Title: Business Development/Business Incubator **#** 295

Source: City of Chattanooga, TN **Co Area:** Technology Business Incubato

Addl Info: http://www.bmpcoe.org/bestpractices/internal/chatt/chatt_8.html

Abstract: When 3M moved out of Chattanooga in the early 1980s, the company left a 125,000 square foot building in deteriorating north Chattanooga. The local economic development agency restored the building in 1988 and developed it into a small business incubator to provide space and support services for new businesses. The funding for the facility is provided by the Economic Development Administration and City/county matching funds.

The facility now contains 50 offices and 30 manufacturing spaces, with office spaces between 130 and 1,300 square feet and manufacturing spaces between 400 and 8,000 square feet. Spaces are rented at the low end of market value, and the rental rate increases by $0.50 per square foot per year during the three-year incubation period. Companies qualify as tenants if they are in their first year of existence demonstrating good business planning sense, demonstrating the ability to outgrow and move from the center after three years, and are designated a for-profit company.

Support services provided to the tenants at no charge include janitorial services, business planning assistance, loan packaging assistance, use of conference rooms and overhead projectors, on-site postal boxes, notary public, security, parking, volunteer counseling, and pick-up of mixed paper for recycling. The companies are charged for utilities, garbage disposal, business property tax, clerical support, copier charges, faxing capabilities, and on-site bookkeeping services. A library, video center, and computer center are also available for use at no charge. In addition, over 100 professional volunteers provide assistance to the companies as needed.

There are 65 companies currently located in the facility, 55 of which are service related, and 10 manufacturing related. Total employment for all companies currently in the facility is 424, and 223 companies have graduated out of the incubator with 1,520 employees. The cumulative sales of these start-up companies has amounted to $200M. Of the 344 companies that started business in the incubator facility, 288 are still in business a success rate of 84%.

Title: Maryland Industrial Partnerships (MIPS) program - Best Practice in technology transfer programs. **#** 335

Source: University System of Maryland **Co Area:** Technology Transfer

Addl Info: http://www.mips.umd.edu/

Abstract: The Maryland Industrial Partnerships (MIPS) program accelerates the commercialization of technology in Maryland by providing matching funds for collaborative R&D projects between companies and University System of Maryland faculty.

Through MIPS, faculty can gain:

* A fast reply -- MIPS lets applicants know within 60 days whether or not they've received a contract award, enabling them to plan their busy research schedules
* Results -- MIPS projects have contributed to many successful commercial products, as well as graduate theses and hundreds of published papers

---

Title: The Michigan Economic Development Corporation's "SmartZone" **#** 336

Source: Michigan Universities **Co Area:** Technology Business Incubato

Addl Info: http://ref.themedc.org/cm/attach/DA889C19-C8A6-434A-9FE4-F5440B4B7DF7/MISmartZonefactsheet.pdf

Abstract: Michigan SmartZones are collaborations between universities, industry, research organizations, government, and other community institutions intended to stimulate the growth of technology-based businesses and jobs by aiding in the creation of recognized clusters of new and emerging businesses, those primarily focused on commercializing ideas, patents, and other opportunities surrounding corporate, university or private research institute R&D efforts.

SmartZones provide distinct geographical locations where technology-based firms, entrepreneurs and researchers can locate in close proximity to all of the community assets that will assist in their endeavors. The locations of the Michigan SmartZones represent areas that comprise a critical mass of technology development assets.

Title: A Guide to Best Practices in Human Subjects Research **#** 339

Source: Bucknell University **Co Area:** Office of Sponsored Research

Addl Info: http://www.bucknell.edu/Documents/InstitutionalResearch/IRBPolicyManual.pdf

Abstract: This document is intended to provide guidance for students and faculty who conduct classroom exercises that involve human subjects. Such exercises are presumed to involve only minimal risk to the subjects, that is, risk that is no greater than subjects would encounter in their everyday lives. If you anticipate that a planned classroom exercise will involve more significant risks, or if there are unique or idiosyncratic elements to your project that do not conform to the descriptions in this document, you should consult first with your departmental representative to the Institutional Review Board (IRB). If your department does not have a standing representative, you may consult with the IRB representative in a closely related department, or contact the Chair of the IRB at 577-3623 (rackoff@bucknell.edu).

