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INTRODUCTION

To streamline the administration of grants and to provide quality service to the UAPB community, pre-award, post-award, and grant accounting services are combined in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP). ORSP is located in the Walker Center for Multi-Purpose Research and Sponsored Programs on the University campus. It is service-oriented and directed by the values of the University, while dedicated to assisting the faculty and staff in seeking and administering funds for research and sponsored programs.

ORSP facilitates research at UAPB by: identifying funding sources, assisting in finalizing proposals, reviewing budget accuracy, negotiating agreements, obtaining and interpreting guidelines, and promoting compliance of grant applications and contracts with sponsor and university policies and requirements. The office assures financial accountability for external funding and research support.

This Handbook was updated to provide the University community with more information that is helpful in processing, applying, and administering off-campus funding.
PRE-AWARD ADMINISTRATION

SEEKING THE AWARD

All faculty/staff proposal developers and/or potential proposal developers are encouraged to register into the Faculty/Staff Research and Research-Related Interests Database, maintained by ORSP. You can register on-line at the ORSP web site: Research & Sponsored Programs (click on Faculty/Staff Research Database Registration). This database is a tool, which assists ORSP in becoming familiar with the basic research interests and needs of those faculty and staff members who are seeking, or interested in seeking, funds to assist the University in fulfilling its overall mission and vision. In addition, it enables ORSP to better serve the UAPB community by providing targeted grant opportunity alerts and information, including program development opportunities, program enhancement opportunities, and career development opportunities.

Sometimes program guidelines may seriously restrict the feasibility of the developer and the institution in reaching desired goals. Therefore, it is important for the overall success to be as clear as possible—in the earliest stages of project development—on the resources required to meet project objectives.

Much of what occurs during the early stages of applying for grant funds affects the University’s ability to manage a grant after it is received. Discussion and cooperation between the investigators and ORSP is critical in developing programs and proposals that receive off-campus funding.

PROPOSAL PREPARATION/DEVELOPMENT

Most federal agencies provide guidelines that describe the procedures to be followed in preparing an application for funding. These guidelines are published and made available upon request at no cost to interested persons, institutions, businesses, etc. Included in these guidelines are such things as:

- Deadline date for submission of the proposal
- Total funds available for awards
- Approximate number of awards to be made
- Range of award amounts
Below are basic steps to follow when developing a proposal:

1. Discuss the solicitation/announcement with immediate supervisor to determine feasibility and appropriateness with respect to the department’s program plans.

2. Complete and submit an *Intent to Submit a Proposal Form* (Appendix B) to ORSP. Although submission of this form is optional, it is highly recommended in circumstances when more than one department is interested in applying for a particular funding opportunity. When a call for proposals allows only one submission from the institution, the department that submitted an *Intent to Submit a Proposal Form* first will be authorized to proceed with the application. The *Intent to Submit a Proposal Form* is available online at the ORSP website Research & Sponsored Programs.

3. Discuss, if appropriate, the proposal under development with a representative of the funding agency prior to its submission. Such contacts help investigators focus their ideas carefully on the requirements of the agency.

4. Develop the full proposal in keeping with the guidelines. You are encouraged to discuss it with ORSP as it is being developed. Assistance in constructing a budget or cost proposal is available from an ORSP representative. All proposal developers are encouraged to include students in the projects as salaried personnel, e.g. research or laboratory assistants, tutors, counselors, mentors, etc., unless prohibited by program guidelines.

5. Complete the *Internal Proposal Cover Sheet* (Appendix C) and sign it with the department chairperson and the dean of your school. The *Internal Proposal Cover Sheet Form* and instructions on how to complete it are available online at the ORSP website Research & Sponsored Programs.

6. Submit the *Internal Proposal Cover Sheet* together with a copy of the call for proposals and a full proposal package (including the forms and assurances required by the agency) to ORSP. ORSP will obtain the remaining signatures and mail the proposal. We encourage you to submit proposals for the signatures of authorized officials at least 10 days prior to the deadline.

For unsolicited proposals follow the same basic steps, as applicable.

**OFFICIAL APPROVAL/AUTHORIZATION**

Pre-approval by the appropriate administrators is a *must*. Approval of a proposal by the appropriate department chairperson indicates a favorable evaluation of academic merit. Approval of a proposal by the appropriate dean indicates a favorable evaluation of its financial implications and/or requirements—as well as its congruence with the School’s mission.
Approval of a proposal by the ORSP, the vice chancellor for academic affairs, the vice chancellor for finance and administration, and the chancellor of the University, indicates that the proposal has been reviewed for: 1) proper calculation of salary and fringe benefits; 2) correct application of indirect costs; 3) the availability of funds for any University match; 4) general compliance with University policies and procedures; and 5) overall administrative consensus that the project will be beneficial to the University and its mission (See: Internal Proposal Application Cover Sheet and accompanying instructions - Appendix C). All proposals submitted on behalf of the University are to be signed by the chancellor or his designee.

PROPOSAL COMPONENTS IN DETAIL

In instances where specific guidelines are not enumerated by a potential funding source, a complete proposal will most often respond to the journalist inquiries of “Who? What? When? Where? Why? and How?” From beginning to end, the proposal should “flow” in a manner which suggests that it is a well-conceived and well-structured document. The following components are generally included in such a document:

1. **Abstract**: The abstract should clearly and concisely delineate the following:
   - **Need** (importance/timeliness of the project)
   - **Objectives** (realistic/quantifiable)
   - **Methodology/Procedures** (should match the objectives & include personal knowledge of related work in the field)
   - **Significance/Impact** (relationship to other disciplines/universality)
   - **Available resources and personnel**

   As a concise statement of the full proposal, the abstract should be written last. Reviewers will read it first to gain a perspective of the project and its expected significance. They will also use it as a reference during discussions with other readers. Key concepts should always be highlighted.

2. **Table of Contents**: All major topics of the proposal should be listed in the Table of Contents (including the appendix); however, it is not necessary in brief proposals (three to five pages).

3. **Introduction**: The institution and the area/(s) involved in the proposed program should be identified in the introduction. The goals, how they will be attained, who will be involved, and the qualifications of the investigator/(s) should be discussed. Also, a one-or-two-page staff vitae is preferred and should be placed in the Appendix section unless requested otherwise.
4. **Problem Statement/Rationale/Need:** A well-documented, realistic description of the problem and its proposed solution(s) should be included in this section. In addition, relevant statistical data that support the assessment of the problem should also be included, e.g. whether it duplicates an existing problem or what necessitates the project’s timeliness.

5. **Objectives:** What is intended to be accomplished should be stated clearly in this section. Statements of objectives should indicate what will be achieved rather than the method/(s) of achievement. They should be stated in quantifiable terms, whenever possible. For example, to raise the proficiency of 25 tenth graders by one grade level over a twelve-month period.

