to offer.

Soul Source and the No-Cost Extensions

Per tradition, join us on Tuesday night for the 21st anniversary of NCURA’s own house band the Soul Source and the No-cost Extensions. Come rock to “Got Your F&A Right Here!” as well more traditional rock and roll favorites. Led by the talented past NCURA President Steve Smartt of Vanderbilt University and including various NCURA members from around the country, the Soul Source night is a perennial favorite at the Annual Meeting.

Many of us have grown up as research administrators listening and dancing to this group over the last 20 years. Sadly, as all good things must come to an end, this will be Soul Source’s Farewell Tour. Join us as we thank these talented colleagues and friends for their dedication to our entertainment these last two decades, and wish them the best.

See You There

Come join us for a meeting that will be a confluence of its own. There is much that remains NCURA tradition – enough to make us know that we are home. There are new things to try, all leading towards even greater connections among our NCURA family. Like rivers joining together, the old and the new will blend to make a fantastic meeting. We hope you will be a part of it.

The Shifting Shape of Science in the Future...Continued from page 4

targeted funding rather than hoping serendipity and enough people working the problems would yield best solutions. As one might expect, with a long heritage of well planned integrated thinking, the impediment to a fuller view of this in Japan is the intense competition and keritzu.

In a similar vein, the STAR-METRICS4 program by OSTP, NSF and NIH will begin to lay the foundation to trace the impact of science investments on knowledge as well as economic and social outcomes in an unprecedented way. However, STAR may set the form of future metrics but not the substance. The substance of future metrics needed to show the value of future expenditure in research will likely contain some elements of priority addressing of national and global issues even if it delays progress in other domains for a time.

For me, this point in time looks just as amazing and exciting for research and what it can accomplish as it must have seemed for the students who attended the 1876 Centennial Exposition and saw their first Corliss engine, the first telephone or first telegraph. The combined effectiveness of the teams of researchers, funders, administrators and convertors of knowledge into actions is the key to a new research renaissance for our world but unlike much of the past, it will be a renaissance of discovery tuned by purpose and priority with methods to confirm if both are achieved. For the next century, science policy will contain a significant component of the same type of massive improvement we have seen in the science itself. This will be similar to moving from the convenient, expedient model to a highly optimized, multi-value vectored model necessary to allow science to compete successfully with the other attentions guaranteed present in our future.

John Voeller is a Senior Vice President at Black & Veatch and a strategic consultant in government and industry. After service in the Office of Science & Technology Policy during President Bush’s Administration from 2003-2008, he now serves as a management consultant to government and industry. After service in the Office of Science & Technology Policy during President Bush’s Administration from 2003-2008, he now serves as a management consultant to government and industry. After service in the Office of Science & Technology Policy during President Bush’s Administration from 2003-2008, he now serves as a management consultant to government and industry.

4 Presentation by Dr. Julia Lane at NCURA annual meeting, March 4, 2010.
4 http://www.eng.msu.edu/corlissj/gc_engine.html
ARRA Awards One Year Later:
The Dawning of a New Age of Compliance?
Ruth E. Torres, MPA

January 2010 marked the end of the second reporting period for recipients of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) stimulus awards. According to the report submitted to Congress by the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, “on January 30, 2010, nearly 162,000 reports were posted on Recovery.gov website. Collecting, transferring and publicizing reports from all 50 states and U.S. territories within a 30 day turnaround period was a massive and remarkable accomplishment. Requiring transparency of government spending is a double edged sword. Transparency promotes accountability, but also reveals the flaws and problems with government and university systems.”1 The NCURA Washington Update Report corroborates that the rigors of ARRA reporting have forced government to look for ways to improve its data infrastructure. The systems currently in place operate separately, making it difficult to extract information useful in tracking and disseminating scientific funding outcomes.2 These statements confirm that both government and institutions agree: the burden of meeting the ARRA accountability obligation has been a taxing and expensive venture for everyone. As primary recipients of stimulus funding, this is particularly true for biomedical and academic research institutions, and the price of growing the necessary research enterprise has been high. Biomedical and academic research institutions have had to restructure their ways of doing business to meet the stringent ARRA award requirements. As we continue on this ARRA journey, what lessons have been learned? Is ARRA a blessing, a call to change, or just a momentary business enterprise which, once successfully completed, will be quickly forgotten? One thing is certain - ARRA has already revolutionized the way government and academic institutions address issues of compliance, accountability, and transparency.

ARRA Awards and Biomedical Research

According to the National Institutes of Health (NIH), $8.4 billion out of the $10.4 billion stimulus funding was earmarked for research priorities; $7.4 billion awarded was transferred to institutes, centers and common funds; and $800 million was transferred to the Office of the Director to support challenge grants (programs focused on health and science problems) where progress can be expected in two years.3 As documented in the NIH Research Portfolio Online Reporting Tools (RePORT, http://report.nih.gov/recovery/), Columbia University Medical Center, my employer, received approximately $62 million of this funding, not including ARRA contracts. Managing and administering this funding posed many challenges for our Sponsored Research Administration (SPA) team who had to re-invent the way they were conducting business.

During the pre-award phase, our faculty and staff produced grant proposals in record time. Never before had I seen such a production! SPA officers, faculty members, administrators, and technical staff worked unceasingly around the clock to review and remit proposal applications. In our small department, in less than a month’s time our faculty developed, composed, reviewed, and submitted 12 ARRA proposals. No sooner did the buzz of ARRA submissions die down when the task of “just in time” and award announcements began to arrive.

In preparation for the arrival of these awards, our SPA team met for weeks in advance with key service departments (e.g., human resources, information technology) to develop reporting systems that would address fundamental ARRA requirements. Tirelessly, they worked around the clock to develop templates, personnel systems links, and upgrades that would enable our system to produce quarterly reports that not only satisfied financial accountability but could also track job creation and retention activities. An ARRA team was assembled with the sole responsibility of preparing and disseminating ARRA quarterly reports. From a bird’s eye view, it was amazing to watch how our SPA team pulled off such an amazing feat in such short time. Despite getting the job done, it was evident from the SPA Departmental Forum updates that the ARRA accountability requirements were imposing an extreme burden on the team and university resources. The post-award management experience also left everyone breathless and hoping that the nightmare would end soon. Not ironically, when I attended NCURA’s Financial Research Administrator IX meeting in February, 2010, similar sentiments were expressed by many other colleagues. The mere mention of “ARRA” struck terror and discomfort among many. Nonetheless, I could not shake the feeling that ARRA, with all its difficulties, had heralded the dawning of a new age of compliance. Could it be that, when the ARRA furor ends, the standard way that federal research dollars are managed will be totally revolutionized?

ARRA: Lessons Learned

With respect to sponsored projects administration at Columbia University Medical Center, several good things have
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already come out of the ARRA initiative. First and foremost, our university has created an ARRA reporting system that does not burden our already overwhelmed faculty with the task of preparing and uploading progress reports on a quarterly basis. Each quarter, our faculty receives a pre-populated electronic progress report template which, with little effort, is edited and submitted to the ARRA team for electronic remittance. Financial reports are also remitted in the same fashion. Spending trends are closely monitored to ensure timely expenditure of funding. When variances and financial discrepancies are noted, departments and principal investigators (PIs) are notified to explain and correct these problems prior to submission. With respect to job creation and retention, PIs are also required to justify significant changes. Concurrently, I have noted a vast improvement in the development of a structured compliance program at Columbia University.

With the support of university leadership, Columbia University SPA and Sponsored Projects Finance (SPF) Offices have been proactive in the creation of a more stringent compliance culture throughout the university. Administrators are now required to attend research compliance educational seminars and are encouraged to report research misconduct to the university Office of Research Compliance and Training (ORCT). Public and individual departmental forums are being held frequently and as a community of administrators, we are called upon to work on better business solutions. To have developed and launched these initiatives in the midst of one of the busiest times in the history of research administration is laudable, and supports the strong need for effective financial compliance programs, despite cost and other challenges. Our university’s SPA and SPF websites are now loaded with the latest information on NIH, ARRA, administrative office changes, standard operating procedures, policies and important links (www.spa.columbia.edu and www.evpr.columbia.edu).

At the same time, Columbia University, like many other institutions, struggles with having to work with antiquated policies, accounting systems, and processes. With the current state of the economy, it is simply too costly to implement new technology and hire the manpower needed to effectively meet the complex government sponsored program requirements. So, behind the scenes we continue to make the impossible happen. We document accounts payable submissions profusely to legitimize a grant-required expense; we place countless phone calls to our student accounts office to ensure that journal entries are promptly processed to avoid delays in grant spending and in the submission of financial reports; and we look for creative ways to hire non typical but ARRA-funding target groups (i.e., disadvantaged summer high school student workers). Is it possible that these archaic policies and systems will finally be revamped after the ARRA frenzy ends? Or, reeling from the strains of a struggling economy, will universities simply fall back into the old ways of doing business? Having relished the beauty of transparency, is it possible that the government might help revitalize university infrastructures (e.g., allow administrative staff salaries on grant budgets) so that academic institutions can continue to develop their research enterprise, thereby allowing government to continue to monitor federal award spending in this new rigorous way? Indeed, the federal government wants transparency and is concerned about the way? Indeed, the federal government wants transparency and is concerned about the way? Indeed, the federal government wants transparency and is concerned about the way? Indeed, the federal government wants transparency and is concerned about the way? Indeed, the federal government wants transparency and is concerned about the way?

ARRA Today, Gone Tomorrow?

In reviewing the sponsored projects administration websites of four prominent research universities, Harvard, Yale, Duke, and Washington University, I noted ARRA similarities. Like Columbia University, these sites listed the ARRA component separately, as if its existence and purpose was totally different than that of a regular grant. It is true that the transparency requirement and frequency of reporting is what differentiates ARRA-funded grants from standard federal award mechanisms. However, the reality is that ARRA awards are governed by the same cost principles which govern most federally-funded awards. When the ARRA fanfare dies down, will universities remove these sites, cancel their training and compliance programs, and place sponsored projects administration at the bottom of their lists of priorities? I do not believe that will be the case. “The fastest-growing area of federal research funding is biomedical research, a field in which breakthroughs yield economic and ‘quality of life’ returns.” It is in the best interest of leaders of biomedical institutions to look for ways to improve current sponsored research compliance programs in order to maintain current funding and assure continued funding. In the short term, the venture may be costly, but in the long run, many strong infrastructures will gain public trust, provide optimal service to its clientele, reduce the incidences of fraud, minimize errors, and relieve overwhelmed faculty members of the cumbersome task of navigating through complex university systems and processes. Government will also be able to more effectively measure the social and economic impact of research on American society.

Next Steps

Coming close on the heels of the doubling of the NIH budget, the ARRA phenomenon has continued to push universities and government to ensure change to meet the avalanche of data that transparency and accountability require. If these requirements are here to stay, research institutions must look for ways to continue to develop this enterprise with limited resources. ARRA and its idiosyncrasies have been powerful factors in prompting government to begin to research ways to improve its business. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Office of Science and Technology Policy


(OSTP) have partnered with other agencies to develop data infrastructures that can track the effect of research on society, the economy, and science. Universities continue to partner with other service departments to produce policies that improve our business and enforce compliance. Could it be that, despite the growing pains, ARRA was a good thing for sponsored projects administration? I believe that ARRA not only jump started the economy, particularly in the academic research arena, but improved universities’ management processes and instilled a rigorous new culture of compliance across campuses. Although the federal government and biomedical institutions still have a long journey ahead of them, it appears that they have begun to embrace the dawning of a new age of compliance.

Scientific Cooperation with China in the Face of U.S. Controls on Technology...Continued from page 9

Congressional figures have tended to be exercised about China and its future challenges without, apparently, recognizing the costs to American security of attempting to protect the nation by denial rather than cooperation.

In any case, it is essential to recognize that it is not the specific scientific or technological knowledge that is the most important for a nation’s economic and military strength, but the ability of an economy to use that knowledge. So far, the U.S. economy is still unparalleled in its ability to innovate, to turn scientific and technological knowledge into useful applications and products. The Chinese are well aware of this. It is one of their motivations in allowing, nay encouraging, Chinese students to come to the U.S. for university study and to work in technology industries. Now, China is attempting to lure back those who have been successful innovators in the U.S. environment. So far, the returning numbers are small, but as China pours more resources into its universities, into research, and into providing venture capital for start-ups, those incentives will become more attractive. In this context, it is essential that the U.S. not only focus on policies to spur innovation, but as a necessary concomitant, to support R&D at a level necessary to continue to be a scientific leader (both of which the administration is now trying to do).

Whatever efforts China makes to become a major scientific player on the world’s stage will eventually be limited as long as it maintains policies that restrict open availability of data and that impose restraints on individuals, including those arising from what they term ‘political activity.’ The continuing attempts to limit access to the global web and to punish seriously those who publicly report government malfeasance or publicize domestic economic data will in time hurt China more than it will protect the regime. These will certainly have a limiting effect on their scientific achievements and reduce both the attractiveness of scientific careers in China and the appeal of international cooperation with them. Whether China will be willing to accept the political implications of genuine open communication remains uncertain.