Title: Cost Sharing Best Practices **#** 401

Source: University of California Davis **Co Area:** Grants & Contracts

Addl Info: http://accounting.ucdavis.edu/Costshare/bestpractices.cfm

Abstract: There are several things you can do to ensure that your cost share tracking is effective, efficient, and accurate. The site covers the following topics:

Review, utilize, and communicate information from multiple sources.
Think carefully about the information being entered in the Effort Commitment & Cost Share Tracking system.
Review the information in the Effort Commitment & Cost Share Tracking system on a regular basis.
Avoid the use of Cost Transfer documents.

They also have a Cost Sharing Help site at http://accounting.ucdavis.edu/Costshare/index.cfm

---

Title: Best Practices Presentations **#** 431

Source: University of Rochester **Co Area:** Grants & Contracts

Addl Info: http://www.rochester.edu/adminfinance/audit/practices.html

Abstract: This site links to several presentations covering the following:

Principal Investigator Ledger Approval Sample Form
Cost Sharing / Conflicts of Interest
Principal Investigator's Fiscal Responsibilities
Internal Control Objectives for Sponsored Programs Audits
Inventory Management Best Practices
Travel and Conference Best Practices
Records Retention Best Practices
Salim Alani's Fall 2000 Finance Conference Presentation
Controls To Minimize Fraud in a Cash Receipts Environment
Internal Controls -- What are they and why should I care?

Title: Best Practices for Obtaining Grants **#** 455

Source: Berkshire Community College **Co Area:** Office of Sponsored Research

Addl Info: http://www.iberkshires.com/story.php?story_id=5465

Abstract: Why are some companies and organizations more successful than others in obtaining training and other types of grants? Some of the best practices for successful grant applications were outlined in a recent workshop sponsored by the Berkshire County Regional Employment Board. They include:

Is this a good fit? Take a close look at the grant's mission statement and goals to see if your own employer's mission matches well.

Title: Grant Development Guide **#** 456

Source: Mount Wachusett Community College **Co Area:** Office of Sponsored Research

Addl Info: http://mwcc.edu/advancement/files/2011/12/Grant-Development-Guide.pdf

Abstract: The role of the institutional advancement (IA) office is to assure Mount Wachusett Community College's growth, viability, and competitive advantage. IA builds an annual grant development agenda, driven by the college's strategic priorities, to seek and obtain external funding support that will enhance the work done at the college in:

- Upgrading current programs;
- Developing new academic programs;
- Attracting new faculty and students;
- Providing new educational opportunities;
- Improving teaching and access to teaching resources;
- Promoting and enhancing diversity;
- Adding and improving resources; and
- Supporting community service activities.

Also see THE GRANT DECISION MAKING MATRIX - http://www.mwcc.mass.edu/PDFs/matrix.pdf

Title: Ethics - Human Subjects - Best Practices **#** 549

Source: University of Toronto **Co Area:** Office of Sponsored Research

Addl Info: http://www.research.utoronto.ca/for-researchers-administrators/ethics/

Abstract: The Ethics Review Office (ERO) is responsible for providing the support and resources necessary to uphold the highest ethical and regulatory standards of research involving human or animal subjects, or using biohazardous materials at the University of Toronto. We are here to assist faculty members, staff and students through the ethical review process, from the preparation of a protocol submission to the final approval of the research and beyond. We also facilitate the review process conducted by our five Research Ethics Boards (REBs), six Local Animal Care Committees (LACCs), University Animal Care Committee (UACC), and help to develop and enforce policies and procedures at the university which are in compliance with national and international guidelines. Finally, we are here as a resource to all university researchers in understanding the why's and how's of research ethics and ethics review.

The site covers -
- Human Subjects
- Animal Subjects
- Application Forms
- Biohazardous Materials
- Contacts

Title: Research Ethics Policy, Principle and Procedures **#** 571

Source: University of East Anglia (United Kingdom) **Co Area:** Grants & Contracts

Addl Info: http://www.uea.ac.uk/research/research_integrity/University+Research+Ethics+Policy+approved+Senate+15+June+2011

Abstract: The University is committed to advancing and safeguarding high quality academic and ethics standards in all its activities. The Policy should be read in conjunction with other complementary policies, including the University's 'Guidelines on Good Research Practice' and with the University's 'Procedures for dealing with allegations of misconduct in research', as well as specific ethics guidance issued by the University and Faculty Research Ethics Committee and any associated sub-committees.

When undertaking research, researchers are expected to consider and observe ethical principles and the University's mission and values. This policy sets out conditions for establishing the ethics review requirements of a research project.