6. **Methodology:** A full description of the means by which the objectives will be achieved, as well as a description of familiarity with methods previously experienced and their results, should be provided in this section. They should follow a logical sequence and support the premise of likely success. In addition, major activities should be identified and set within a timetable for orderly presentation. If applicable, certain approvals and safeguards should be discussed if the research involves human subjects. *Procedures for obtaining Institutional Review Board approvals for matters concerning human subjects in research are discussed in this manual under the heading “Policies on Research.”*

7. **Evaluation and Dissemination:** An essential element of any proposal, the evaluation provides final evidence of success or failure for both the University and the funding source. It measures needed changes/adjustments in programs lasting more than one year. *Subjective* evaluations are generally discouraged because they focus primarily on opinions and feelings of participants. *Objective* evaluations are most preferable because they are more likely to include pre- and post-test instruments, interim testing, and/or other examinations of observable circumstances. For example, who will conduct the evaluation? How does the cost compare to the total cost of the program? And, what will be done with the results?

8. **Budget:** The budget of any proposal is always the “bottom line.” Based on estimated cost, it must be as accurate as possible and consistent with the program and University administrative guidelines/procedures. When a project is expected to extend over more than one year, the budget for each additional year should be incremented at the standard “cost-of-living” rate.

   The components of the budget (*Direct Costs*—those directly attributable to the project, and *Indirect Costs*—those that cover general management and support charges) should be reviewed, discussed and cleared by the proper administrators, prior to submission of the final draft for overall proposal review and signatures of approval. Fringe benefits and indirect cost rates change. The current indirect cost and fringe benefits rates can be obtained from ORSP.

9. **Appendix:** Documentations such as: 1) letters of support, 2) charts, and 3) any other technical information for reference are included in this section. *“Overkill” resulting from a proposal that is too lengthy and too cumbersome should be avoided.*

10. **Appliance/Assurance Forms:** As a result of congressional actions, a number of assurances must be included in proposals, which entail: 1) Drug-Free Workplace, 2) Lobbying, 3) Anti-Discrimination, and 3) Debarment/Suspension. They all require the Chancellor’s signature on behalf of the University.
THE PROPOSED BUDGET

The project cost must be carefully planned, and the budget must be inclusive-- providing a complete picture of overall expenses involved, e.g. personnel, activities, evaluation and dissemination. The primary budget categories should include the following:

a. **Personnel/Salaries and Wages**
   Personnel/Salaries and Wages may be charged to the project on a full-time or part-time basis. When salary support is less than full-time (particularly for the principal investigator or project director) the hourly rates/percentages of full-time effort and salary base must be specified. Future salaries (increases) may be estimated at 3% annual increments.

b. **Student Support**
   Student support includes graduate student stipends, fellowships, tuition, undergraduate salaries, and scholarships. All research grants are expected to provide some form of support for students, unless prohibited by the funding agency or organization.

c. **Fringe Benefits**
   Fringe benefits are charged to grant applications as direct costs. Standard UAPB fringe benefit rates must be applied to personnel costs in all proposal applications. There are two official fringe benefit rates: for faculty/staff, and for extra-help personnel. The current rates can be obtained from ORSP. *Fringe benefits are not applied to the student support category.*

d. **Travel**
   Travel expenses include transportation, lodging, subsistence and related items (tolls, parking, etc.). Detailed information on both domestic and foreign travel should be provided.

e. **Supplies and Materials**
   Supplies and materials include consumable items, raw materials for fabricating project items, computer software, etc.

f. **Equipment**
   Equipment includes items with an estimated cost of $2500/more per unit. Funding source guidelines should be carefully checked to determine whether specific items of equipment are among allowable costs.

g. **Alterations and Renovations**
   Alterations and Renovations include work required to change the interior of an existing facility, to either adapt it to meet programmatic requirements or to enhance it for its currently designated purpose.

h. **Other**
   Other includes items not readily assignable to another category such as: 1) rental cost (space, equipment, furniture); 2) shipping and handling/communications (postage, facsimile transmissions, toll calls); 3) library acquisitions, 4) internet access fees; 5) computer time; 6) printing and duplicating expenses; 7) evaluations; 8) participant support; 9) conference fees; and 10) consultation—unless guidelines specify a separate listing.
I. **Indirect Costs**

Indirect Costs or Facilities and Administration Costs (F&A) are those expenses which result from shared services and cannot be directly charged to the project such as: 1) library facilities, 2) building and equipment maintenance; 3) utilities, 4) purchasing, 5) payroll, 6) accounting, and 7) general administration. All other budget items (salaries and wages, materials, supplies, equipment, travel) are easily identifiable as direct costs.

Indirect costs are real and necessary expenses of UAPB in support of its costs of operation. Unless prohibited or restricted by the sponsor, indirect costs should be included in the budget of each proposal submitted to funding organizations external to the University. These costs must be budgeted in order that UAPB would not experience an adverse cash flow because of lack of recovery of true expenses incurred in the execution of research, public service, or instruction, which has not been allowed for in the State’s appropriation to the University.

Indirect costs rates are determined through periodic negotiations between UAPB and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The basis for these negotiations is a close review of information provided by UAPB about its costs and operations. The negotiated indirect cost rate should be used in all grants and contracts, unless restricted by the sponsor. The current UAPB base upon which the indirect rates are calculated is one of salaries and wages excluding benefits.

The UAPB indirect cost rate agreement includes two rates assigned for on- and off-campus sponsored projects, according to the actual location of the proposed effort. The off-campus indirect cost rate should be used for those sponsored activities, which are located and conducted at sites that are not University owned or operated.

**COST SHARING/MATCHING**

Some grant programs require that grant funds must be matched proportionately with nongrant funds, or that the grantee participate in the cost of the project. Congress frequently prescribes matching requirements in the grant program’s authorizing legislation and sets limits on federal participation in a project. Similarly, cost sharing is often required under research grants and most often is prescribed by Congress in various appropriation acts.

Costs used to satisfy a matching share or cost-participation requirement may be financed using either or both of the following:

- allowable costs incurred by UAPB; and
- the value of third-party in-kind contributions.

The term “in-kind” is more appropriately used for third-party noncash contributions.

Given that UAPB resources available for matching are limited, offering voluntary cost share (when it is not required by the call for proposals) is strongly discouraged. When cost share is
required to be considered for an award, Principal Investigators are requested to first use some or all unrecovered indirect costs as a match, to the extent allowed by the funding agency.

Costs of expenses incurred by the administrative offices that serve the entire university system (Accounting, Purchasing, Personnel, Physical Plant, Technical Services, Space, Utilities, etc.), as well as materials and supplies associated with the performance of duties of departmental administration may not be included as part of cost share when the full amount of indirect costs (either paid by the agency or unrecovered) is included in the budget.