Conclusion

In sum, unfettered international cooperation in science is of prime importance both to the U.S. and China. For the U.S., it is to keep abreast of and benefit from collaboration with a growing scientific power; for China, it is to recognize and adopt the norms that will enable it to become that scientific power.

By Raina Rose Tagle, Kimberly Ginn, and Ashley Deihr

Most Americans associate the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) with our country’s economic crisis, $787 billion dollars, and the term “transparency.” For Americans that are ALSO Research Administrators, you likely associate ARRA with working late to meet ARRA reporting deadlines, pondering what it means to report “jobs created,” and fretting about whether your principal investigators are spending their ARRA awards timely. As if these worries were not enough, it is also likely that you will be receiving special attention from various auditors if you have not already. Over the past year, we have picked up on some audit themes through our experiences in working closely with internal audit departments, external auditors, and funding agencies. Our goal is to help you to be ready when your time comes.

The Focus for Internal Auditors

Internal audit departments at many institutions have been and will continue to audit ARRA-funded grant activity. Internal auditors often focus their efforts on areas of high risk, including programs that are new and different for an institution or have complex compliance requirements. ARRA grants meet both of these criteria. Internal auditors help to protect their institutions by identifying needed improvements in the infrastructure and controls around critical business processes. So, when internal auditors come knocking, what will they likely want to see? You can anticipate that your internal auditors may employ these types of procedures:

• Examine the systems and processes for tracking, managing, and reporting on ARRA grants. Your internal auditors will identify each additional requirement of ARRA and assess how your systems and processes have been updated to satisfy these requirements. For example, internal auditors may assess whether your financial system is providing timely, up-to-date information for quarterly ARRA reporting.

• Review subawards. Subrecipients of your ARRA grant funding are responsible for following the same regulations that you are. One way that this is enforced is by including these clauses in your subaward agreements. In addition to reviewing the actual subaward documentation, internal auditors may interview researchers at your institution and/or subrecipient personnel to evaluate their understanding of the subrecipient’s suitability to receive ARRA funding.

• Select a sample of ARRA reports and test for accuracy of the data presented. This testing could include interviewing the researchers to understand what proportion of their ARRA-funded work has been completed and comparing that information to the proportion of funds reported as expended, reviewing financial reports for reasonableness and comparing reported amounts to supporting documentation for expenses incurred, and reviewing Human Resources records to assess whether jobs funded by ARRA were reported correctly.

• Compare committed versus actual effort on ARRA grants. Your internal auditors may recognize that researchers who received one or more ARRA grants may be spread too thin and unable to provide the level of effort promised to each sponsor. Internal audit may review the effort reports of these researchers, including interviewing the researchers and their administrators, to understand how the researchers balance their priorities to provide an appropriate level of support for both ARRA and non-ARRA grants.

• Test cost transfers moved onto ARRA grants for cost allowability and timing of the expenses. Your internal auditors may be concerned that researchers will attempt to move costs onto grants in an effort to spend down funds within the limited time period covered by the ARRA funding.

The Focus for External Auditors

Of course, it’s not just your internal auditors who are taking an interest in ARRA grants. Your financial statement auditors who perform Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-133 audits, “Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations” (A-133), will also focus on these grants. A-133 auditors are considering ARRA-funded awards as high-risk, so bear in mind that awards that would not typically get the auditors’ attention are finding their way into the audit program because they are ARRA-funded. In addition to their normal testing procedures, your A-133 auditors may perform the following:

• Review policies and procedures regarding ARRA grants, and hold interviews with research administration personnel, to gain a background of the controls and procedures your institution has in place to effectively manage ARRA awards.

• Understand how ARRA funds are separately tracked in your accounting systems. ARRA funds must be reported separately from other sponsored funding. In general, your external auditors will expect to see a separate field designating a grant as ARRA-funded, or another clear and consistent way to track these funds. It is essential that an institution can track ARRA awards separately and that the awards are not “rolled up” into other reporting numbers.

• Test a sample of costs charged to ARRA grants for allowability. In addition to testing for traditionally unallowable costs per the applicable cost principles, your auditors will also be verifying that ARRA funds were not used for specifically unallowable activities that are outlined in the legislation, such as the building of zoos or golf courses. (Likely your institution will
not be receiving funds to build zoos or golf courses, but we felt that we should include a reference to cover our bases!)

- **Review a sample of reports for completeness, accuracy, and timeliness.** Specifically, your auditors will want to see that your ARRA reports included all data through the end of the quarter, were submitted timely, and accurately and reasonably reflected funds expended and jobs reported. They will likely want to review supporting documentation for many of the numbers reported.

- **Review a sample of ARRA grants to test whether subawards were awarded to any suspended or debarred individuals or organizations.** Also, auditors will want to see that your institution has a policy and process in place that addresses the identification and treatment of suspended and debarred individuals and organizations.

- **Review a sample of subrecipient award documents for correct flowdown language.** The auditors may also review certain communications between your institution and subrecipients.

### The Focus for Offices of Inspectors General

Many of the Offices of the Inspectors General (OIG) for the funding agencies plan to focus heavily on ARRA grants this year. Due to pressures from both Congress and the public for institutions to be good stewards of ARRA money, the OIG will be looking in depth at these grants. In fact, we have learned that OIGs are dedicating more resources to audit ARRA grants and that many OIGs are putting their most experienced auditors on ARRA awards and that many OIGs are dedicating more resources to audit ARRA awards.

So, what specifically will the OIG be looking for?

- **Some frequent issues that major agencies have seen during reporting should be relatively easy to fix, so be sure to address these issues. Don’t let the OIG catch you on something simple!**
  - Wrong award number or date
  - Wrong agency code
  - Submission issues (e.g., no DUNS registered)

- **Duplicate entries in the report fields**

- **The OIG may compare the number of jobs funded to the amount of funds expended.** There have been reports that the OIG has developed a rule of thumb formula for estimating how many jobs should be funded by a certain number of dollars. If you’re not within that threshold, they may ask for more support or perform additional audit testing.

- **The OIG may perform budgeted to actual expenditure analyses to assess whether funds expended are aligned with the work performed.**

### And Finally, How Can You Stay Out of Trouble?

Of course, no one wants to be cited for noncompliance with ARRA requirements, whether it is by your internal audit group, your A-133 audit team, or the OIG. So how can you stay compliant with the myriad of reporting and spend-down requirements? There are certain ongoing and proactive activities that you can undertake to stay on top of ARRA requirements:

- **Work with your internal audit department to identify issues. You’d rather have an internal group find your problems first, right?**

- **If you find significant issues, consider correcting the error in your filed report, if possible. Depending on the error in question, many schools are choosing not to make changes retroactively, but working with the funding agencies to incorporate that information going forward.**

- **Designate a single accountable person for ARRA compliance. This individual should assist the involved individuals to divide and conquer the various responsibilities required by ARRA.**

- **Bring researchers into the equation, especially if someone other than the researchers is providing the information for ARRA reporting. If the OIG interviews the researcher, you want to be sure that what was reported by the institution is consistent with the researcher’s perspective.**

- **Remain abreast of audits being performed and areas being reviewed. As relatively little auditing has been done in this area to date, there is still uncertainty as to the auditors’ specific activities. Monitor list serves and keep lines of communication with your peers open.**

- **Refer to OIG audit reports of other institutions to gain insight into the focus of OIG audits. OIGs publish completed audit reports on their websites.**

- **Keep up with your professional associations! In addition to the National Council of University Research Administrators’ website and publications, the Council on Governmental Relations is an excellent resource to learn more about ARRA.**

- **Stay in the know about upcoming changes. Will there be no-cost extensions? Is more money coming? Hold regular discussions with your governmental relations office.**

- **Don’t be afraid to reach out to the funding agencies for questions on reporting and program requirements. ARRA is new to them, too, and they are expecting your call!**

We would like express our gratitude to Rick Moyer, Associate Vice President of Internal Audit and Institutional Compliance for Stanford University and the Stanford University Medical Center, and Hilary Connolly, Senior Associate Director of Internal Audit for Stanford University, for contributing to this article.

---

Raina Rose Tagle is a Partner at Baker Tilly/Beers + Cutler. Kimberly Ginn is a Senior Manager at Baker Tilly/Beers + Cutler. Ashley Deihr is a Manager at Baker Tilly/Beers + Cutler.
GUIRR Update: February 2010 Meeting
Sensors: from Sea to Space – Innovations and Implications for the Future

By Susan Sauer Sloan

From environmental, industrial, and biomedical applications to advances in aerospace technology, computing power, and biotechnology, sensors impact almost every aspect of our daily life. There’s no question: sensors are set to become a truly pervasive technology, yielding a flood of new data and presenting myriad opportunities and challenges. The ubiquity of sensors is certain to have a huge impact on society.

At its February 2010 meeting, members of the National Academies Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR) examined some of the political, economic, and societal considerations in the global sensors market. The group first considered the use of sensors in the sky (real-time crack monitoring in aircraft, as one example), ground (e.g., infrasound), and space systems (e.g., remote sensing). Discussion then moved to the medical arena, looking at sensors used for screening and surveillance, disease monitoring, and diagnostics. Sensors and systems will be increasingly important in developing high quality, efficient healthcare as the chronic disease burden increases, stated one speaker. They will be impactful in home health, point of care health, and in traditional hospital settings.

In fact, sensors are increasingly a technology of choice for safety (healthcare monitoring, but also infrastructure, disaster prevention, food safety, automobiles, chemical detection), sustainability (energy conservation and management of water, traffic, energy, waste, and agriculture), and security (intrusion detection, location awareness, financial authentication). To the latter, GUIRR members considered the use of IED detection sensors by the military as one means of maintaining national security. And, just like with other industries, sensors are destined to play a key role in the energy/power sector – with the Smart Grid. Sensors will be a part of operating system innovation.

The GUIRR meeting concluded with consideration of sensor networks and privacy, and also questions that arise with the promise of massive amounts of data, for example: How do you improve security? And: How do you convince people to share more of their personal data? Policies that encompass new technologies such as sensors, cloud computing, and social media will need to be updated. There is also a need for greater legal protections.

To view a more expansive written recap of the February 22-23, 2010 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 joined The National Academies on May 27, 2008 as Director of the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR). GUIRR provides a platform for leaders in science and technology from government, academia, and business to discuss and take action on scientific matters of national importance. Before assuming her current role, Ms. Sloan served a six-month appointment as Executive in Residence at the Center for the Advancement of Scholarship on Engineering Education (CASEE) of the National Academy of Engineering and, for the six and a half years prior, as Chief Executive Officer of the Global Wireless Education Consortium (GWEC), a university-industry membership organization committed to the development and incorporation of current wireless technology curricula in academic institutions worldwide. Sloan got her start in Washington, DC, working as a staff assistant to Representative Timothy E. Wirth (D-CO), U.S. House of Representatives. She holds a bachelor’s degree in biology from the University of Oregon in Eugene.

Call for Professional Development Committee Volunteers

NCURA is pleased to announce volunteer opportunities to serve on the Professional Development Committee (PDC). The PDC is responsible for all programming and program development at the national level. Serving on the committee is competency-based. A detailed description of the responsibilities and time commitment are available at http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/opportunities/

Volunteering in your professional organization is an enriching experience. When you share your time and expertise with NCURA, you have the opportunity to assist others grow professionally, expand your network of colleagues and enhance your career!

You can easily apply or nominate your colleagues by completing the online Volunteer Application available at http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/volunteer_app.php by June 1, 2010.

Volunteer Opportunities: Terms begin January 1, 2011
- Professional Development Committee Vice Chair – 2 year term
- Professional Development Committee Member – 2 year term

If you have any questions regarding these positions, please contact PDC Chair Patricia Hawk at Patricia.Hawk@oregonstate.edu or by telephone 541-737-6699 or NCURA staff liaison Marc Schiffman at schiffman@ncura.edu or by telephone 202-466-3894.

NCURA is committed to achieving diversity of all kinds in its appointments, including experience levels, geographic area, institutional type, gender, and ethnicity, and we encourage ALL interested members to become involved.
REGION I
New England
http://web.mit.edu/osp/www/ncura

Region I is bustling with activity as we prepare for our Spring Meeting in Portsmouth NH. The theme “Embracing Change” is one that I think we can all relate to as research administrators. I believe it falls under the last line in all of our job descriptions, “all other duties as required!” We can safely say that the only constant in our field is change. This is why you are so lucky to be a member of Region I. Here in Region I we have a very busy curriculum committee that is working very hard to bring robust, relevant, and informative programs to you right here in Region I. We just held our second RADG meeting of 2010 with special guest Lori Pilcher, Assistant IG for Grants and Internal Activities, Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Office of Inspector General. We also held our first offering of Essentials of Research Administration for 2010 on March 25. Our Essentials program evaluations are in and we are delighted to report that 100% of the participants would recommend the program. The third RADG meeting will be held on June 2, at the John Hancock Conference Center. Pearl O’Rourke from Partners Healthcare will be our speaker, so bring your questions and concerns on IRB and other human subject’s issues and join us for lively discussion. Don’t forget to sign up for lunch, it is a great opportunity to network with your fellow Region I colleagues. We are also planning on holding a second Essentials of Research Administration Workshop in August. Please check in on the NCURA Region I website at www.ncuraregion1.org regularly to find out about upcoming local programming.