Title: Research Ethics: A Handbook of Principles and Procedures **#** 576

Source: University of Gloucestershire (England) **Co Area:** Grants & Contracts

Addl Info: http://insight.glos.ac.uk/researchmainpage/researchoffice/documents/research%20ethics%20handbook%20final%20nov%2010.pdf

Abstract: Introduction

1. Professional and academic communities are placing increasingly exacting responsibilities on their members to improve the ethical standards of research and practice within their disciplines, and journal editors may require evidence that research projects have secured formal ethical clearance before agreeing to publish their findings.

2. Research Ethics: a Handbook of Principles and Procedures has been produced in response to this growing awareness of ethically sensitive issues in research and scholarly activity. Under the aegis of Academic Board, its intention is to guide and, where necessary, regulate the scholarly activities of researchers at undergraduate, postgraduate and staff levels within the University and to promote a stronger appreciation of ethical considerations in research.

3. The Handbook comprises three parts.

Title: Overview of Research Ethics at Griffith University **#** 585

Source: Griffith University **Co Area:** Office of Sponsored Research

Addl Info: http://www.griffith.edu.au/or/ethics/humans/content_overview.html

Abstract: In accordance with the National Statement of Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans, the University has established the Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC). This committee is responsible for considering applications for ethical clearance, monitoring the conduct of approved protocols, and advising the institution on the formulation of policies and guidelines for this area.

The previous 5 years have seen a rapid pace of change in the regulation of human research ethics in Australia. During the same period the volume and complexity of human research within the institution has increased. In light of concerns expressed by some researchers and a desire to ensure that the University's research ethics arrangements will keep pace with international best practice, the former Deputy Vice-Chancellor initiated a wide-ranging review of the University's arrangements.

The Review report made a number of significant recommendations that were accepted by the Academic Committee at its 11 September meeting, 2003.

Title: Worst Practices - Best—and Worst—Practices in Research Administration **#** 642

Source: National Council of University Research Administrators **Co Area:**

Addl Info: http://www.ncura.edu/content/news/rmr/docs/v13n1.pdf

Abstract: Page 11 (p13 of PDF file)
This article discusses some of the best—and worst—practices in research administration. This discussion is based on a review of the literature and our cumulative 70 years of experience in establishing, administering, training, evaluating, and mentoring research administration programs and professionals in public and private universities. In essence, four main factors differentiate the best from the worst: (1) Culture; (2) Change; (3) Competence; and (4) Communication.

Traditional emphasis on “best practices” has focused on the competence or skills necessary to be an effective research administrator. This article takes a broader perspective, placing competence in a larger framework of organizational behavior that includes the attributes of culture, change, and communication. Mishandled, any one of these factors can hamper an institution’s research and scholarship initiatives. Conversely, when handled skillfully, research administrators are extremely effective and experience high job satisfaction as judged by themselves and their professional colleagues.

Title: Best Practices for Ensuring Quality Care of Research Animals **#** 746

Source: University of California San Francisco **Co Area:** Office of Sponsored Research

Addl Info: http://www.iacuc.ucsf.edu/Policies/lf_iacuc_bestpractice_trifold.pdf

Abstract: Conducting high-quality research is essential to UCSF’s mission of advancing human health. Animal research in particular is highly regulated, and UCSF is committed to full compliance with all regulatory agencies and oversight groups. Beyond what laws and regulations dictate, we recognize that laboratory animals are living creatures that deserve to be treated with care and compassion.

In fact, UCSF is dedicated to becoming the national model for animal research and care. To that end, this brochure outlines the best practices possible for ensuring the well-being of our animals and to maximizing their comfort and welfare.

Title: Intellectual Property **#** 844

Source: University of Newcastle **Co Area:** Technology Transfer

Addl Info: http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000831.html

Abstract: The University is committed to fostering a culture which advances scholarship, promotes innovation and supports the dissemination of knowledge for public benefit. It recognizes that intellectual property created as a result of these activities is a significant and valuable asset which must be responsibly managed to support the mission of the University, acknowledge the rights of contributors, and optimizes benefits for our communities.

This policy provides clear guidance on the University's position in relation to the ownership and management of intellectual property including its creation, use, sharing, protection and commercialization within the organization's risk management framework. It supports the National Principles of Intellectual Property Management for Publicly Funded Research identified by the Australian Research Council.

The above is the IP Policy - this is the IP Procedure - http://www.newcastle.edu.au/policylibrary/000832.html

---

Title: Developing a Grant Budget **#** 853

Source: University of Wisconsin Colleges **Co Area:** Office of Sponsored Research

Addl Info: http://www.uwc.edu/administration/academic-affairs/grants/writing/budget/

Abstract: Budget preparation varies greatly from project to project. All Request for Proposals (RFP) require some type of budget presentation. Budget items should match up exactly with the project activities, goals, and objectives being proposed. Eliminate budget amounts that cannot be justified by your proposed activities. Realistic figures go a long way toward convincing readers and project officers that your organization is reliable and can do the job. For example, an on-campus project that requires minimal travel should not include a $1,000 travel line item.