If salaries, supplies or other line items that require cash outlays are included in the cost share budget, the Principal Investigator should consult with the chair of his/her department to determine from which accounts institutional support funds may be drawn. When this is determined, the amounts to be contributed and the accounts from which funds will be drawn must be listed in the Detailed Cost Share/Match section of the Internal Proposal Cover Sheet.

**ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS**

In many instances, proposals can be submitted to the funding agency on paper. However, electronic submission of proposals is on the rise. Government and some private agencies are converting to computer-based systems that encompass searching for opportunities, grant submission, award administration, and reporting. Grants.gov, managed by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, will soon serve as the portal by which all Federal proposals will be submitted.

A staff person at ORSP is officially registered as a Primary Organizational User/ Account Administrator for all UAPB accounts with the systems of electronic proposal submissions, including Grants.gov, eRA Commons and FastLane.

**Submission of applications via Grants.gov (the Federal government’s single on-line portal):** The Principal Investigator must first download the grant application package, complete, and save it locally on his/her computer. However, before you can download an application package, you will need to download and install the PureEdge Viewer. This program will allow you to access and complete applications. NIH and other PHS agencies require all text attachments to the PureEdge forms to be submitted as PDF files. Text attachments/files should be prepared using
a word processing program and then converted to PDF before being attached to the appropriate component in the application package. Some type of PDF-creation software is necessary to create the PDF. The university's Technical Services is available to assist in installing whatever software that is needed to complete the application process. After completion, a copy of the application package has to be provided to an ORSP representative, who transmits it electronically. *Principal Investigators do not need to register with Grants.gov.*

Within two (2) business days after the electronic submission, Grants.gov performs validation of the application and notifies UAPB via the ORSP representative who transmitted the application about the errors that may need to be corrected. The entire corrected application must be resubmitted to Grants.gov. Prior to a specified submission date, applicants may make corrections and resubmit an application through Grants.gov. After a specified submission date, if applicants make corrections and resubmit, the application will be considered late. In this case, a cover letter explaining the reasons for the delay must be included. Late applications are accepted only in extenuating circumstances and are evaluated on an individual basis considering the reasons provided.

**Submission of applications via eRA Commons (the NIH electronic Research Administration system):** Principal Investigators must be registered in the eRA Commons with an account created in the system. In order to get registered, the Principal Investigator must contact an ORSP representative, who is responsible for creating a log-in for investigators wishing to submit a proposal electronically.

The Principal Investigator does the initial transmission of the application to the eRA Commons. Within two (2) business days after transmission of the application package, both the Principal Investigator and the ORSP representative will be notified by email to check the eRA Commons for results of NIH validations check. If it passed, both the Principal Investigator and the ORSP representative need to verify the application in the system in order to complete the submission of the application. Applicants can track the progress of their application in the eRA Commons. Please note that although the eRA system will make every effort to send an email to the Principal Investigator and ORSP representative summarizing download and validation results,
this method of notification cannot be completely guaranteed. Applicants are strongly encouraged
to periodically check on the application status both in Grants.gov and the eRA Commons, so that
the application verification can be effected in the timeliest manner possible. Timely verification will
enable the application to continue through the remaining steps in the agency review process.
Failure to perform this review and verification process in the time allotted may prevent the
application from receiving further consideration by the agency.

**Submission of applications via FastLane (the NSF electronic system):** Upon request
from Principal Investigators, an ORSP representative will create an initial password to allow access
into FastLane for each user. The user will be prompted to change his/her password if it is desired.
When the proposal is ready, a Principal Investigator will pre-submit it in FastLane. After that, a
designated ORSP representative will log into the system and transmit the proposal directly to NSF.
Upon receiving notification of a successful transmission and an assigned reference number from
NSF, the ORSP representative will forward this information to the Principal Investigator.

_in order to meet the application deadline, it is recommended that all applications that
require electronic submission would be submitted two weeks before the deadline._

All necessary signatures on the Internal Proposal Cover Sheet should be acquired _before_
the transmission of the proposal.

**THE UNSUCCESSFUL/SUCCESSFUL PROPOSAL**

Federal agencies often provide an explanation of reasons why an application was not
recommended for funding. It is usually presented in the form of a particular score or ranking
achieved as a result of the review process. A copy of the reviewer’s comments/scores is often
provided upon request. Below are the most common reasons why research proposals may not be
funded:

- research goals inappropriate or unclear
- study design deficient
- staff, time, and budget inappropriate
- problems in overall presentation
- administrative detail
- no funding plan beyond the termination date, no apparent sustainability

An effective grant proposal has to make a compelling case. Not only must the idea be a
good one, but so must the presentation. Successful grant-writing involves solid advance planning
and preparation. Organize your proposal, pay attention to detail and specifications, use concise, persuasive writing, and request reasonable funding. Clearly understand the funder's guidelines before you write your proposal. Make sure the funding agency’s goals and objectives match your grant seeking purposes.

A well-prepared, well-documented, easy-to-read proposal encourages a reviewer to put it on top of the “to consider” pile.

**POST-AWARD ADMINISTRATION**

**NEGOTIATING THE AWARD**

Whenever a proposal is recommended for funding at less than the amount requested, the project director or principal investigator may be contacted by a representative from the funding agency, suggesting an unofficially approved amount and offering comments/suggestions relative to the proposed project activities. Note and keep in mind that ORSP is the official contact for assistance in constructing a revised budget, and nothing is official until a signed copy of an award document is received by the University. In addition, responses to inquiries relative to project activities that do not involve budget items should be prepared by the project director. Both financial and technical responses are to be transmitted over the signature of an authorized University representative, e.g. the chancellor or vice chancellor for finance and administration, or their designee.

**THE AWARD INSTRUMENT**

The Award Instrument formally acknowledges the award of funds by an authorized representative of the funding agency. It will typically contain information such as:

- The grant number assigned by the agency
- The project title
- The amount of the award
- The CFDA number
- The name of the principal investigator/project director
- The name of the agency’s project program/technical officer
- The name of the agency’s grant/fiscal officer
- The period of the award (start and end dates)
When UAPB receives notification of funding, ORSP will notify the principal investigator within one business day. In the event if a principal investigator receives notification of funding directly, he/she is required to forward all award documentation to ORSP as soon as possible. ORSP is responsible for obtaining the signature of an authorized University representative (e.g. the chancellor or vice chancellor for finance and administration, or their designee) on all official award documents.

**FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING SYSTEM**

Operating in compliance with 2 C.F.R. 220 (formerly the OMB Circular A-21) “Cost Principles for Educational Institutions”, the University accounting system facilitates the monitoring of grant expenditures, as well as the preparation of required reports.