Congratulations to Roger Ray, Grant/Contract Accountant II, Brown University, who won the raffle for a free RADG meeting. You can win a free RADG meeting, just be sure to fill out the evaluation and put in a comment providing a suggestion for a future RADG topic.

Our Volunteer and Membership Committee has been hard at work rounding up volunteers and preparing for the kick off of our successful mentor/mentee program which runs July 1st- April 30th of each year. This program enables newcomers to quickly and easily network with seasoned NCURA professionals who have volunteered to share their expertise, guidance and support. The enrollment period for the next cohort officially kicks off at the regional meeting; however the committee is glad to accept applications any time until May 30th. Mia Enright at Bridgewater State College and Tina DeVries of WPI are organizing the mentor/mentee program and are happy to answer any questions. Their contact information can be found on the NCURA Region I site.

I am pleased to announce the winners of our Region I Spring Meeting Travel Awards; Lisa Benson, Associate Director of Research Administration, Connecticut Children’s Medical Center, and Anne Faria, Clerk IV, Bridgewater State College.

It is also with great pleasure that I would like to announce the winners of our Region I Recognition Awards which were presented at the spring meeting - Distinguished Service Award 2010, Norman Hebert, Director of International Research Administration – Brown University; Merit Award 2010, Patrick Fitzgerald, Associate Dean for Research Administration – Harvard University; Outstanding Volunteer Award 2010, Denise Rouleau, Research Administration Specialist – New England School of Acupuncture; Outstanding New Professional Award 2010, Estelle Lang, Financial Coordinator – Brown University. Special thanks to our Awards committee who has worked very hard this year to update the awards and create the 2 new travel awards for PRA and FRA. Please be sure to get your nomination in for the Region I PRA travel award by 5/28. The next travel awards will be announced at the end of the summer for the NCURA national meeting. We will be giving 3 travel awards to the national meeting.

Don’t forget to nominate your Region I colleagues for the NCURA National Recognition Awards which are due May 28, 2010. The Catherine Core Minority Travel Award, the Distinguished Service Award, and the Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award and the Joseph Carrabino Award. More information is available on the NCURA website under the volunteer section.

As we move into spring and summer it is a time for renewal and growth, a time to reflect on our own personal and professional development. The fact that you are reading this magazine indicates that you have made a commitment to your professional development. I would like to encourage everyone to volunteer in some way. Every time that you volunteer provides an opportunity for learning and growth, whether it is meeting other NCURA members, or learning a new skill, or leading a committee. There are so many great opportunities, please take advantage of them all, and give back when you can.

I hope everyone has a great summer. For those of you who want to combine some learning and vacationing, PRA (Preaward Research Administration) is being held right here in Region I, in Providence, RI. It is a great opportunity to attend one of NCURA’s national conferences in our own back yard. Enjoy, and don’t forget the sunscreen!

Susan Zipkin is Chair of Region I and serves as the Director of Research Finance, Radiology Research at Brigham and Women’s Hospital.
Let me see if I can predict the future, as this article is being written before our regional meeting in Princeton, NJ but will be published after the meeting…

Yep, we had an outstanding conference! As I write this article, we have finalized the program and we think we have an outstanding slate of sessions. During these economic times members need to make hard decisions with their travel budgets so, if you were not able to make this year’s Regional meeting, hopefully you will be able to attend the National meeting in November. As I’m sure you’ll agree, attending a regional meeting or National meeting is rewarding both professionally and personally.

I’d like to announce Region II’s recipients of our Regional Travel and Service Awards. Our Steering Committee (and everyone in the Region) congratulates our travel award winners Christie Johnson from The Johns Hopkins University and Jeannine Zuber from The Commonwealth Medical College. With the agenda our program committee has put together, I’m sure experiencing this meeting will ensure that our travel award winners will come back for more in future meetings.

We would also like to congratulate this year’s Regional Service award winners. Both Antoinette Lawson of University of Maryland, College Park and Dr. Robert De Martino of Seton Hall University have been recognized as Region II’s 2010 Service award winners. Congratulations, and thank you both for your service to our region. It’s difficult to put into words how much your contributions mean to us.

So what to do now that this year’s Regional meeting is over? Get to work on some of the initiatives outlined in previous articles. The Region’s Volunteer Committee will be hard at work on further developing a mechanism to better promote and track all the volunteers we have in our region. This is one area we can always look to improve since volunteers are so critical to a healthy organization. We will also begin work on the 2011 Regional Meeting, to be held in New York City. Sure, Cheryl Williams (this year’s Program Co-Chair and next year’s Program Chair) might take a month off, but I’m sure she will be right back to planning next year’s event before we know it.

Finally, I want to personally thank everyone on this year’s program committee. They have put in long hours of work and deserve a round of applause. And where would we all be without our Program Chair and Co-Chair Jared Littman and Cheryl Williams? They led the program committee effectively and cheerfully and that is something this military member is in admiration of. Thank you.

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

As noted on the Region III web site, the Membership Awards Committee received many outstanding applications for the 2010 travel award of $1,000 applied toward expenses associated with attending the spring meeting. Region III extends congratulations to Scott Mitchell (Vanderbilt University), who was the Region III 2010 travel award winner. There will also be TWO travel awards to support Region III members’ attendance at the annual meeting in Washington, D.C. The 52nd annual meeting, entitled “Research Administration: At the Confluence of Creation and Collaboration,” will take place at the Washington Hilton, October 31-November 3. Keep your eyes open for the Travel Award announcement and application. Be sure to share that information with your colleagues, especially those who may never have had the opportunity to attend. Just in case you have a junior colleague who is under the impression that the competition is for experienced NCURA members, please remind him or her that the travel award is actually geared toward newer members who otherwise might not have an opportunity to attend one of these events that we all rely on for professional development and networking opportunities.
Speaking of professional development opportunities, we would like to remind Region III members of a few upcoming workshops that are taking place in our Region. Both Fundamentals of Sponsored Project Administration and Sponsored Project Administration: Level Two, Critical Issues in Research Administration will be offered June 9-11 in Savannah, GA. Also in Savannah, the Departmental Research Administration workshop will be offered June 16-18. See the Educational Programs link on the NCURA web site for details.

Believe it or not, Chair-Elect Rick Smiley (East Carolina University) and his crew are already planning next year’s Region III spring meeting for the Isle of Palms, South Carolina. As you know, Rick has also served for the past two years as Region III Volunteer Coordinator. We are pleased to announce that Robyn Remotide (Mississippi State University) has accepted the position as our new Volunteer Coordinator. Robyn will be shadowing Rick during the final stages of preparation for the meeting. As always, Region III members are encouraged to keep that volunteer spirit alive. Volunteering at a meeting is a wonderful way to get involved and get to know your NCURA colleagues. Please visit the Region III web site for more information about volunteer opportunities.

We’ve benefited from great leadership in Region III over our history. The time to start thinking about leaders for our future is now. The nominating process and elections will take place later this year to fill two offices: Regionally elected member to the position at the Regional Meeting to be held in the spring of 2011 and of the Program Committee for the annual meeting. The Regionally elected Board Member’s term will officially begin on January 1, 2011; however, incoming Board members often are invited to attend the meeting of the Board of Directors held in conjunction with the annual meeting immediately preceding the beginning of their term of office. The role of the Regionally elected Board Member is to actively support the mission and the goals of NCURA according to the position description at http://www.ncura.edu/content/volunteer/opportunities/member_of_the_board_of_directors.php. He or she is invited to report relevant discussions, actions, and plans to the regional membership during regional business meetings. The Regionally elected Board Member’s term will officially begin on January 1, 2011; however, incoming Board members often are invited to attend the meeting of the Board of Directors held in conjunction with the annual meeting immediately preceding the beginning of their term of office. The role of the Chair-Elect is to serve as the second chief executive officer for the region and to assume the Regional Chair’s duties in his or her absence. The Chair-Elect also assists the Regional Chair in directing the activities of the region and serves as Chair of the Program Committee for the regional annual meeting. The Chair-Elect for 2011-2012 will assume their duties at the close of the Regional Meeting to be held in the spring of 2011 and become the Chair in 2012-2013.

Please consider taking part in the nominating process for these important positions. Region III values the contributions and voices of all its members.

Immediate Past Chair, Jill Frazier Tincher (University of Miami) wanted to extend a special thank you to her fellow Region III Officers, Committee Chairs, Committee Members, Volunteer Coordinator, Newsletter Editors and Webmaster: “Your daily contributions truly enabled me to fulfill my role as Chair-Elect and Chair. Thank you so much for all of your hard work and dedication during the past two years. For all of the Region III members, PLEASE volunteer your time. This organization cannot survive without your volunteerism. Moreover, YOU will truly gain so much more from this organization through your involvement. This organization is as good as you make it! Thanks again!”

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

REGION IV Mid-America
www.ncurarregioniv.com

Springtime is often described as a time for renewal. I am confident that our Region IV members will be refreshed and energized this year by our excellent programming and our new group of leaders. As I reflect on my time as Chair, I see how we are constantly in motion – our region truly changes and grows with the seasons!

Region IV Spring Meeting
As I write this, we are only two weeks away from and the Region IV Spring meeting in Omaha, Nebraska. For their hard work in planning or organizing the meeting, I would like to thank incoming chair Christa Johnson, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville; co-chairs, Craig Reynolds, University of Michigan, and Mary Laura Farnham, University of Nebraska at Omaha; and, program committee members, Diane Barrett, University of Wisconsin, (Workshops), Heather Offhaus, University of Michigan (Case Studies), Joanne Altieri, University of Kansas (Case Studies), Nancy Schlesiger, University of Nebraska at Omaha (Faculty Sessions), Kathy Taggart, Creighton University (Federal and Compliance Track), Sheila Lischwe, Saint Louis University (Federal and Compliance Track), Shannon Sutton, Western Illinois University (Beginner Track), Diane Meyer, Iowa State University (Beginner Track), John Falconer, University of Nebraska at Kearney (Intermediate Track), Sarah Starr, The Ohio State University (Intermediate Track), Bill Sharp, University of Kansas (Intermediate Track), David Lynch, Mayo Clinic Rochester (Advanced Track), David Schmidt, University of North Dakota (Advanced Track), Crystal Miller, University of Nebraska Medical Center (Local Arrangements), and, Glenda Bullock, Washington University (Sponsor/Vendor Liaison). I would also like to extend a special thank you to her fellow Region III Officers, Committee Chairs, Committee Members, Volunteer Coordinator, Newsletter Editors and Webmaster: “Your daily contributions truly enabled me to fulfill my role as Chair-Elect and Chair. Thank you so much for all of your hard work and dedication during the past two years. For all of the Region III members, PLEASE volunteer your time. This organization cannot survive without your volunteerism. Moreover, YOU will truly gain so much more from this organization through your involvement. This organization is as good as you make it! Thanks again!”

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

REGION IV Mid-America
www.ncurarregioniv.com

Springtime is often described as a time for renewal. I am confident that our Region IV members will be refreshed and energized this year by our excellent programming and our new group of leaders. As I reflect on my time as Chair, I see how we are constantly in motion – our region truly changes and grows with the seasons!

Region IV Spring Meeting
As I write this, we are only two weeks away from and the Region IV Spring meeting in Omaha, Nebraska. For their hard work in planning or organizing the meeting, I would like to thank incoming chair Christa Johnson, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville; co-chairs, Craig Reynolds, University of Michigan, and Mary Laura Farnham, University of Nebraska at Omaha; and, program committee members, Diane Barrett, University of Wisconsin, (Workshops), Heather Offhaus, University of Michigan (Case Studies), Joanne Altieri, University of Kansas (Case Studies), Nancy Schlesiger, University of Nebraska at Omaha (Faculty Sessions), Kathy Taggart, Creighton University (Federal and Compliance Track), Sheila Lischwe, Saint Louis University (Federal and Compliance Track), Shannon Sutton, Western Illinois University (Beginner Track), Diane Meyer, Iowa State University (Beginner Track), John Falconer, University of Nebraska at Kearney (Intermediate Track), Sarah Starr, The Ohio State University (Intermediate Track), Bill Sharp, University of Kansas (Intermediate Track), David Lynch, Mayo Clinic Rochester (Advanced Track), David Schmidt, University of North Dakota (Advanced Track), Crystal Miller, University of Nebraska Medical Center (Local Arrangements), and, Glenda Bullock, Washington University (Sponsor/Vendor Liaison). I would also like to extend a special thank you to her fellow Region III Officers, Committee Chairs, Committee Members, Volunteer Coordinator, Newsletter Editors and Webmaster: “Your daily contributions truly enabled me to fulfill my role as Chair-Elect and Chair. Thank you so much for all of your hard work and dedication during the past two years. For all of the Region III members, PLEASE volunteer your time. This organization cannot survive without your volunteerism. Moreover, YOU will truly gain so much more from this organization through your involvement. This organization is as good as you make it! Thanks again!”