Title: Auditor's Role in Research Compliance **#** 859

Source: University of Florida **Co Area:** Inspector General

Addl Info: http://apps.research.ufl.edu/research/training/ppt/SPT005.0_RATS-RACOC.ppt

Abstract: Auditor: a friend or a foe? Find out what your university auditors consider to be high-risk issues in sponsored research administration and accounting. There will be a discussion of audits performed, summary of common issues and findings and proactive best practices in higher education.

Auditor's role and how you can be prepared?

Joining forces for educational, and compliance oversight activities involving research administration?

Title: Automated Workflow for Employee Fund Changes **#** 890

Source: Medical University of South Carolina **Co Area:** Grants & Contracts

Addl Info: http://www.sacubo.org/awards/bestpractices/archive/2009bp/

Abstract: What is the best way to automate the large number of paper personnel transactions that flow through Human Resources, Payroll, and Grants and Contracts Accounting on a daily basis? Further complicating the situation was the fact that almost 85% of MUSC's academic administrators were already utilizing a financial shadow system to create and account for these type transactions. For as many as 15 years, MUSC has been exploring alternative ways to automate the Position/Employee Action Request (PEAR) form.

MUSC's answer to this problem was to purchase and implement a workflow tool to integrate information from the shadow system into the financial system of record. The first process chosen to automate was changes to payroll (labor) distribution, called "Fund Changes" at MUSC, and the project was dubbed the "TeamWorks for Fund Changes Project."

When possible, TeamWorks writes data directly into the HR/Payroll system of record, eliminating the risk of data entry errors by Payroll staff. When human intervention is necessary, TeamWorks streamlines the process by delivering tasks to a user's inbox and delivering status updates to the UMS user along the way so the business manager always knows where the request stands.

Title: Audits find no more fraud at U of L **#** 929

Source: University of Louisville **Co Area:** Grants & Contracts

Addl Info: http://www.courier-journal.com/article/20081114/NEWS01/811140437

Abstract: U of L officials called for the audits in July after allegations surfaced that former education dean Robert Felner had mishandled grant and contract money. They also offered a number of suggestions for U of L to improve its grant practices, including providing better oversight training to department chairs and deans. They also recommended that when a dean is the principal investigator on a grant, someone else be assigned to provide oversight.

The auditors also suggested:
1. Periodic reviews of grants by the university's internal auditor.
2. Improving the monitoring of conflict-of-interest statements to ensure they are filed and that sanctions are enforced against those who do not file them. They also recommended periodic audits to ensure the filings' accuracy and said the university should consider requiring all faculty to file the forms, even those not involved in research.
3. Increasing training for business managers in the university's schools and colleges, and possibly implementing a grants-management position separate from the unit business managers.
4. Improving controls over grant-related expenses paid for with departmental debit cards.
5. Standardizing and streamlining grant reporting systems across the university.

Title: Research and Sponsored Projects Administration **#** 938

Source: Arizona State University **Co Area:**

Addl Info: http://researchadmin.asu.edu/

Abstract: Very informative site.

Title: Research Best Practices Toolkit **#** 939

Source: Northwestern University **Co Area:** Environmental Health & Safety

Addl Info: http://www.research.northwestern.edu/ori/responsibleresearch/

Abstract: ORI is dedicated to providing the research community with tools to ensure consistent and reliable internal mechanisms for supporting University-wide research activity. The tools on this page are intended to assist Northwestern's research community with conducting, administering and facilitating research in compliance with federal and University policies and procedures.

The toolkit contains some of Northwestern's best examples for recommended tools currently available. If you've developed a useful tool or procedure not listed here that would be helpful to others in Northwestern's research community, please tell us about it! This page represents a compilation of common best practices and tools to assist you with research at Northwestern University. We'll update and revise this page frequently to ensure it contains the best tools and resources we can provide.

Covers Operating Environment | Fiscal Administration | Responsible Conduct of Research | Research Safety

Title: Survey of Venture Capitalists Uncovers Five Key Factors Associated with Successful Technology Transfer **#** 954

Source: University of Southern California **Co Area:** Technology Transfer

Addl Info: http://stevens.usc.edu/read_article.php?news_id=424

Abstract: The USC Stevens Institute for Innovation at the University of Southern California today released a white paper detailing the findings of a comprehensive national survey exploring the issues affecting university-venture capital (VC) relations in an effort to better understand -- and ultimately improve -- the spinout process for all of the stakeholders involved.