Upon receipt of the award instrument, ORSP will assign the new award a grant account number, which will identify the project, and a cost-share account number, if cost share is required by the award. The budgets for the grant and cost share portions of the project will then be placed in the financial record system to facilitate both purchasing and accounting procedures.

Notifications of the new accounts are sent to the principal investigator and the dean of the school with a complete copy of the award documentation.

Principal investigators have the responsibility to ensure that grant budgets are not exceeded. Effective July 1, 2005, when grant award budgets are exceeded, the overage is transferred to the principal investigators’ respective (E&G) departmental accounts.

Since principal investigators and project directors have the fullest knowledge regarding the expenses charged to their grant accounts, including those that may not yet be posted, it is recommended that they maintain the most updated record of expenses in the departments. Such a record can be a simple Excel spreadsheet listing all the requisitions submitted for each account and comparing the total expenses against the award budget.
MONTHLY BUDGET REPORTS, FINANCIAL REPORTS AND INVOICES

To assist program directors in budget management, ORSP is providing monthly expenditure reports to the departments. These reports are the ACCOUNT AVAILABILITY REPORT (GLSA) and the DETAIL BUDGET STATUS REPORT (GLBS). Both reports are generated for every sponsored (grant) account. Grant Accountants are also available to provide a copy of the current reports of expenditures from the general ledger upon request.

The Account Availability summarizes the account’s budget and actual activity to show the budget available for future activity. This information is shown for both revenues and expenditures. The Account Statement report also shows the outstanding encumbrances against the account.

The Detail Budget Status shows the detailed transactions that occurred on the account for the month. This information provides the detailed audit trail for the summarized data on the Account Availability report.

Budget officers/principal investigators are required to review, initial and date monthly budget reports in their respective areas. This requirement is to ensure that all questionable costs are identified and resolved in a timely manner.

Equally important in the grant budget management is the need to limit the under-expenditure of funds, which might denote efficiency of operation but at the same time indicate that the sponsor is not receiving the level of expected output.

All required financial reports and invoices to the sponsoring agencies are prepared and submitted by ORSP according to the requirements of each award. Project directors and/or investigators may not submit financial reports and invoices on behalf of the University. Copies of the financial reports and invoices are available to principal investigators upon request.

RETROACTIVE COST TRANSFERS

Sometimes it is necessary to make correcting journal entries (retroactive cost transfers) to ensure that original charges and/or credits are recorded in the proper account, fund group, department, project, and expenditure code. A memorandum from the PI should be completed for
any “Cost Transfer” and submitted to Grants Accounting for final approval and processing. Payroll
retroactive cost transfers for correction of labor and benefit charges are recorded on a "Personnel
Action Form" (PAF) and corrected with a journal entry on the G/L JE Summary Form.

Individuals responsible for sponsored agreement administration may request necessary
reclassification of accounting data. Since the original entry is presumed to have been approved
after adequate review, any change should be fully justified. The department/unit must ensure that
funds are available to permit any transfer of charges/credits. Documented explanation and
justification should be provided in order to evaluate the appropriateness of the cost transfer.
For sponsored agreements, retroactive cost transfers for the purpose of expending available funds
still remaining on a project are not allowable. Other unacceptable purposes for retroactive cost
transfers include circumventing award restrictions, avoiding a cost overrun by charging another
unrelated agreement, or transferring an item which applies to a closed fiscal year. Regulations
governing cost transfers are specified in OMB Circular A-21 and in certain federal sponsors’
regulations: "Any costs allocable to a particular research (sponsored) agreement...may not be
shifted to other research (sponsored) agreements in order to meet deficiencies caused by overruns
or other fund considerations, to avoid restrictions imposed by law or by terms of the research
agreement, or for other reasons of convenience." (Circular A-21, "C.4.b.) "...Frequent, tardy, and
unexplained (or inadequately explained) transfers, particularly where they involve projects with
significant cost overruns or unexpended fund balances, raise serious questions about the propriety
of the transfers themselves as well as the overall reliability of the institution's accounting system
and internal controls.

A memorandum should be used to request, document, justify, and certify a correction to
the accounting records. Transfers should be made within 90 days (3 months) from the end of the
month that the charge appears on the GLBS (Detail Budget Status Report). For example, if the
cost to be transferred is recorded on 1/7/0X, then the retroactive cost transfer should be processed
within 90 days of 1/31/0X (by 4/30/0X). After the 90-day period, an explanation of tardiness or
certification of change should be included with the normal justification for transfer.

Acceptable Criteria for a cost transfer is justified in the following circumstances:
a. Clerical and data entry errors--Any request to correct a clerical error should be accompanied by an explanation of how the error occurred. The correcting entry must include a statement certifying that the adjusted charge/credit is correct and appropriate. Any explanation that merely states that the transfer is made "to correct error" or "to transfer to correct project" is not sufficient. Frequent errors in the recording of costs may indicate the need for improvements in the grantee's accounting system and/or internal controls.

b. Transfers between a continuation grant and a new project when the account number was established at the time the expense was incurred--It is possible that if a continuation grant account number is not established promptly, continuation grant charges that have been incurred on or after the start date of the continuation award may have been temporarily charged to the prior year's account. Over expenditures from a prior year are unallowable costs that can be transferred to the continuation award only with sponsor approval.

c. Pre-award costs that are specifically authorized in writing by the sponsor--A department or research unit may, at its own risk, incur obligations and expenditures to cover costs prior to the beginning date of an award if the following criteria are met: 1) costs incurred are considered necessary for the conduct of the project, 2) costs are allowable under the potential award, and 3) sponsor's written prior approval is obtained when required.

d. Pertinent information is received subsequent to the date of original entry.

e. It was impractical or impossible to allocate charges at the time of the original entry.

f. An award fails to materialize and charges have been incurred on the grant/contract account.--Costs incurred subsequent to the anticipated effective date of the award will need to be transferred to other nonfederal funds. At times, principal investigators are notified verbally or by memo that an award is forthcoming. If, for any reason, the award is not received as anticipated, a request may be necessary to transfer any charges made to an emergency account to other nonfederal funds of the department.
The journal entry (GL J/E Summary) should be supported by documentation that contains a full explanation and justification for the transfer. Documentation consists of either 1) a copy of the original invoice document and 2) the GLBS showing the transaction(s) charged/credited to the incorrect account.

Revisions to the effort (and corresponding dollars) of personnel charged or credited to a grant account should reflect the Time and Effort Confirmation Reports ("time and effort" reports) that have been certified for the pay period(s) corrected.