Laura Letherbetter 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.
thank you to all of our Spring Meeting volunteers. Your help is essential to a well-run and productive event!

All attendees are sure to have their own valuable take on this year’s theme, “Recovery through Discovery.” It applies equally well to both the federal government’s efforts to guide our country through this historic recession and to our membership’s need to “recover” through discovery of a wealth of knowledge and professional networking.

Meeting highlights, including information about the workshops and the wide range of concurrent sessions, and a recap of our fascinating keynote speaker, Thomas Gouttierre, Dean of International Studies and Programs, and Director of the Center for Afghanistan Studies at the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO), will appear in our next issue. In addition to relevant and timely professional development opportunities of the meeting, the city of Omaha will offer attendees both entertainment and cultural possibilities.

Awards
Nominations for Region IV awards were due in March. Awards were announced at the 2010 Spring Meeting and are presented here. The Meritorious Contribution Award was given to Vernon Ferrell, from the University of Cincinnati and two travel awards to next year’s Spring Meeting in Cleveland were given to Cate Caldwell, from University of Detroit Mercy and Jeremy Cox from the University of Missouri.

Elections
The Nominations Committee proudly presented an excellent slate of candidates for leadership positions on the Region IV Board of Directors. On the 2010 ballot, Region IV voted for Chair-Elect, Secretary, Treasurer-Elect, and two Members at-large. The electronic polls closed April 12, 2010. The results are as follows:

Chair-Elect: David Ngo, University of Wisconsin, Madison  
Secretary: Michelle Schoenecker, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee  
Treasurer: Shannon Sutton, Western Illinois University  
At Large: Robert Holm, Butler University and Nancy Reidelberger, Washington University

Looking Ahead
As my duties as Region IV Chair come to a close, I am struck by our “regional” renewal that occurs annually with each new group of leaders. As NCURA members, we are always in motion, always moving forward. Planning for the 52nd annual NCURA meeting program is underway. The meeting will be held in Washington, D.C., October 31 November 3, 2010. I don’t know about you, but I’m looking forward to going back to the Washington Hilton to see all of the renovations. Home again!

Jaynee Tolle is Chair of Region IV and is a Senior Grant Administrator at the University of Cincinnati. Natalie Goodwin-Frank is Chair of the Region IV Communications Committee and is the Operations and Grants Manager for an Energy Frontier Research Center at Washington University.

REGION V  
Southwestern  
www.ncuraregionv.com

Spring is in full bloom and our Region V committees were very busy. Marianne Woods and the Program committee were putting the finishing touches on the Spring meeting which was held April 25 -28 in South Padre Island, TX. The program was excellent and our attendance was excellent as well! Also, in the Region, elections were underway with a top-notch slate of candidates. The positions were for Vice-Chair/Chair Elect, Treasurer, and two at-large members of the Board. We appreciate all those willing to serve the Region as officers and hope everyone took the opportunity to vote. The results were announced at the Spring Meeting and in an Eblast to the Region.

The Awards committee consisting of Kay Ellis of University of Texas-Austin as Chair and Scott Erwin of Texas State University – San Marcos, Tena Smith of University of Oklahoma, Colette Solpietro of Texas Tech, Toni Shaklee of Oklahoma State and Greg Wilson of the University of Central Oklahoma as members chose this year’s recipients of the Quinten S. Mathews Travel Scholarship. Congratulations goes to Erin Sherman of Texas A&M Corpus Christie and Christian Flores of University of Texas – Austin as winners of the $750 travel awards to the Spring Meeting being held in South Padre Island, TX. The committee also chose to present the Distinguished Service Award to Matt Berry from University of Oklahoma - Norman Campus. He was presented his award at the Spring Meeting.

The National Office of NCURA has a call for nominations for the National Offices of Vice-President/President Elect and Two At-Large Members of the Board of Directors. They are also taking nominations for the Distinguished Service Award, Outstanding Achievement in Research Administration Award, Joseph Carrabino Award, and the Catherine Core Minority Travel Award applications. Please consider nominating a fellow Region V member for these awards and positions.

Looking ahead to the future, the 2012 joint meeting with Region IV will be held at the Hilton St. Louis at the Ballpark on April 14 - April 19. The hotel is directly across the street from the
Ballpark so let’s keep our fingers crossed that they will have a home game during that time.

This is the last Regional Corner I will write as Chair of Region V so I would like to say that it has been my honor and pleasure to have served in this position for the last year. I thank each and everyone who has guided, assisted and volunteered to make this job so much easier.

Gail Davis is Chair of Region V and is the Director of Contract and Grants and Proposal Administrator at Lamar University.

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

Greetings Region VI!!

In addition to the Region VI and VII joint Spring Meeting in Newport Beach, California. There are many other activities going on behind the scenes in the Region, and I’d like to bring our regional membership up-to-date.

2010 Regional Spring Meeting: Our Spring Meeting was held at the Newport Beach Marriott Hotel and Spa from Sunday April 18 through Wednesday April 21, 2010. The program committee worked tirelessly to put together a wonderful program for our members at the Spring Meeting. The program, developed by co-partners Region VII, included six pre-conference workshops and over 45 concurrent sessions. There were also discussion groups on a wide range of topics from Regulatory Compliance, Professional Development to Clinical Trials, Government Contracts, and Intellectual Property. The many opportunities for education, networking, and fun were welcomed by all attendees, and our entertainment was memorable! Special thanks for the program to our Co-Chair Debra Murphy in Region VII; to our Officers: Csilla Csaplar of Stanford University and Maggie Griscavage of the University of Alaska Fairbanks; and to our Track Leaders: Joseph McNicholas of Loyola Marymount University, Ted Mordhorst of University of Washington, Jeri Muniz of University of Southern California, Georgette Sakamoto of University of Hawaii, Rosemary Madnick of Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute, Marcia Knipher of University of Washington, Melissa Mullen of California Polytechnic State University, Leisa Rodriguez of University of Nevada at Las Vegas; and to all of our presenters. Thanks also to the many others who volunteered time to assemble packets, staff the Registration desk, help administer evaluations, and assist with numerous other tasks that are essential to a successful program. It has been my privilege to work with each of you.

While we are aware of the budget cuts and travel freezes across the country, we are grateful for the regional support from everyone who attended this wonderful meeting and made it a success.

Awards Committee Update: The Awards Committee met and reviewed the nominations for the first Region VI Meritorious Contribution Award. The Information Technology Team from Washington State University was nominated by David Mayo of California Institute of Technology with support of this nomination provided by Georgette Sakamoto, University of Hawaii, and Bruce Morgan, University of California, Irvine. The Information Technology Team at Washington State University includes Dan Nordquist, Monte Sutton, Dean Webster, and Taurean Sutton. This Information Technology Team has created, maintained, and provided long term support of the Region VI website. It has also supported the Region VI Databases including the Career Page database, the Spring Meeting Program database, the Award/Recognition database, the Region VI Volunteer database, and the Officer’s Corner database. Their work has made a tremendous impact since creating the website and its databases which provides volunteers with a standard and consistent mode of operation; provides members with up-to-date technology to facilitate regional business; and allows historical data to be archived in the Officers’ Corner which creates an important link to tracking progress as an organization. This is the first Meritorious Award granted by Region VI.

Congratulations to the award recipients!! We deeply appreciate the willingness, the abilities, the time commitment, and the enthusiasm of the Washington State University team members in serving the members and activities of Region VI.

Education and Professional Development Committee Update: The mentees of the LEADME program worked extremely hard on their Personal Best Projects which were presented via a Poster session at the Spring Meeting in Newport Beach. The Personal Best Projects will be posted on the Region VI website. Please visit our website, view their projects, and provide them your feedback and encouragement.

2010 Election: In the next few months, Region VI will be gearing up for its 2012 election for our Officers, and we will be looking to fill several positions in various committees. If you are interested in serving the NCURA Region VI, or if you would like to nominate anyone, please contact the Nominating Committee. Their contact information is on our Region VI website. Volunteers are always needed and appreciated so please consider volunteering to support our Region. Volunteerism is the engine that drives our organization which can only continue to thrive and grow through the efforts of its volunteers. Please feel free to contact me if you have any suggestions or feedback.

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.
As I write this article it is springtime in sunny Tempe Arizona (yes we have spring – it lasts 3 days) and we are busy putting the finishing touches on the plans for our shared 2010 Regional Meeting in Newport Beach, California – by the time you read this we will all be enjoying the summer.

I am pleased to report that Sinh Simmons, my Co-Chair from Region VI who coordinated the site operations, and I were very excited that we had over 220 attendees and a strong program for the joint Regional meeting in Newport Beach, California. I want to take this opportunity to thank the Region VI Team for the excellent site support, accommodations and entertainment – we could not have asked for more. You all did a terrific job and we thank you.

I would like to thank the Program Committee Members and Track Leaders who worked tirelessly to identify, engage and educate us at the conference. My gratitude and thanks for the wonderful program goes to Candyce Lindsay, Arizona State University; Josie Jimenez, New Mexico State University; Randall Draper, University of Colorado, Boulder; Dianne Horrocks; Idaho State University; Elizabeth Boyd, University of Arizona; Lisa Mosley, Arizona State University; Christine Pacheco, University of New Mexico and Tim Edwards, Montana State University. I also really appreciate the hard work of numerous individuals who stepped up to help with registration, evaluation and all the little things that need to be done at the last minute. Together we learned a lot, enjoyed the experience and benefited from the networking opportunities. I’d like to say a special thank you to the site committee from Region VI for securing our Keynote Speaker and for arranging the Tuesday evening dinner and entertainment.

Plans are underway for our 2011 joint regional meeting to be held in Tucson, Arizona. I am sending our gratitude to Tim Edwards who will co-chair the meeting next year for working to plan ahead for next year. I know he will be calling on you to volunteer your time, experience and talents toward next year’s program. Be on the lookout for more information on this topic.

Nominations are currently open for National Officer and At Large Board of Director positions and also for National awards. In addition, you soon will be invited to nominate colleagues for regional office and awards. I hope that you will consider sharing your expertise, talent and energy to our organization that gives so much to us all – and take the time to thank those who have dedicated themselves in the past.

Again, thank you to everyone who worked so hard to make our Regional Meeting a success and are helping to make this year a success for us all. If you have any suggestions or questions about regional issues you can email me at debra.murphy@asu.edu or call at 480.965.2179.

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

In July, make sure to look out for NCURA Magazine’s Special “Green” Magazine. This magazine will focus on issues of environmental responsibility as it comes to play in Research Administration. To emphasize our own environmental awareness, this issue will only be available ONLINE. So keep an eye on your inboxes in July!

NCURA editors Jerry Pogatsnik, Tom Wilson, Debbie Smith, and Jim Casey
ARRA reporting presents a series of challenges for PUI’s, aside from the difficult task we PUIer’s normally face with the mounting reporting and compliance issues and the limited resources that are available to us. Apart from the reporting, itself, research administrators at PUI’s have had to commit a considerable amount of time to just “learning the ropes”. Our ARRA portfolios vary widely among institutions. The situation is further complicated by the different ways that states have chosen to use the State Fiscal Stabilization Funds, and some of these impact sponsored programs offices in more ways than others. As a result, each PUI has had to determine the best method for management and oversight of the ARRA reporting requirements by our institutions.

ARRA reporting requires teamwork. In my discussions with other PUI’s, some of us have developed small teams with pre and post award folks involved. A key issue for pre-award is to clearly identify all sponsored agreements where ARRA funding is involved. In other cases, teams may be expanded to include financial/accounting offices or human resources offices to dole out different aspects of gathering of information and delegating responsibilities on reporting. The perspectives of other key individuals can be invaluable in making sense and interpreting of the myriad of notices from federal agencies as well as the e-mails from the FDP ARRA list serve, NCURA PUI-Neighborhood, and announcements and updates from COGR. These sources have been of invaluable assistance in keeping all of us updated on changes, revisions and new or additional requirements on ARRA reporting.

As with anything else, the devil is in the details (and are there details!). ARRA seems to have spawned a whole new language. Prior to the first reporting cycle, how many of us had ever heard of TAS codes? As always, there are challenges in securing the quarterly narrative reports from PI’s and trying to determine the FTE’s for jobs retained and jobs created. Post award staff need to insure that expended/invoiced amounts reported reconcile with our letter of credit draws, insure the data is accurate and complete, including Agency Codes, Activity Codes and TAS codes, and upload the reports in federalreporting.gov just to name a few of the tasks involved. There are also a million questions: how do we know if ARRA funds included in our federal financial aid awards?; why were there no special CDFA numbers for all ARRA funds?; how many reporting templates were issued and which one is the correct one?; why are there changes from one reporting cycle to the next?; and why there are conflicting messages and nuances to information and data regarding the copy forward method, calculation of FTE’s, the requirement for reporting FTE at first cumulatively and now only for the reporting period? (Have I missed any?)