The suggestions in the white paper titled, "Venture Capital -- University Interface: Best Practices to Make Maximum Impact," come from insights shared by venture capitalists and cover five key areas: understanding investor motivations, supporting entrepreneurs, streamlining bureaucracy, improving access and visibility, and fostering a culture of innovation on campus.

"As hotbeds for technological innovation, university research labs create groundbreaking innovations that have been at the heart of many successful start-ups. Unfortunately, university technology transfer professionals and venture capitalists have often struggled with cultural disconnects, hampering efforts to make maximum impact for university research," said Krisztina "Z" Holly, USC Vice Provost for Innovation and Executive Director of the USC Stevens Institute for Innovation. "A key piece in developing a healthy technology ecosystem, in any area, is to improve the efficiency of converting university research into viable, growing startups. We hope that by empowering university tech transfer professionals with the key findings from our study, we will help build and strengthen our economy nationwide."

Title: Research Park as Economic Engine: A Case in Best Practices **#** 989

Source: Wordpress.com - Michael Cecire **Co Area:** Research Park

Addl Info: http://michaelcecire.wordpress.com/2009/04/29/research-park-as-economic-engine/

Abstract: Designing a great, economically productive research park is an exercise closely intertwined with behavioral economics, believe it or not. By the end of this, you will understand why.

Title: IP Handbook of Best Practices **#** 990

Source: Rockefeller Foundation **Co Area:** Technology Transfer

Addl Info: http://www.iphandbook.org/

Abstract: Prepared by and for policy-makers, leaders of public and private sector research, tech transfer professionals, licensing executives, and scientists, this online resource offers up-to-date information and strategies for utilizing the power of both intellectual property and the public domain. Emphasis is placed on advancing innovation in health and agriculture, though many of the principles outlined here are broadly applicable across many fields.

Site guides available for policymakers, senior administrators, technology transfer managers, or research scientists.

Title: Guidelines for Monthly Grant Reconciliation **#** 1026

Source: East Carolina University **Co Area:** Grants & Contracts

Addl Info: http://www.ecu.edu/cs-educ/research/accounting.cfm

Abstract: In keeping with the College of Education's commitment to follow established best practice procedures, all grants and contracts must have a monthly reconciliation of account activity and balances. This reconciliation must be reviewed and signed off by the SPA administrator and Project Director/Principal Investigator. It is also recommended for the Department Chair/Director to review and sign off. This is done using Banner.

Title: Circular A21 Step Guide to Effort Certification: **#** 1209

Source: University of Arkansas **Co Area:** Office of Information Technolo

Addl Info: http://www.sacubo.org/docs/bestpractices/2012/EffortCertification.pdf

Abstract: Recognizing the deficiencies in the A21 Effort Certification process used for the past 15 years, the University embarked on a project to replace it with a new robust, and yet convenient system. The overwhelming objective for a new system was to strictly adhere to the requirements and intent of Circular A21 so that there is no potential liability for non-compliance. Also, to be consistent with modern trends and all other administrative efforts, the system needed to be paperless. This meant that Principal Investigators would need direct online access to perform effort certification, and that the process must be as simple as possible – requiring no formal training. A web based solution was the obvious way to address these requirements.

Title: Creating a One-Stop Shop for Research Administration: Sponsored Projects Administration Site (SPAS) **#** 1212

Source: University of Georgia **Co Area:**

Addl Info: http://www.sacubo.org/docs/bestpractices/2012/SPAS.pdf

Abstract: In 2008, UGA appointed a Research Administration and Infrastructure Ad Hoc Committee, composed of faculty and administrative staff, to assess and evaluate the current research infrastructure and determine if it was sufficient to enable UGA to meet its strategic goals for further development of the research enterprise. In addition, the committee was to determine if the research administration infrastructure was meeting the basic needs of research faculty and staff.

The Ad Hoc Committee's final report provided 37 specific recommendations to improve the services provided to the research community, more effectively manage its sponsored program activities, and mitigate compliance risk. These recommendations included consolidating the Office for Sponsored Programs (OSP) and the Contracts and Grants Office (C&G) in order to help improve service levels and increase communication. Another recommendation addressed the management of policies and procedures, specifically advocating that a single electronic location be established for key administrative tasks supporting research. Finally, the report recommended that campus-wide training and education programs be established via a single repository and include novel approaches using Web-based training tools and electronic formats whenever possible.