The Principal Investigator must certify on the memo the following: (1) the change indicated on the grant/contract is correct; (2) the costs are allowable; (3) funds are available to make the transfer; and (4) the grant/contract benefiting directly from the respective charges. The following approval signatures are required for the transfer:

- Principal Investigator/Budget Officer
- Grant Accountant
- Assistant Controller or Controller

**DOCUMENTING COST SHARE**

Cost sharing becomes a condition of an award when it is made part of the approved award budget. The award is made on the assumption that cost sharing is necessary to meet the grant objectives. When cost sharing falls short, the funding agency could require a portion of its funds returned. Both UAPB costs and third-party in-kind contributions should be verified by appropriate documentation.

UAPB cost share costs will be charged to cost share accounts set up for each award with a cost sharing component in the approved budget. Budget amount of cost share will be reallocated to the award’s cost share account from the principal investigator’s departmental E&G (110) account. The amount of UAPB cost share for each period will be reported to the funding agencies based on the expenses charged to cost share accounts. The hiring units should submit Personnel Action Forms (PAF’s) to enable posting cost share portions of salaries of faculty and staff to cost share accounts.
For in kind contributions, the value of donations should be documented using the ORSP forms Value of Donation by a Third Party, Value of Donated Labor, and Value of Equipment Donated by a Third Party (Appendix I), unless other certifying documentation is available from a third party that made an in-kind contribution.

In order to make the process of documenting and reporting cost share as smooth as possible, ORSP strongly encourages principal investigators to discuss cost share arrangements for the future project during the stage of drafting a new proposal.

TECHNICAL/PROGRESS REPORTS

In compliance with the U.S. OMB Circular A-110, all federal agencies require grant recipients to report periodically on the progress of work being supported. Information on reporting requirements are included or referenced in award documents. Also, additional information is provided in agency publications such as: 1) the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), 2) the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant Policy Manual, 3) the Public Health Service (PHS) Grants Policy Statement, and 4) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Grant and Cooperative Agreement Handbook.

Technical and progress reports are prepared and submitted to the sponsoring agencies by the principal investigators. After the end of the award period before ORSP will close out the award, the principal investigator is required to certify that he or she has submitted all final reports (other than financial) on the Award Close out Checklist (Appendix D). The Award Close out Checklist is sent by ORSP to principal investigators approximately 30 days after the award end date.

PROJECT CHANGES

The ability of the project director to make budget adjustments, to alter planned activities, or to extend the project period is governed first by regulations of the funding agency, then, by the policies and procedures of the University. A copy of the regulations governing each award or a reference to the appropriate regulations usually accompanies the award documents. All principal investigators and program directors are required to read and adhere to the regulations governing
their awards. ORSP is available to assist with the interpretation of the federal and non-federal regulations.

A request to revise a grant/contract must be initiated by the principal investigator and approved by the funding agency prior to making any project changes. Questions relative to the allowability of certain activities or expenditures, which cannot be addressed by the University, will be referred to the funding agency’s designated project officer for answer. Written request for approvals must be submitted by the principal investigator via ORSP.

**PURCHASING PROCEDURES**

According to the OMB Circular A-110 “Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Nonprofit Organizations”, grant fund expenditures are governed by whichever law is most restrictive (state or federal). Even if a specific product or service is written into the approved proposal, whether or not this is what you will actually be able to order will depend upon what the bid process will yield. Please keep in mind that the State of Arkansas’ buying laws are more restrictive than the Federal.

All purchase requisitions charged to sponsored and cost share accounts should be submitted to the UAPB Procurement office via ORSP. ORSP will confirm the availability of funds and the allowability of expense. All purchases must be in compliance with funding agency regulations and University policies and procedures.

Principal investigators initiate requisitions based on the needs of the project, which are consistent with the approved budget.

Points of consideration when needing to purchase are as follows:

- The eighteen digit account number, which identifies the grant account and type of purchase being requested, should be placed on the requisition. For example, in the account #499-23-12345600-53000, the first thirteen digits indicate the *fund, function and center code*; the last five digits are the *object code* and indicate that a request is made for a particular classification, in this case—*supplies*. 
• The spending limits, types of procurement and lead time to purchase order should be considered in order to receive the commodity or service in a timely manner*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIMIT</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE ISSUE TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.0 cents to $5,000 (usually commodities)</td>
<td>Small Order</td>
<td>1-2 days (no bidding required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000-$25,000 (usually commodities)</td>
<td>Quotation Bid</td>
<td>1-2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 ad infinitum (usually commodities and construction)</td>
<td>Formal Bid</td>
<td>3-4 weeks (formal bid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 weeks latter (after specs are prepared)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 ad infinitum</td>
<td>RFP (Request for Proposal)</td>
<td>6-8 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(usually services such as consultants, evaluators, facilitators, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sole Source/Single Source Procurements:

• The commodity is available from only one supplier due to patent or copyright restrictions.
• Latent damage or a compatibility issue exists with a procurement.
• There is public exigency or an emergency need for items, (as defined by State Procurement Law), which will not permit the delay associated with competitive solicitation.
• After solicitations and advertisements, competition yields no other sources.

*(If not on state contract)*

PROPERTY CONTROL/MANAGEMENT

Property accounting is a mandatory process that is necessary to document what the University has and maintain collaborative accountability of all new acquisitions with the general ledger (See: Finance and Administration Business Procedures Manual for a complete explanation of procedures).

Generally, equipment purchased through University accounts is received by Central Receiving (CR). A state decal must be attached to all new equipment before it leaves CR. The requester of new equipment should be available to verify that the equipment received is correct and is what was ordered. If the inspection by the requester is not done within two working days, the Property Control (PC) Manager at his/her discretion may authorize the attachment of the decal without the requester’s signature. CR then takes responsibility for accepting the equipment and
authorizing payment. After the decal is attached, the equipment is delivered to the ordering department for acceptance.

Property Control Management is responsible for all equipment from the time it is received on campus, as it maintains a file on all decaled equipment.

There are instances where equipment is delivered directly to the buying department. There are also instances where the equipment is too large and heavy to be practically handled by warehouse personnel and must be installed by the vendor. In circumstances when equipment is handled on a case-by-case basis, cooperation with Property Control is required.

Equipment requiring assembly will be assembled by PC at the Hazzard Annex and subsequently delivered to the department. When the equipment is large or complex and requires professional assembly, craftsmen from the Physical Plant will assist with the assembling. The requesting department will be charged an appropriate assembling fee.

All furniture will be fully assembled in CR (if there is no statement on file specifying that that department does not desire assembling and tagged with a property tag (decaled) before it is delivered to the requesting department.

**HIRING PROJECT PERSONNEL**

In hiring project personnel, the employment category of the individual(s) to be hired on externally-funded projects will determine the type of employment documents required for approval. For example, persons having some level of instructional responsibility will require the approval of the vice chancellor for academic affairs before final approval by the chancellor. A *Personnel Action Form* (PAF) is then processed by the hiring unit.