The situation is far worse for those institutions where a single individual is responsible for performing all aspects involved in ARRA processes. Depending on the number of ARRA grants awarded, the time and effort devoted to the reporting processes diminishes the time that we have available to perform our normal duties. At my institution, which is a state university, the April ARRA reports have to be performed at the time that coincides with our deadlines for submission for fiscal year 2011, projection reports to our budget offices, schools and units on campus requirements for quarterly reports on the details of grant income and expenditures generated by their units, quarterly financial and performance reports are due, and normal monthly financial reports are due, our 2009 OMB A-133 audit has been released and have to be sent to those agencies and institutions from which we received federal and flow through funding and in turn we are receiving FY2009 audit reports from our sub recipients which need to be reviewed and addressed if there are any questions. We also need to continue providing assistance to faculty and staff with proposal development and/or reviews, budget preparation and submission, and award processing and management.

The problems are compounded by the fact that our smaller institutions rarely have the type of data management systems, sophisticated or not, to incorporate many of the reporting requirements and must resort to shadow systems and manual processes. Some PUI’s have to begin the ARRA reporting process early, anywhere from 10 to 15 days in advance of the opening day of the 1st of the month following the quarter end when reporting can begin, to insure that they secure information from PI’s on their quarterly activities, review payroll activity, personnel activity and hiring documents and/or changes in assignments on ARRA grants for FTE’s reports, review vendor information, equipment purchase information and so on.

The bottom line is that we all need to be grateful for the increase in externally sponsored programs that the ARRA/Stimulus funding has brought to our institutions. But we are not particularly thrilled with the complexity of the reporting requirements and the burden that it places on our small and often under-staffed offices. In our most optimistic moments, we can wonder if the government just might take pity on us and provide stimulus funding as a resource to allow us to secure a position or two; that
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would be a great way to use these funds for “jobs retained or jobs created”.

At the NCURA FRA X conference last year in Palm Springs, California, before the ARRA reporting requirements were well known by institutions of higher education, I attended the plenary session entitled “The View from the Top: What Keeps Chief Research Officers Awake at Night.” I recall that Dr. Brad Fenwick, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville discussed the necessity of institutions looking at increasing their staffing to handle the increase in grant funding opportunities because of stimulus funds, and also to handle the increase in more stringent compliance and reporting requirements that would come along with this new funding method – ARRA. I think many institutions took heed to his insight and were or are well prepared to deal with federalreporting.gov. Others of us can only dream of what it might be like to just, at least, have a little extra help.

For the most part, it appears that we at PUI’s are in different stages of the challenge we face with ARRA, but the struggle continues! And for those of us who don’t have the infrastructure support is it almost “Mission Impossible”? But PUI’ers are resilient and despite the odds we manage somehow.

Josephine Barnes has been Director of the Office of Research and Projects at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville since January 2001. Her career includes over 30 years of administrative experience with an emphasis in the non-profit sector for agencies with budgets ranging from one to forty million dollars. In her current position she directs, manages and coordinates post award financial and non-financial activities for the university.

From 1998 to 2002, Barnes served on the faculty of the NCURA United Negro College Fund (UNCF) Fundamentals in Sponsored Projects Administration sponsored in part by the U.S. Department of Defense. As part of the faculty, she provided workshops to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) minority institutions, which included Hispanic and Indian Tribal Institutions. She has also been a presenter, speaker and moderator at various NCURA regional, national and FRA conferences and was the recipient of the 2007 NCURA Distinguished Service Award.
Introduction
In 2008, the President of the United States introduced a new term of art for United States Government use: “Controlled Unclassified Information” (CUI). Ostensibly arising from the government’s interest in controlling classified and unclassified information related to combating global terrorism, under the aegis of several subsequent Presidential Memoranda, the executive branch of the federal government is now taking steps to implement a standardized framework for controlling unclassified information across all federal agencies. Proposed changes would extend government-wide controls on information beyond those statutorily authorized requirements to protect “national security”, and would restrict information pertinent to the national interests or policy of the United States or to the important interests of entities outside the Federal Government. The risk for the proliferation of CUI’s restricting university research is profound and likely to grow.

What is Controlled Unclassified Information?
Government control on unclassified information is not new. Over many decades, the federal government has controlled unclassified information in many disparate ways, under the umbrella headings of Sensitive Information and Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) Information, among others. However, as defined in the President’s May 7, 2008 Memorandum Designation and Sharing of Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI):

“Controlled Unclassified Information” is a categorical designation that refers to unclassified information that does not meet the standards for National Security Classification under Executive Order 12958, as amended, but is (i) pertinent to the national interests of the United States or to the important interests of entities outside the Federal Government, and (ii) under law or policy requires protection from unauthorized disclosure, special handling safeguards, or prescribed limits on exchange or dissemination. Henceforth, the designation CUI replaces “Sensitive But Unclassified” (SBU).

Since 2008, the process for developing a government-wide framework and standard for CUI has continued under the current administration. The target for implementation of the CUI framework is 2013. In his May 29, 2009, Memorandum on Classified Information and Controlled Unclassified Information, President Obama called for the establishment of an Interagency Task Force on CUI, which formed and met in 2009 and distributed its Report and Recommendations of the President’s Task Force on Controlled Unclassified Information in December, 2009. Outside of the Federation of American Scientists, no organization related to higher education was consulted by the Task Force.

The Report identified 107 distinct SBU regimes currently in use by federal agencies, and 117 distinct existing SBU markings. In the interest of standardizing application of CUI throughout the federal government, the Task Force, recommended a revised definition:

“All unclassified information for which, pursuant to statute, regulation, or departmental or agency policy, there is a compelling requirement for safeguarding and/or dissemination controls.” (Task Force, 2009)

The Task Force also called for a Presidential moratorium on definition or development of new SBU categories outside of the CUI Framework, which at the time of this article has not been enacted. In the absence of a moratorium, at least one new sweeping category of SBU- “DoD Information,” has been defined in an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking by the Department of Defense (DFAR, 2010).

Protected Critical Infrastructure Information (PCII) – a CUI Case Study
Though the origins and purposes of CUI vary widely by agency, some categories of information are authorized by statute for control. Setting aside the better known export control regimes of Export Administration Regulation (EAR), International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), and Export and Import of Nuclear Equipment and Materials Regulations, there are at least seven other regimes of CUI with statutory designation.

Many colleges and universities have already encountered three of these regimes of controlled unclassified information, established in the wake of 9/11, which have potential for government-imposed civil and criminal penalties for misuse of their information, including:

Protected Critical Infrastructure Information (PCII), under the jurisdiction of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS),

Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (CEII), under the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), and

Sensitive Security Information (SSI) under joint regulation by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and Department of Transportation (DOT).

Rules for access, control, and dissemination of CUI under these regimes are not standardized. The most rigorously controlled of these regimes appears to be Homeland Security’s PCII. The PCII control regime is illustrative of the extent to which the federal government can now procedurally restrict
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unclassified information. PCI Information includes information regarding the security of critical infrastructure and protected systems, analysis, warning, interdependence study, recovery, reconstitution, or other informational purpose. PCII includes information generated by nonfederal agencies (e.g., municipalities, power and communication utilities, computer and internet companies, and energy distribution systems). Some examples of PCII might include gas pipeline roving security schedules, and power grid safety device or critical internet node locations. This information becomes PCII only when designated by DHS.

It is worth reviewing the extent to which DHS has developed procedures for controlling PCII in some detail, as the President’s Task Force was “impressed” with the DHS guidelines for PCII control, and further opined that the PCII safeguarding standards “can be achieved with reasonable and appropriate efforts by non-federal partners”—e.g., colleges and universities. PCII controls may well become the government’s model for securing more types of CUI in the future.


### Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) Markings Currently in Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. SENSITIVE</th>
<th>25. LIMITED ACCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. DO NOT DISSEMINATE</td>
<td>26. RESTRICTED ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SBU-NF</td>
<td>27. MEDICAL RECORDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SBU/NOFORN</td>
<td>28. LAN INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. UNLIMITED RIGHTS</td>
<td>29. IT SECURITY RELATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GOVERNMENT PURPOSE RIGHTS</td>
<td>30. LAN BACKUP SENSITIVE INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LIMITED RIGHTS</td>
<td>31. SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RESTRICTED RIGHTS</td>
<td>32. TRADE SECRET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SPECIAL LICENSE RIGHTS</td>
<td>33. ATTORNEY CLIENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PRE-EXISTING MARKINGS</td>
<td>34. BUDGETARY INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. COMMERCIAL MARKINGS</td>
<td>35. PRE-DECISIONAL,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. CLOSE HOLD</td>
<td>36. FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. RSEN</td>
<td>37. NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION (SGI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. PREDECISIONAL PRODUCT</td>
<td>38. AGENCY INTERNAL USE ONLY (U/AIUO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE</td>
<td>39. TRADE SENSITIVE INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. DEA SENSITIVE (DEA S)</td>
<td>40. SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED (SBU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. SENSITIVE (SENS)</td>
<td>41. HEALTH RELATED INFORMATION (EM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. COPYRIGHT (DATE) (OWNER)</td>
<td>42. NO DISTRIBUTION (NODIS OR ND)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. DELIBERATE PROCESS PRIVILEGE</td>
<td>43. LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE (LES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. RELIDO</td>
<td>44. EXCLUSIVE DISTRIBUTION (EXDIS OR XD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. EYES ONLY</td>
<td>45. FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (FOUO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. BANK SECRECY ACT INFORMATION (BSA)</td>
<td>46. SENSITIVE STUDENT RECORDS (STR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ACQUISITION SENSITIVE</td>
<td>47. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION (CBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT</td>
<td>48. LIMITED OFFICIAL USE (LOU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. LIMITED DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. LIMITED DISTRIBUTION (LIMDIS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. SENSITIVE INFORMATION (SINFO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. COVERED BY CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. ORIGINATOR CONTROLLED (ORCON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. CONTRACTUAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. ENFORCEMENT CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION (ECI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. LIMITED OFFICIAL USE INFORMATION (LOUI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. SUBSTANCE ABUSE RECORDS (SAB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION (SSI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. TITLE III COMMUNICATIONS (T3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. FEDERAL TAXPAYER INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. BOMB TECH SENSITIVE (BTS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. CFIUS INFORMATION (CFIUS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. RESTRICTED BY COURT ORDER (CO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. LIMITED USE ONLY (Luo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. PRIVACY ACT PROTECTED INFORMATION (PAPI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. PROPRIETARY INFORMATION (PROPIN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. CHILDVICTIM/WITNESS (CH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the perspective of an institution of higher education, the formalization of control on access and dissemination of information required in the PCII Procedures Manual is eye-opening, to say the least. There is more than a passing similarity to controls required for information classified for national security (Confidential, Secret, and Top Secret) under the National Security Policy Operating Manual (NISPOM). Yet, this DHS PCII manual represents the agency-authorized controls for unclassified information.

To bring PCII to your campus, your institution or state must first be accredited with DHS to have access to PCII, and must have a designated PCII Coordinator. FBI background checks are required for employees and nonemployees (e.g., students) with access to such information. Nondisclosure agreements, with terms objectionable to many universities, are required. Government training is mandatory for anyone with access to PCII.

Document marking and control procedures imitate regulations governing classified material requirements for packaging (double wrapping required), coversheets, and rules governing derivative marking, and document marking requirements—the latter with portion (paragraph by paragraph)

| 69. FINANCIAL RECORDS (NON-NSL) (FR) | 88. CONTROLLED NUCLEAR INFORMATION (U//DCNI OR U//ECNI) |
| 70. FINANCIAL RECORDS NSL (NSLF) | 89. CHEMICAL- TERRORISM VULNERABILITY INFORMATION (CVI) |
| 71. SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION | 90. NAVAL NUCLEAR PROPULSION INFORMATION (U-NNPI) |
| 72. LIMITED CREDIT INFORMATION NSL (NSLC) | 91. OFFICIAL USE ONLY-EXPORT CONTROLLED INFORMATION |
| 73. SELECT AGENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION (SASI) | 92. NAVAL NUCLEAR PROPULSION INFORMATION (NOFORN) |
| 74. CALEA COST RECOVERY INFORMATION (CALEA) | 93. SENSITIVE UNCLASSIFIED NONSAFEGUARDS INFORMATION (SUNSI) |
| 75. INNOCENT IMAGES VISUAL INFORMATION (IIVI) | 94. PROTECTED CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION (PCII) |
| 76. SENSITIVE TREATY/MOU/nda INFORMATION (STM) | 95. OFFICIAL USE ONLY - SENSITIVE INTERNAL INFORMATION |
| 77. PRIVILEGED FBI ATTORNEY CLIENT | 96. TELEPHONE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS NSL (NSLT) |
| 78. OFFICIAL USE ONLY-SMALL BUSINESS | 97. JUVENILE - PROTECT IDENTITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH 18 USC 5031 (JI) |
| 79. OFFICIAL USE ONLY-PROTECTED COOPERATIVE CENSUS CONFIDENTIAL | 98. SENSITIVE INFORMATION- SPECIAL HANDLING REQUIRED |
| 80. SBU-GSA-BI | 99. SENSITIVE WATER |
| 81. OFFICIAL USE ONLY (OUO) | 100. LIMITED OFFICIAL USE- LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE (LOU-LES) |
| 82. ATTORNEY/CLIENT PRIVILEGED | 101. EXPORT CONTROLLED INFORMATION (OR MATERIAL) (ECI) |
| 83. GRAND JURY MATERIAL (FGJ) | 102. SENSITIVE HOMELAND SECURITY INFORMATION (SHSI) |
| 84. OFFICIAL USE ONLY-APPLIED TECHNOLOGY | 103. OPERATIONS SECURITY PROTECTED INFORMATION (OSPI) |
| 85. DOD UNCLASSIFIED CONTROLLED NUCLEAR INFORMATION (DOD UCNI) | 104. DISSEMINATION IS PROHIBITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY AR 20–1 |
| 86. OFFICIAL USE ONLY-PATENT CAUTION INFORMATION | 105. COMMUNICATION/ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT (PRV) |
| 87. CONFIDENTIAL CONTRACT PROPOSAL INFORMATION (CCPI) | 106. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT INFORMATION |
| | 107. INNOVATION RESEARCH INFORMATION AND SMALL BUSINESS |
| | 108. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION PROTECTION AND STATISTICAL EFFICIENCY ACT OF 2002 (CIPSEA) |
| | 109. WITNESS SECURITY PROGRAM - PROTECT IDENTITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH 18 USC 3521 (WS) |
| | 110. SENSITIVE DRINKING WATER RELATED INFORMATION (SDWRI) |
| | 111. CONTRACTOR ACCESS RESTRICTED INFORMATION (CARI) |
| | 112. COMPUTER SECURITY ACT SENSITIVE INFORMATION (CSASI) |
| | 113. SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR) PROGRAM |
| | 114. PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION - PRIVACY ACT OF 1974 |
| | 115. PERSONNEL DATA, PRIVACY ACT OF 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552A) |
| | 116. FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY- LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE (FOUO-LES) |
| | 117. FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT (FISA) |
marking of any document containing PCII. There are document
destruction procedures, and requirements to report lost or misuse to
the federal government.