It is important to remember that, according to the federal regulations, only charges for work performed directly on sponsored agreements that can be easily identified with the project are permitted on sponsored accounts. If services of an employee are fully charged to a sponsored account, the department is required to show on the PAF that services of this employee are related to the grant. Please use the line “Reason for Action” for this purpose (for example, “To provide support to the project xxx”).
The classified personnel hiring process (whether part-time or full-time) requires that an Employment Application be completed by the applicant and, if approved, a PAF is submitted for processing via the Office of Administrative Services. For additional information regarding the personnel hiring process (extra-help, etc.), contact the Personnel Office.

When employing students on research and sponsored projects as extra-help, the Office of Financial Aid should be contacted to find out the maximum amount of money the student can earn. If the student is found eligible to earn additional compensation, then, the proper forms/paperwork should be executed. Extra-Help forms are available in the Personnel Office, and all student forms are available in the Office of Financial Aid. In addition, Voucher forms are to be used to facilitate payment of monthly stipends to graduate students.

Project personnel assigned to off-campus sites (e.g. University of Arkansas Medical Sciences) are required to:

- attend regular meetings with the campus coordinator
- undergo a periodic performance review of their work
- comply with Time and Effort Report Policy --as for all other externally funded projects

These individuals are to be treated as employees of the University and not as employees of the organization/site at which they are located. Grant funds cannot be used to increase one’s salary; however, concurrent employment is permissible under certain circumstances (See: Policy on Concurrent Employment - Appendix E).

**SUBAWARDS**

A subaward is a transfer of substantive programmatic work under a grant. Subawarding always requires prior agency approval, unless it is incorporated in the approved proposal.

If a potential sub-recipient organization is identified prior to proposal submission, it must submit a proposal to UAPB, including the Statement of Work, Budget and Budget Justification. The Principal Investigator should then incorporate the sub-recipient’s material into his/her proposal following the sponsor’s instructions. The potential sub-recipient’s budget should be incorporated into the UAPB budget as a line item.
The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) has responsibility for ensuring that subaward agreements contain appropriate federal and other applicable regulations. Upon receipt of the information from the Principal Investigator, ORSP will prepare a draft of the subaward agreement. The Principal Investigator should provide ORSP with the particulars of the subaward, including a copy of the sub-recipient organization’s Statement of Work, Budget and Budget Justification. All terms and conditions accepted by UAPB flow down to sub-recipients of awards.

If the Principal Investigator determines that a subaward needs an amendment, ORSP will prepare a draft of the amendment documentation.

Principal Investigators (PI’s) have primary responsibility for the monitoring of sub-recipients to ensure compliance with federal regulations and with the terms of both the prime award and the subaward. PIs are responsible for ensuring that subaward costs are reasonable and allowable, and for ensuring that the sub-recipients are accomplishing their agreed-to program goals and objectives. PIs are also responsible for the receipt and review of technical performance reports or other deliverables and the review of expenses vs. budget. There may be additional sponsor-specific or program-specific requirements that mandate collection and documentation of other kinds of assurances.

Reports from the sub-recipients must be in sufficient detail for the Principal Investigator to determine whether the funds are being properly used. To achieve the goal of effective monitoring, it is critical for the Principal Investigator to establish regular communication with sub-recipients and maintain a system for early flagging of potential problems.

**TIME AND EFFORT REPORTING**

Time and effort reporting requirements are based on Section J.10 of the 2 C.F.R. 220 (formerly OMB Circular A-21) “Cost Principles for Educational Institutions”, which establishes principles for determining costs applicable to grants, contracts, and other agreements with educational institutions. For all staff whose salary is paid fully or partially out of sponsored accounts, as well as for those whose salaries are charged to cost share, UAPB is required to maintain records confirming the actual time that was spent working on each project.
Time and Effort reports serve as proof to the auditors of the fact that an employee had indeed devoted certain time and effort to a particular project, which received off-campus funding. In addition to that, Time and Effort reports are a basis for adjusting salary charges if there was a change in the work activity of an employee.

As you know, the distribution of salaries and wages of UAPB staff applicable to sponsored agreements is based on work activity budgeted in the approved award proposal. Time and Effort reports are in place to confirm after-the-fact a percentage distribution of effort spent on each federally sponsored project (please note that total effort on the report must always equal 100%).

Effective January 1, 2012, Grants Accounting (ORSP) will produce Time and Effort forms quarterly. The schedule for the release and return of Time and Effort forms is listed below:

Release: January 20\textsuperscript{th}  
April 20\textsuperscript{th}  
July 20\textsuperscript{th}  
October 20\textsuperscript{th}  

Return: February 5\textsuperscript{th}  
May 5\textsuperscript{th}  
August 5\textsuperscript{th}  
November 5\textsuperscript{th}  

If the reports accurately describe the distribution of effort, they have to be signed by the staff and their supervisors and returned to ORSP in a timely fashion. If the person is no longer employed by UAPB by the time when the department received his or her Time and Effort report, the signature of a supervisor is sufficient to document the distribution of effort.

If the distribution of actual effort had been different than the distribution reflected on the report, retroactive adjustments to the payroll have to be made. The adjustments will only take place if there is a significant change in the time and effort distribution. Short term (such as one or two months) fluctuations between workload categories do not have to be considered as long as the distribution of salaries and wages is reasonable over the term of 6 months.

**FIXED-PRICE CONTRACTS**

Fixed-price contracts provide for a price that is not subject to any adjustment on the basis of the contractor’s cost experience in performing the contract. Contracts of this type place upon UAPB full responsibility for all costs and resulting profit or loss, while imposing a minimum administrative burden upon the contracting parties.
Since fixed-price contracts provide maximum incentive to control the project costs, it is sometimes the case that UAPB expenses are less than the amount paid by the agency by the time of the contract close out. When this is the case, excess cash will be transferred to another unrestricted account after the contract is closed and all the required reports submitted and accepted by the agency. Indirect costs that may be due to UAPB on the contract will be withheld prior to such transfer. The left over funds may then be used for the departments’ operating expenditures or to meet cost share requirements for other awards.

**FILING AND RECORD RETENTION**

**Filing**

1. A separate file is maintained for every award. The file should include the following documentation:
   - A copy of the proposal, including the proposal budget
   - Original or a full copy of the award agreement signed by the agency and UAPB
   - Documentation related to opening the grant account
   - Documentation related to opening the cost-share account for the awards that require cash match/cost share
   - Copies of all financial reports with appropriate backup for each report
   - Originals or full copies of all award modifications
   - Completed close-out form (the form is added to the file after the award ends)

2. Grant Accountants are responsible for creating and maintaining award files.
3. Coordinator of Sponsored Programs is responsible for documentation flow related to award proposals.
4. Grant Accountants are responsible for documentation flow related to award close out.