Even universities well versed in dealing with export restricted
information may find the procedural requirements of PCII to be
challenging and administratively burdensome. The other post 9/11
security regimes of CUI, CEII and SSI, do not have the same level of
procedural security restrictions (yet). CEII is controlled through a web
of FERC orders, issued in no apparent order.

TSA’s SSI is reportedly controlled through DHS Instruction for
Safeguarding and control IAW DHS MD 2810.1 SSI Program and the
TSA SSI Policy and Procedure Manual; however, the
TSA SSI Manual does not appear to be published yet.

CUI and University Research

Academic researchers have already encountered PCII, CEII, and SSI
in their sponsored research activities. The Department of Homeland
Security issues block grants to state homeland security departments
and some of these monies are being used to fund research at colleges
and universities. Power utilities have been restricting information
relating to their facilities since 2002. DHS and TSA have been
restricting their information since 2004. As the framework for CUI
continues to be developed by the executive branch of the
government, and applied across more federal agencies, more
government furnished unclassified information will be controlled, at
worst case for universities, using procedures patterned along the lines
of DHS’ PCII Manual.

Research Administrators will find CUI terms and conditions creeping
into many different research instruments, including memoranda of
understanding, nondisclosure agreements, grants, cooperative
agreements, and contracts. Some interdepartmental coordination will
likely be necessary to accommodate the more sophisticated controls
required by federal agencies such as DHS (e.g., research compliance,
sponsored programs, and academic units). When accepting CUI, each
institution should develop a clear understanding of the administrative
burden associated with security restrictions required for custody of the
information, and how those responsibilities are allocated among
academic and administrative units. Faculty will need to understand the
effect CUI can have on peer review, publishing, and student
participation, particularly those projects involving CUI in thesis
research. As the federal government continues down its path to
develop a CUI framework across all executive agencies, the problem of
Controlled Unclassified Information will be a growing one for higher
education, and one that is unlikely to go away. ■
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An Early Spring Visit to AUTM

By Clark McCartney

This NCURA member, as an invited Past President of AUTM (SUPA), attended the annual meeting of the Association of University Technology Managers, March 18th thru 20th, 2010 in New Orleans, Louisiana. “This Association is a non-profit organization dedicated to promoting, supporting, and enhancing the global academic technology transfer profession through internal and external education, training, and communication. AUTM’s more than 3,500 members represent managers of intellectual property from more than 300 Universities, research institutions and teaching hospitals as well as numerous businesses and government organizations” (“Autumn Essentials of Academic Technology Transfer Course,” 1). (See Autm.net for more information.)

The meeting scheduled eight track days with each day’s track featuring eleven different seminar subjects. This presented the meeting attendee with a wide choice of subjects to attend, many of which provided for CLE/CLP eligible certification. In addition to the morning and afternoon subject-intensive meetings, several plenary speakers presented general topics of interest to all attendees.

Three significant plenary meetings that should be mentioned were: First, Dr. Michael Rozen M.D., Chief Wellness Officer, Cleveland Clinic, with his unique presentation on “Transforming Health.” Dr. Rozen emphasized to the delegates that “Research has demonstrated that life-style choices and behavior have a far greater impact on longevity and health than heredity.” He discussed several of these steps as well as his own experiences in moving some of these concepts from academia into the marketplace (See www.autm.net for a complete transcript of this enlightening speech).

The second plenary meeting was the Friday morning “wake-up” plenary presentation by Dr. Matthew M. Norden, Vice-President, Venrock, on the topic of “Motivate or Die! Nanotechnology, Synthetic Biology, and Sustainability.” Dr. Norden discussed how advances in multi-disciplinary fields like nanoscience and synthetic biology can reconfigure resources for a lasting future. One example is technologies that can address real sustainability problems without just creating larger ones in the process, e.g. wind farms need natural gas backup, electric vehicles depend on scarce rare metals, and biofuels have daunting land use requirements.

Third was the popular and lively AUTM debate on the “Role of Inventors in Negotiating License Transactions.” The panel consisted of four debaters with one university academic administrator/faculty inventor on each side along with one legal advocate on each side. Unanimity was nearly reached between the university and inventor sides, but a hearty discussion did prevent total agreement on the premise of providing a seat at the table for inventors.

The membership of the Association has a very active international membership. Approximately one-third of the membership is international. The international attendees at the meeting were active in their attendance at all activities and seminars. AUTM also has a Vice-President for International Relations. As stated in the meeting program, “attendees are offered a unique opportunity at the meeting to be informed first-hand about AUTM’s current and planned International activities.” The participation of all attendees in interactive discussions with colleagues from all over the world was encouraged to “learn more about issues that are most relevant to day-to-day activities in the Increasingly International technology transfer arena.”

An example of international flavored seminars was the “Open Innovation and Public Research: Comparing American and European Practices” comprised of two speakers from French universities, one from the French government, and one speaker from an American university. This seminar focused on the current imperative for generation of economic development from new technological advances. It was agreed that how companies source their innovations in the academic sector reveals great differences among them in markets such as in the US and Europe. And with close reference to the US Bayh-Dole legislation, most western Europe countries have developed a strong institutional framework of university ownership of intellectual property. (Exceptions from this policy are few in western Europe, but Sweden stands out with its legal policy of open innovation without institutional ownership rights to faculty/staff intellectual property.) However, all the panelists emphasized that US and EU markets do show cultural differences which in many instances are crucial factors to consider when seeking international licensing success.

In conclusion, the in-depth program of this annual meeting was impressive in its variety and quality presentation of topics relating to intellectual property and its transfer to the marketplace. New Orleans was also a pleasant attraction for this writer to renew memories of previous visits. You can be assured that the “Big Easy” is now greatly restored and most enjoyable for its special music, food, and ambiance.

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

Compliance
As you read this, summer is upon us. Rather than pick a heavy compliance topic to review, I thought I would take a lighter approach. Let’s have a little fun with my attempt at a poem about the Research Compliance Officer.

Believe it or not, we are really here to help you,
Don’t exactly know the right thing to do?
Just ask us “how to”,
With a smile, we always have a Policy for your review.

We’ve been called a lot of things,
And along the way received our fair share of stings.
We don’t expect to be treated like kings,
For helping respond to the Grand auditor’s findings.

Seems like there are new rules all the time,
From an alphabet soup of regulators ...but they don’t help make this rhyme!
We don’t make most of the rules... a few of us whine.
But our due diligence avoids the penalty or fine.

On a serious note... The Compliance Neighborhood Committee will be posting our first podcast Implementing NSF’s RCR Training Requirement in mid-May. Please visit the NCURA Neighborhood website and check it out!

Mike Falzano is a member of the Compliance Neighborhood Committee and serves as Executive Assistant Dean and Director of the Office of Research Affairs, Administration and Compliance at Albany Medical College in Albany, New York. He fully discloses that he is not a poet, in case there was ever any doubt.

Departmental
United to Provide Service
A good relationship between the Department, College and Central Administration is critical when working toward timely submission of a proposal and when working on post-award issues. Open lines of communication on all three sides of this triangle—Department, College, and Central Administration—is critical to providing the best service possible to the faculty/principal investigators.

Our Department’s procedure at the University of Florida requires us to present the proposal to the College for the Deans’ signatures, and then forward the proposal to the Central Administration for final submission. During instances when a last minute proposal is being submitted, contacting and following up with the administrations at both the College and Central has assisted with timely submission of the proposal.

Communication from the Central to the Department level that have direct knowledge of their researchers’ day-to-day activities, and normally serves as the first contact when there are questions. An example of this can be when what is normally office supplies, such as binder clips, are purchased to make traps for a lab. At first glance this expenditure may appear improper, however after communication with the Department, the expense may be seen as legitimate.

Open lines of communication on all sides of the Department, College, and Central Administration triangle are critical to ensuring the best service to the faculty/principal investigators, which means meeting deadlines and resolving compliance issues in a timely fashion.

Michelle Quire is a member of the Departmental Administration Neighborhood Committee and serves as Administrative Coordinator, School of Forest Resources and Conservation, IFAS, University of Florida

eRA
The eRA Neighborhood has been busy and growing. Here are the latest in the eRA business and details are now on our website:

Grants.gov Update
The Program Management Office (PMO) is asking for comments and ideas regarding the system as the PMO is currently developing a draft business case for the “next generation” of Grants.gov.

ARRA Recipient Reporting Reminder!
NIH reminds all ARRA grant recipients: You have to finish all your close out paper work in order to “complete” your project. If you only completed your report at FederalReporting.gov, your project is not completed yet.

National Science Foundation
NSF FastLane is now accepting Microsoft 2007 files. These files have the extra “x” on the extension (for example docx, xlsx files) and they can be now uploaded directly into FastLane. No more need to convert files into PDF first.

Mark Your Calendars
NIH will host its Regional Seminar on Program Funding and Grants Administration on April 15-16 in Philadelphia, PA and June 23-24 in Portland, OR

Online Chat
Check out the transcript of our recent March 24 online chat NIH eRA Commons: Soup to Nuts with NIH experts Megan Columbus, Sheri Cummins, and Scarlett Gibb. It is available in the chat archives http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/online_chats/archives.php
On Campus Interview

The April on campus member profile features an interview with Tammy Custer, Grant and Contract Officer/eRA Specialist at Cornell University. It is available at http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/on_campaign2010.php

For more detailed information, please visit the eRA Neighborhood website at: http://www.ncura.edu/content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/electronic_research/index.php

Pei Lin Shi is a member of the eRA Neighborhood Committee and serves as Grant Services Coordinator, Office of Sponsored Programs, University of Texas at Brownsville

Pre-Award

The transition to electronic submission of NIH grants represented a challenge to central and departmental research administrators. Now, the new NIH requirement for restructured (shortened) research plans presents a further challenge for our faculty both in terms of preparing NIH applications and reviewing these applications in line with NIH’s enhanced review guidelines.

Please visit NCURA’s online Pre-award Neighborhood at http://www.ncura.edu/ams/login.php?url=content/regions_and_neighborhoods/neighborhoods/pre_award/index.php for helpful links for restructured applications and guidance on NIH’s enhanced peer review process.

Communication has always been an important part of our role as research administrators, but with all the recent changes in our field (particularly the increase in electronic submissions and the recent restructuring of the NIH applications) our ability to communicate effectively with all constituents has become even more critical. Please join us for our Pre-Award Neighborhood chat entitled “Bridging the Gap: Using tools and techniques to close the divide between central and department administrators” on June 29th. The chat will cover specific tools and communication techniques central and department research administrators can implement in order to collaborate on the same mission for their institutions.

Jane Tolbert is a member of the Pre Award Neighborhood Committee and serves as Senior Research Administrator, Office of Research and Project Administration, University of Rochester

PUI

A Grant Writer?

Recently, a request was made on the PUI listserv for a “Grant Writer” job description. My response was that Pre-Award Research Administrators are not grant writers. They facilitate all aspects of proposal submission from the “pre-pre-award” phase of research development, helping PIs to form the hypothesis or leading them to a topic that might fit their interests and field of study. Today’s topic de jour is obesity. Research Administrators can help an Economics PI come to a research agenda based on this topic.

Next, Pre-Award staff identify possible funding sources, vetting those sources for the sponsor requirements, scoring criteria, budget limitations, institutional cost issues like F&A restrictions and cost sharing or matching, etc. They try to take out the parts that a researcher does not need to address and showcase those that are important to them. They work with PIs on drafts of sections, the budget, seeking collaborators if necessary, guiding them to institutional resources that may strengthen their proposal, for example, the University Factbook, the research librarians who will perform literature reviews, the Safety Office and other compliance offices such as IRB, IACUC if applicable.

Pre-Award staff help PIs to build a strong proposal. They edit for grammar, formatting and content, provide good budget information, like actual salary and fringe information (you’d be surprised how many faculty don’t know how much they make!), give suggestions for additions to the budget, and assist in creating the fiscal narrative or budget justification. They still do not write the proposal.

So the list continues. The Pre-Award office reviews the proposal in comparison to the RFP to which it is responding. Has the PI really nailed scoring criteria #2 which amounts to 15% of their score? Have they made a vivid picture for reviewers through their logic model and explained the research methods clearly? Is the narrative concise and readable? Does the budget tie to the research agenda and capture all costs?

Then we move to seeking Institutional Approval. The Dean asks “why is the full F&A not collected here?” The Chair asks “does the PI really need that much time to perform the research?” We encourage the PI to answer these questions but in a pinch, you know who has to take it on.

The online submission, a unique and different experience, it seems, with every agency and foundation—unless of course you are dealing with a state agency who continue to require paper submissions! It is the Pre-Award office who nudges, begs, and reminds the PI to update their profile on the NIH eRA Commons. At the end of the day, it is the Pre-Award office that ensures what the PI has created is what the sponsor wants to see and submits it.

The Pre-Award office works to negotiate an award that does not match the proposal or a contract with unfriendly language to the satisfaction of the PI. And they still have not written a proposal, let alone a grant! They do, however, enter the award onto the institution’s fiscal administration system and hand it off the Post-Award side.

The title “Grant Writer” misleads faculty as to what we do as Research Administrators. I submit that the phrase itself is a misnomer. Pre-Award Research Administrators assist PIs in drafting fundable proposals. The grants come from the sponsors.

Anne Pascucci is the chair of the PUI Neighborhood Committee and serves as Director, Sponsored Programs and Grants Management, Radford University. Special thanks for the editorial assistance of Taryn Chase, Pre-Award Editorial and Informational Specialist, Radford University
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If we only knew back then what we know today. Even just ten years ago, the life of a Research Administrator was drastically different from what we experience now. Deadlines were generally the first of the month. Then the rest of the month was dedicated to working on projects, following up on tasks, planning and forecasting. Fast forward to early 2009. The best way to describe this decade of transition is captured in Dr. Ned Hallowell’s retelling of the urban legend about boiling a frog (http://www.drhallowell.com/crazy-busy/). This frequently used allegory suggests that if you put a frog in boiling water he jumps out right away, but if you put him in cold water and gradually turn up the heat, he stays comfortably in the pot to be cooked! Someone has been gradually turning up the burner on Research Administrators since the late 1990s, and like the allegorical frog, we must take precautions to avoid finding ourselves in boiling water.

As if the regular NIH cycle and other spring deadlines were not enough to keep the average Research Administrator bouncing from Grants.Gov submissions to Fastlane, from e-mail to the PI standing in the doorway, from the Export Control question to the phone messages awaiting a response, and all of the added compliance requirements to the reports due tomorrow. We were being asked to do even more with less, as budgets tightened and people were being laid off. Just when you thought it could not get any more “crazy-busy,” one Friday afternoon in February 2009, Research Administrators all over the country learned that 10.4 billion dollars had been appropriated to NIH when President Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) designed to stimulate the economy. The stimulus package added a whole new set of tasks to a list that was not getting any shorter. It began with the feeding frenzy of applications to process, followed by weekly and quarterly reporting that the already stressed research community had to absorb. Research administration duties continue to grow at a far faster pace than resources or personnel, pushing us beyond the average stress level and seriously overloading our circuits.

Previously published in the Harvard Business Review in January 2005, an article by Dr. Hallowell titled Overloaded Circuits: Why Smart People Underperform struck a vein. For someone who has experienced Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) as a parent, Ms. Howson could see her child’s behavior mirrored in her own during periods of heavy stress, but it was never continuous or predictable. Dr. Hallowell calls this condition Attention Deficit Trait or ADT. Before reading this article, Ms. Howson could only speculate about and struggle with the answer to the best way to manage competing demands until the crisis passed. For many classmates in the 2009 LDI class, it was easy to relate this crisis mode to the day-to-day life of a Research Administrator.

Dr. Hallowell, a graduate of Harvard College and Tulane Medical School, is a prominent psychiatrist in practice for over 25 years, author and lecturer. He has written numerous articles and books about issues surrounding Attention Deficit Disorder and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (AD/HD), the power of the human connection, forgiveness, worry, and managing excessive busyness. This includes a 2006 book titled Crazy Busy: Overbooked, Overstretched, and About to Snap, which suggests that the pace of our
Attention Deficit Trait (ADT) refers to a feeling of being overwhelmed by modern culture. Dr. Hallowell notes that ADT is not a medical condition that requires medication, unlike ADD. ADT can be controlled by taking charge of one’s environment, emotional health, and mental health. Preventive measures include:

- **Promote positive emotions by creating a positive, fear-free environment.**
- **Build brain power by spending a few minutes, face-to-face, with a colleague you enjoy every 4-6 hours.**
- **Care physically for your brain.**
  - Sleep — Get enough rest, meaning you can wake without an alarm clock.
  - Diet — Maintain stable glucose levels.
  - Avoid simple carbohydrates by replacing them with complex carbohydrates found in fruits, vegetables, and whole grains.
  - Remember protein is important; start your day with it.
  - Take a multivitamin every day.
- **Exercise – Increase blood flow and biochemical reactions that promote mental agility by moving around.**
- **Exercise 30 minutes every other day.**

The article also enumerates ways in which to organize one’s work to eliminate or reduce ADT, including:

- Break large tasks or projects into smaller ones.
- Keep a section of your desk clear at all times.
- Keep a portion of your day free to think and plan (set planning appointments on your calendar).
- Monitor e-mail at intervals, not constantly throughout the day.
- End each day by making a short list of 3-5 items to attend to the next day.
- Use the OHIO rule for each document you touch: Only Handle It Once.
  - Act on it.
  - File it.
  - Toss it.

When all else fails (and occasionally it will), take action to prevent slipping into survival mode.

**As leaders and managers, remember that ADT affects everyone. Take active steps to protect yourself and your employees by contributing to a positive atmosphere and by aligning employee skills to tasks. Understanding ADT and how it affects you is the best way to prevent it.**

Supporting the Reporting Requirements for ARRA

By Kerry Peluso

When speaking to Research Administrators regarding the topic of ARRA funding, there are many positive thoughts expressed. The availability of funds to further institutional research initiatives is viewed very favorably and research administrators fully appreciate the benefits provided to their institutions and to those in the research administration profession by the availability of these funds. As the availability of ARRA funding became a reality so did the needs to ensure the responsible administration of these funds and that the federal government gathered the information that they needed to share with the public. In response to this need, the federal government has developed detailed reporting requirements. These reports require detail at a greater level than is typically required for federal research grants. Early in the process, research administration offices throughout the country understood that their role in the process would be significant. How they would ensure their institution’s ability to meet these requirements has required much thought and planning. Many institutions have had to begin tracking some information that they did not centrally track in the past. In some cases, this required the implementation of new or modified information systems and business processes. More frequent (quarterly) reporting with tighter reporting deadlines has required that institutions evaluate whether their current level of staffing could meet these new demands. In a recent survey of 112 research institutions, it was clear that the responsibility of ensuring that ARRA funds are appropriately administered and accounted for is a very high priority for these institutions. The information below is based upon the results of this survey and additional interviews which sought information on what research administration offices have done to ensure that they will be able to meet the requirements of ARRA reporting.

Staffing to Support ARRA Reporting

When interviewed about what they have done to respond to the reporting requirements, those responsible for ARRA reporting provided a variety of responses. Adding new staff was reported by approximately 31% of the institutions surveyed. (10.7% reported adding additional managerial staff.) As might be expected, the larger the volume of ARRA awards received, the more likely that the institution would hire additional staff. Some institutions stated they may have considered adding additional staff but their institutions are currently under a hiring freeze while other institutions noted that they had canceled prior plans to reduce research administration staff in order to ensure additional staffing to meet ARRA reporting requirements. Some reported hiring temporary staff to assist with ARRA Reporting.

Some institutions became more creative and have brought in their school and departmental administrators to assist them with preparing the reports. Some institutions have assigned the reporting responsibilities to other departments within their institution (Research Compliance Office and Procurement Office were identified).

Systems to Support ARRA Reporting

Of those surveyed, 76.8% are using excel for their reporting while 23.2% are using XML format. Results reported that 16.4% of respondents have developed new systems to assist them in collecting the data required for ARRA reporting. Many institutions have developed some type of web based form to collect data from the PI’s and departmental personnel. Over 91% of the institutions stated that they require the PI to provide information for reporting on a quarterly basis with an additional 2% stating that this is required during the initial reporting period only.

Challenges

While the institutions all noted the benefits of ARRA funding to their institutions, most research administration offices reported that they have faced challenges with ARRA reporting. The most frequently mentioned challenges included managing with the changing requirements, responding to the tight reporting deadline and developing systems or processes to gather and track large amounts of information that has not been centrally tracked in the past. With the spending of ARRA funds well underway these days, obtaining information from subawardees has become one of the larger challenges facing institutions during this most recent reporting period. Also often noted as a challenge, was the impact on staff (workload, morale, etc.).

Lessons Learned and Advice

Below are some of the recommendations received from the institutions surveyed. Please note that not all options will work for all institutions and that these are based upon individual opinions and experiences. The most heavily noted area was the value of communication. Accurate reporting involves input from a variety of different areas which often will include several departments and systems. Effective, organized and ongoing communication can greatly assist in streamlining the process.

Other items of advice provided included:

- If you have a larger amount of ARRA awards, dedicate staff to ARRA reporting.
- Assign a staff member to monitor the updates from OMB and the major funding agencies.
- Develop an effective method for disseminating information to the others involved in the reporting process.
- Ensure that roles and responsibilities in the reporting process are clearly defined and communicated. Clearly define deadlines in this process.
- Consider a team approach within the central research administration office.
- Involve the PIs and keep them apprised of the process and their role in it. Provide training for them and make their process as user friendly and accessible as possible.
- Start collecting the information from PIs several weeks prior to the deadline to allow
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**Around the World**

*By Dave Richardson*


I remember my very first NCURA conference where upon observing the vast number and diversity of the participants it immediately struck me that the job I held was part of a larger profession and that research administrators throughout the United States toiled daily with similar challenges. I experienced a similar revelation but with a global perspective with my recent participation in the 2010 International Network of Research Management Societies (INORMS) Biennial Conference held in Cape Town, South Africa. This biennial meeting, hosted by the South African Research and Innovation Management Association (SARIMA), exceeded all expectations attracting over 400 participants from more than 40 different countries. SARIMA and the Capetonians, as residents of the Western Cape Province are called, proved to be excellent hosts and continuously displayed their warmth and hospitality. South Africa is set to host the 2010 World Cup this June and from my experience with INORMS 2010, they are more than ready to welcome the world.

The official NCURA delegation also included Dr. John Carfora, past chair of the NCURA International Commission. John and I traveled to INORMS 2010 with the goal of expanding NCURA’s collaborations among the various international research management associations and to put forth the possibility of having the 2014 INORMS Conference held in North America. I’m proud to admit that we were successful on both fronts. As representatives of the oldest organization of research management professionals in the world, we were often called upon to share how we institutionally approach training, outreach, and management of our membership. We readily shared on numerous formal and informal occasions the many lessons learned from our long-term participation in NCURA and how a professional research management association can advance its field and yet at the same time serve its members. It was great having the opportunity to communicate our perspectives on the common thread of research administration regardless of language or location in the world. We are also thrilled to announce that North America will be granted the opportunity to host the 2014 “World Cup of Research Administration” tentatively targeted for Washington D.C. Stayed tuned over the course of the next year as details of the 2014 INORMS Conference emerges.

At last year’s annual NCURA meeting we focused on the theme of “One World Connected through Research”. While this still rings true I would like to modify the theme somewhat to read “One World Connected through the Eyjafjallajokull Volcano”. As the 2010 INORMS Conference came to a successful conclusion we received warnings that a volcano in Iceland was erupting and spewing enormous clouds of ash that was threatening flights into and out of the Northern European airspace. Given that a great many of us flew either directly from or connected through Northern European airports, the Eyjafjallajokull ash cloud drew our attention. Mother Nature did win out and the ash cloud managed to make a mess of travel plans around the globe. The NCURA delegation found itself “stuck” in Cape Town without word or news of when air traffic would resume. While we dwelled on our fate, we considered ourselves fortunate for during the course of our “extended” conference we were treated very well by all whom we encountered and had the opportunity to solidify our organizational relationships with our European and African counterparts. There is nothing like a crisis to bond people and organizations together. I’m pleased to say that the field of research administration prepared us well for surviving this unexpected extension of our time in South Africa. We expanded our professional network by befriending the flight crews who were staying at our hotel for they were the only reliable source of information on the airspace above Europe. When the airlines themselves ultimately failed to assist us, we called upon our professional negotiation skills in finding an alternative route out of Africa. In the end, we survived the largest global flight stoppage in history by managing to flank the ash clouds by traveling back home via a South American route. We are extremely grateful to many and owe thanks to a number of people who assisted us in safely returning home during this crisis. Specifically, we wish to thank Kathleen Larmett for she was there with us in spirit the whole time via email and voice communication and was a constant reminder of why NCURA is such a great organization.