**Record Retention**

1. Pursuant to the *OMB Circular A-110, Section _53, Subsection (b)*, all records pertinent to the federal awards are retained for a period of three years from the date of submission of the final expenditure report or, for awards that are renewed annually, from the date of the submission of the annual financial report. If any litigation, claim, or audit is started before the expiration of the 3-year period, the records shall be retained until all litigation, claims or audit findings involving the records have been resolved and final action taken.

2. Records for non-federal awards are retained in the same way as records for federal awards.

3. Copies of unfunded proposals and fully executed Internal Proposal Cover Sheets are retained for a period of 12 months after the date of submission deadline.

4. Copies of funded proposals and fully executed Internal Proposal Cover Sheets become a part of the award files and are retained in accordance with paragraph 1 Section II of this Policy.

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR TRANSFERS**
When a principal investigator, who receives external funding, transfers to or away from UAPB, ORSP will work to coordinate this process by reviewing and providing assistance in processing the official paperwork that is needed for the transfer.

Much of the administrative work involved in the transfer of sponsored funding will be initiated by the investigator who is changing institutions as well as the investigator’s department. When the principal investigator is transferring to or away from UAPB, a decision must be made as to whether the project will stay with the original institution or will be transferred to the new institution. Approval of the funding agency is required for the transfer of sponsored funding and for principal investigator transfers. ORSP can help to interpret the specific terms and conditions of an award related to the transfer and to facilitate discussions necessary to complete a desired transfer.

For transfers of funding from UAPB to another institution, the official endorsement from UAPB officials, including the department chair, the dean of school, and the chancellor are required, along with a written approval from the sponsoring agency.

In those cases where an award is not expected to follow the investigator, the sponsoring agency should be notified to request a change in the principal investigator. In cases where the award will be transferred to the principal investigator’s new institution, a request for transfer of an award should be discussed with the funding agency’s program officer as early in the process as possible so that any complications or concerns can be addressed in a timely manner.

**Responsible Parties:**

**Principal investigators** have the ultimate responsibility for providing information about the move to departmental and ORSP personnel in a timely manner and ensuring that the transfer of the award is completed in accordance with all applicable federal and sponsor regulations. The principal investigator is also responsible for completing any required technical reports.

**Departmental administrators** have the responsibility to conclude transactions and make any necessary adjustments to award accounts for departing principal investigators.

**ORSP** will review each sponsored program transfer and perform the functions necessary to reconcile the financial aspects of the awards and to complete the financial statements. In addition, when a project is leaving UAPB, ORSP will obtain signed amendments ending any outstanding subcontracts or other agreements.
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH

The University’s policies and procedures for addressing allegations of research misconduct are described in detail in the document, “Policies and Procedures for Handling Misconduct in Sciences,” approved by the Faculty Senate and the Chancellor on 2/10/94. This document can be viewed on the ORSP web site www.uapb.edu.

The procedure for the investigation of allegations of research misconduct will have at least four stages, namely:

1. an inquiry to determine whether the allegation of research misconduct warrants further investigation;
2. an investigation, when warranted, to collect and thoroughly examine evidence;
3. a formal finding; and
4. an appropriate disposition of the matter.

In addressing allegations of research misconduct, the University will act through the Research Committee of senior administrators and faculty named by the chancellor. The functions of this committee include: 1) conducting inquiries into the allegations of research misconduct and determination of whether or not investigation is warranted; 2) determination of the composition of the investigative committee to evaluate the evidence, when appropriate; 3) recommendations of corrective or disciplinary actions when research misconduct or serious research errors are found; 5) dissemination of findings of the investigative committee, as appropriate.

Research fraud is a form of scientific misconduct involving deception. It should be distinguished from honest error, which can occur inadvertently in any enterprise. It is often difficult when confronted with an allegation to determine where along the spectrum—from error to fraud—a particular case will lie. The following are some examples/definitions of various types of errors/fraud:

- **Misconduct** – 1) fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other serious deviation from accepted practices in proposing, carrying out, or reporting results from research; 2) material failure to comply with federal requirements for protection of researchers, human subjects, or the public.
for ensuring the welfare of laboratory animals; 3) failure to meet other material legal requirements governing research.

- **Falsification of Data** – ranging from fabrication to deceptively selective reporting the purposeful omission of conflicting data with the intent to falsify results.

- **Plagiarism** – representation of another’s work as one’s own.

- **Misappropriation of Others’ Ideas** – the unauthorized use of privileged information, such as violation of confidentiality of peer review, or however obtained.

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD/HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE**

The function of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) is to review projects and activities that involve human subjects. Membership in IRB is by appointment by the Chancellor or by his/her designee. The Board determines, for each activity, whether subjects will be placed “at-risk” and, if there is risk involved, whether:

- the risks to the subject are so outweighed by the sum of the benefits to the subject, and the importance of the knowledge to be gained warrants a decision to allow the subject to accept the risks;

- the rights and welfare of any subject will be adequately protected;

- legally effective, informed consent will be obtained by adequate and appropriate methods; and

- the conduct of the activity will be reviewed at timely intervals.

Any research project, which involves human subjects must be approved by the Human Subjects Committee. Protocols must be submitted to the committee no later than 10 working days prior to the proposal deadline, and there are no exceptions. The minimum requirement is: 1) a cover letter; 2) a copy of the proposal cover page; 3) an abstract (one-page minimum), 4) a detailed description of the procedures involving human subjects. Literature references are not sufficient for this description; 5) copies of all survey instruments used in the study. (See: Human Subjects Protocol - Appendix F). Dr. Richard Walker (Chair) (870) 575-8894

**INSTITUTIONAL ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEE**

The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (UAPB) was instituted to oversee the University’s animal research programs, facilities
and procedures through the experience and expertise of its members. Membership in the committee is by appointment by the Chancellor or by his/her designee. That committee’s responsibilities include the following:

- Review at least once every six months the program for humane care and use of animals in research.
- Inspect and evaluate at least once every six months all animal research facilities - including animal study areas.
- Prepare signed reports of the committee’s evaluation of animal research facilities. [Such reports shall be updated at least once every six months after completion of the required semiannual evaluations of research facilities, and shall be maintained by the research facilities.]
- Review all concerns involving the care and use of animals for research.
- Make appropriate recommendations to University officials concerning any aspect of the institution’s animal research program, facilities and/or personnel training, when warranted.
- Review, approve, require modifications in or withhold approval of those components or sections of a proposed animal research activity related to the care and use of animals that do not meet accepted standards of animal care and use.
- Review, approve, require modifications in or withhold approval of proposed significant changes concerning the care and use of animals in ongoing animal research activities.
- Have the authority to suspend an animal research activity that does not meet recommended standards of care and use of animals.
- Operate strictly according to the standards of care and use of animals for research recommended by the U. S. Public Inspection Service (USDA) in their booklets on animal welfare.
- Make available to persons involved in animal research at the University the above-mentioned booklets on animal welfare published by USPHS and USDA.
- Assist the University in filing and obtaining the Assurance required by Government agency(ies).