Even with the additional challenges of our return trip home, I would not change anything about the experience. The 2010 INORMS Conference was a great success and it was an immense honor to represent NCURA to the world. While we look forward to the 2012 INORMS Conference in Copenhagen, we will be preparing ourselves to host the world in 2014!

Dave Richardson joined the field of research administration in 1992 starting as a grants officer with the University of Georgia. While at the University of Georgia, Dave’s work focused initially on pre-award activities in the Office of Sponsored Programs and concluded with service as a departmental business manager handling pre and post award responsibilities on a large international cooperative agreement. In 1998, Dave joined the administrative faculty of Virginia Tech assisting the Vice President for Research with research management operations of the university. In 2001, he was appointed the Director of the Virginia Tech Office of Sponsored Programs and was responsible for both pre- and post-award functions. He concluded his service to Virginia Tech as the Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration in 2006. In 2007, Dave joined Pennsylvania State University. He currently serves as the Associate Vice President for Research and Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs.
Overloaded Circuits and Stress

By Jennifer Crockett

Budget Manager, Research

In the current state of our institutions, research administrators are constantly trying to do more with less support and still get everything done on time. How is it possible to get the work done without some sort of superpowers?

Generally, managers (or team leaders) tend to take on more of the responsibilities/tasks themselves because they are likely to see the workload of those around them before they will admit to the level of their own workload. They have a strong work ethic and are committed to getting the work done on time; they prefer to do it right the first time and in the right way. Has anyone ever stopped to consider what happens to you when you take on more and more of this burden? Generally, you end up working more and more hours, which translates to longer days and often weekends in the office or at home. You’re being pushed to complete everything, and naturally something is being sacrificed. Is it quality, your confidence, team efforts, your sanity, or all of the above? Eventually, this will take a toll not only on yourself but also on those around you since this is not a sustainable way of life.

What happens to you when you become overloaded and stressed? Are you aware and know what your “behavior of choice” is: micromanaging, withdrawing, competing, or some other type of behavior? While you’re evaluating your behaviors when you’re stressed, also consider how you receive other people’s stress (faculty, staff, and/or students) and how your stress impacts others (intentionally or not). You’ve all had a moment when you had to deal with a stressed faculty member, student or staff member; how did you know that person was stressed? Were you able to quickly identify the stress by their behavior or the tone of their voice, or was it another indicator that was slightly more subtle? Whatever the indicator or indicators were, it is always much easier to see what is happening with someone other than yourself.

You are often so caught up in the details of the issues at hand, it is hard to see the forest for the trees! This often means that you don’t recognize the indicators that others observe in you or realize the kind of impact you are having on those around you, whether intentionally or unintentionally. If you aren’t aware of your own behaviors, simply ask those around you. If you’ve built the kind of team where honest feedback is encouraged, you may get just that. Others may be less inclined and will often give you the feedback in a less direct context. Regardless of the way you get the feedback, encourage and welcome the input, digest it, and then keep it in your back pocket as a reference so that you’re aware of your behaviors, your triggers, and your “tell” signs.

 Personally, I was made aware of my own behaviors in a less than positive way but realized that, while I had an issue with the delivery of the message, the message itself had a point. I have been working to become more aware and to curb those stress-filled behaviors at the onset. I tend to mix the modes and “swirl,” which is basically running around in circles trying to put out the “fires.” When you’re in this mode, you are so busy running to put out the fire that you don’t take a minute to think about what’s happening. You aren’t prioritizing, you have a hard time completing items, you have a higher percentage of errors occurring, and last but not least, you may not be very pleasant to be around. Hours turn into days, which turn into weeks and then months; and it all begins to snowball in a downward spiral. Before you know it, you’ve spent so much time concentrating on the never-ending fires that you don’t have time for anything else, and often walk away feeling like you haven’t completed anything.

You may also fall into the trap of thinking it is much easier to just do it yourself than to delegate to someone else who either isn’t trained to handle the work or who will do it wrong; at least you know that by doing it yourself it will be done right. Don’t believe it! Think about the long-term implications of this behavior with your staff and your supervisors; you’re giving everyone the impression that you don’t have any confidence in your staff’s abilities, you don’t trust your staff to take on and complete the work, and you haven’t quite grasped the concept of teamwork and delegation. If you assign the tasks to someone who isn’t trained, you’re setting them up for failure; so what is the solution?

Stop the madness!!! Step back from your never-ending cycle; evaluate what you have on your plate and what’s coming down the road; work with your team to identify alternatives, solutions, and responsibilities; review with them and clarify responsibilities; then refocus and get the work done. Yes, it’s easier said than done; but as managers it is your job to lead by example, to create a sphere of positive influence, to always be open to new ideas and suggestions, but also to be realistic. Engaging your staff and supervisors emphasizes that you trust them, respect them, and value their contributions.

One thing that I’ve taken away from “learning the hard way” is that as a manager/team leader, you cannot be the “hero,” the person who always takes responsibility for critical issues, and then tries to get the job done alone without any collaboration. The next time you’re in a meeting, look and listen to see if the to-do items are being spread around or if the same one or two people are the ones consistently walking away with the assignments. Try to observe if those assignments truly belong to that specific area and what happens to those assignments when they are taken back to the group. As “movers and shakers,” managers have a tendency to take on too much just because no one else steps up and takes responsibility. This behavior sets you up for failure, so how can you change this without letting things fall through the cracks? First, find a method of assessing your workloads on a consistent basis—something along the lines of “Monday morning quarterbacking” where you take an
honest view of the previous week and discuss what went wrong or what could have been done better. Then use the lessons learned to make changes in the coming week. Even if you only spend thirty minutes in this review session, it will help you and your team prioritize the work for the week and will be setting a pattern for evaluation that could be invaluable to you and your team.

Another key tool for an effective manager/team leader is to learn the difference between delegation and passing the buck. A supervisor once told me that I didn’t delegate enough. When I explained that my staff were not experienced enough to take on certain aspects of the work, I was told to delegate anyway and if they failed, they failed. From my point of view, this was passing the buck not delegating, and appalling behavior from someone who was supposed to be leading by example. Delegation is not something to be used to simply get something off your desk; delegation should be used to balance workloads and empower those working for or with you. With delegation also comes the relinquishment of control, something that can only be done when there is trust in those with whom you’re working. A large part of delegation also involves training those individuals to whom you’re going to delegate a task or assignment. Each time someone has a question, use it as an opportunity to teach or reinforce a skill. Teaching will definitely take time that you may not feel you have right now, but it is time well spent since you will be providing direction and assigning tasks of which your staff will take ownership and be confident enough to complete; and you will be building the capacity of your staff.

Don’t misunderstand; none of this will make support appear like magic fairies or lessen the work to be completed. It will only help you to become aware of what your stress factors are, when you are overloaded, and how your behaviors impact others. However, when all else fails, go get coffee. This makes you walk away from the office, if only for a few minutes. Take that time to reflect and rethink your “mode of operation.” Plus, a good café latte always puts me in a great mood!

---

Supporting the Reporting Requirements...Continued from page 40

- Ensure that your process includes maintaining organized back up documentation for your reports.
- If you have more than 50 ARRA awards, look at the XML option.
- Meet with your procurement office and ensure that they understand the requirements and can be your partner in their parts of the process.
- Start communications with your sub-awardees early.
- While not always easy or possible, consider offering “comp time” to staff for some of the additional extra time worked.
- Get creative: One school reported giving a prize (a box of girl scout cookies) to the first PI to provide all of their information.

In the end, it is very important to note that as an institution receives any significant amount of additional sponsored program funding, the research administration leadership needs to address the infrastructure needs to support the additional efforts that come with the additional funding. Evaluating whether additional staffing or systems are required and the development of the proper business processes and communication channels is all part of this. The Research Administrators interviewed acknowledged these areas and, in the end, stated that they felt the benefits of the ARRA funding received by their institutions were well worth the efforts required by ARRA reporting.

Jennifer Crockett, BS, MBA, is currently the Budget Manager for the Vice Provost of Research at Northeastern University, and recently spent eighteen months as the International Programs Administrator in the Department of Nutrition at the Harvard School of Public Health in Boston, MA. With close to twenty years experience working in higher education, primarily in the New England area, and nearly ten years experience in sponsored research administration and management, her work has involved managing the financial, personnel, and operational aspects of sponsored projects including working closely with subrecipient partner institutions in developing countries to build capacity and sustainability. Jennifer has been a member of the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) since 1996.

Population of those surveyed (ARRA funding received):

- 33.0% $1 to $10,000,000
- 12.5% $10,000,001 to $25,000,000
- 18.8% $25,000,001 to $50,000,000
- 10.7% $50,000,001 to $75,000,000
- 7.1% $75,000,001 to $100,000,000
- 17.9% Over $100,000,000

Kerry Peluso is the Associate Vice President for Research Administration at Emory University. Kerry has over 20 years experience in research and grants administration, is a CPA and holds an MBA. In her current role, she is responsible for the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Office of Grants and Contracts Accounting. These offices provide pre and post award research administration support services to Emory’s research community.

Prior to joining Emory in February 2007, Kerry held the position of Director of Post Award Financial Administration at the University of Pennsylvania. Her background also includes several years experience as a Senior Accounting Manager at Rutgers University in the Division of Grant and Contract Accounting and seven years experience managing grants for non-profit organizations. Beyond grants and research administration, Kerry’s background includes five years experience in tax, private and public accounting.

Kerry has been involved in a variety of roles with the National Council of University Research Administrators including serving as National Treasurer, Chair/co-Chair of national conferences and Chair of the Financial Research Administration Neighborhood Committee. She served as a faculty member for NCURA’s Financial Research Administration Workshop and is currently a Peer Reviewer for the NCURA Peer Review Program. She is a frequent speaker at national conferences.
EFFORT CERTIFICATION AND REPORTING JUST GOT AFFORDABLE.

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

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

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

See it now at itworks-inc.com.
See why Huron is the ideal partner to assist with managing the complexities of a university research enterprise

- Comprehensive plans for improving organizational and operations performance
- Helping institutions understand and respond to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)
- Interim management and staffing support
- Developing research education and training programs, including assistance with NSF’s RCR training requirements
- Huron’s ecrt® solution for web-based effort reporting
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2010 Polls Will Open This Summer

The Nominating and Leadership Development Committee is accepting nominations through May 21, 2010, for Vice President/President-Elect and two At-Large Board Members.

NCURA Members will then receive an electronic ballot this summer and will be asked to vote at that time. Elections are open for 30 days after the polls open.

Your vote counts! Thank you in advance for your participation in these important upcoming elections!

The 2010 Nominating and Leadership Development Committee

Chair
Pamela Whitlock, University of North Carolina at Wilmington, Emeritus

Vice Chair
Vivian Holmes, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard

Region I
Gary Smith, Massachusetts General Hospital

Region II
Ann Holmes, University of Maryland College Park

Region III
Cathy Snyder, Vanderbilt University

Region IV
Diane Barrett, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Region V
Kay Ellis, University of Texas at Austin

Region VI
John Carfora, Loyola Marymount University

Region VII
Winnie Ennenga, Northern Arizona University

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

FUNDAMENTALS OF SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION
Seattle, WA.........................................................May 17–19, 2010
Savannah, GA ...................................................June 9–11, 2010
Princeton, NJ ......................................................July 26–28, 2010

SPONSORED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION II WORKSHOPS
Savannah, GA ...................................................June 9–11, 2010
Princeton, NJ ......................................................July 26–28, 2010

DEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
Seattle, WA.........................................................May 17–19, 2010
Savannah, GA ...................................................June 16–18, 2010

FINANCIAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP
Seattle, WA.........................................................May 17–19, 2010

2010 NCURA TV SATELLITE BROADCAST SERIES
Managing Financial Requirements of Awards ................Available on DVD
Critical Issues for the Department Administrator ..........Available on DVD
Non-Financial Research Compliance ................................June 15, 2010
Negotiating Federal Contracts and Pass-Through Awards ..................................................September 21, 2010

PRE-AWARD RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION 4
Providence, RI ....................................................July 19–21, 2010

NCURA ANNUAL MEETING

THE NEXT TWO ISSUES ARE:
SUMMER 2010 “GREEN” ISSUE
Submission of Articles.............................................July 1, 2010
Submission of Advertisements................................July 1, 2010

SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 2010 DEADLINES:
Submission of Articles to Contributing Editors: ........August 5, 2010
Submission of Articles to Co-editors: .........................August 12, 2010
Submission of Advertisements: ...............................August 19, 2010

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

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