[See: Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee Policies and Guidelines for an explanation of the committee’s services and/or functions; and see Appendix G for copy of the Application for Use of Vertebrates for Research, Teaching or Demonstration Form.] Dr. Andy Goodwin (Chair) (870)575-8137

**INSTITUTIONAL BIOSAFETY COMMITTEE**

The Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) is a committee established by the University for the review of recombinant DNA research, as specified and required by NIH Guidelines. Membership in IBC is by appointment by the Chancellor or by his/her designee. The Committee is
registered with the NIH Office of Biotechnology Activities (OBA) by the University, and membership updates must be filed with OBA annually.

Certain types of experiments, including all human gene transfer studies, require prior IBC review and approval. Below are detailed responsibilities of the IBC:

- Reviewing recombinant DNA research conducted at or sponsored by the institution for compliance with the NIH Guidelines as specified in Section III, Experiments Covered by the NIH Guidelines, and approving those research projects that are found to conform with the NIH Guidelines. This review shall include: 1) independent assessment of the containment levels required by the NIH Guidelines for the proposed research; 2) assessment of the facilities, procedures, practices, training and expertise of personnel involved in recombinant DNA research; 3) ensuring that all aspects of guideline’s Appendix M have been appropriately addressed by the Principal Investigator; 4) ensuring that no research participant is enrolled (see definition of enrollment in NIH Guidelines Section I-E-7) in a human gene transfer experiment until the Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee (RAC) review process has been completed (see Appendix M-I-B, RAC Review Requirements), Institutional Biosafety Committee approval (from the clinical trial site) has been obtained, and all applicable regulatory authorizations have been obtained; 5) for human gene transfer protocols selected for public RAC review and discussion, consideration of the issues raised and recommendations made as a result of this review and consideration of the Principal Investigator’s response to the RAC recommendations; 6) ensuring that final IBC approval is granted only after the RAC review process has been completed (see Appendix M-I-B, RAC Review Requirements); and 7) ensuring compliance with all surveillance, data reporting, and adverse event reporting requirements set forth in the NIH Guidelines (Section IV-B-2-b-1);

- Notifying the PI of the results of the IBC’s review and approval (Section IV-B-2-b-2);

- Lowering containment levels for certain experiments as specified in Section III-D-2-a, Experiments in which DNA from Risk Group 2, Risk Group 3, Risk Group 4, or Restricted Agents is Cloned into Nonpathogenic Prokaryotic or Lower Eukaryotic Host-Vector Systems (Section IV-B-2-b-3);

- Setting containment levels as specified in Sections III D-4-b, Experiments Involving Whole Animals, and III D-5, Experiments Involving Whole Plants (Section IV-B-2-b-4);

- Periodically reviewing recombinant DNA research conducted at the institution to ensure compliance with the NIH Guidelines (Section IV-B-2-b-5);

- Adopting emergency plans covering accidental spills and personnel contamination resulting from recombinant DNA research (Section IV-B-2-b-6);

(Note: The Laboratory Safety Monograph describes basic elements for developing specific procedures dealing with major spills of potentially hazardous materials in the laboratory, including information and references about decontamination and emergency plans. The NIH and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention are available to provide consultation and direct assistance, if necessary, as posted in the Laboratory Safety Monograph. The institution shall cooperate with the state and local public health departments by reporting any significant research-related illness or accident that may be hazardous to the public health.)

- Reporting any significant problems with or violations of the NIH Guidelines and any significant research-related accidents or illnesses to the appropriate institutional official and NIH/OBA within 30 days, unless the Institutional Biosafety Committee determines that a report has already been filed by the PI. Reports to NIH/OBA shall be sent to the
LABORATORY SAFETY

At the time of submission of the application for sponsored funding, investigators are required to indicate on the Internal Proposal Cover Sheet whether or not their projects require laboratory safety compliance.

Laboratory safety compliance means compliance with the U.S. Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Laboratory Standard. Under this standard a laboratory is required to have a Chemical Hygiene Plan which addresses the specific hazards found in its location and its approach to them.

Laboratory supervisors have the responsibility for maintaining safe standard operating procedures and maintaining or recommending revisions of the procedures as necessary. Laboratory supervisors are defined as the faculty members who are responsible for the research laboratories and specific laboratory sections.

Each employee and student must be provided with information and training concerning the hazards of the chemicals present in his or her work area, as mandated by OSHA. The training must be provided at the time of initial assignment and prior to any new assignments involving different exposure situations. Providing and documenting this training is the responsibility of the laboratory supervisor. Documentation of the training must be kept in the laboratory and should include copies of the training materials and sign-in sheets for the training participants.
Student laboratory assistants should be provided training prior to their supervision of other students. This training must be provided and documented at the beginning of their employment by their laboratory supervisor.

Outside contractors or university workers from such areas as the Facilities Management must be informed of the hazards to which they must be exposed while working in the laboratory environment. The department that contracts the work has the responsibility for informing workers of the safety procedures and providing any associated training that will be site- and job-specific.

HAZARDOUS WASTE DISPOSAL

The department that needs to dispose of hazardous materials is required to contact the Assistant Director of Physical Plant to place a request for disposal. Each container must be labeled as to its actual contents. During the disposition of hazardous waste, or equipment that contains components or parts suspected of containing hazardous materials, the Physical Plant is responsible for ensuring that all federal, state, and local requirements are followed.

Mr. Russell  
Will Pollution Control Industries (870) 575-7187

INVENTIONS, COPYRIGHTS, AND PATENTS

As a state-supported institution of higher learning, the University of Arkansas has a responsibility for and an interest in the advancement of knowledge and creative work that will enhance its educational mission and promote the economic and social welfare of the public it serves, particularly the people of the State of Arkansas. This responsibility and interest are advanced by engaging in research, the results of which may, on occasion, have commercial applications, which are patentable or copyrightable. While Inventions are not the primary objective of University Research, when they occur the University has the responsibility of ensuring that such Inventions are used and controlled in a manner that benefits the public, the inventor, and the University to the fullest extent possible. To achieve this purpose, the University adopts this policy to meet the following objectives:

1. Assist the faculty, students, and staff in matters related to inventions, patents, and copyrights and provide an environment that will encourage the disclosure and development of meaningful Inventions;

2. Obtain the proper benefits for inventors and for the University from commercial applications of University Research and apply funds accruing to the University
from these applications to the support of research and other scholarly activities at the University; and

3. Determine the rights and interests of all parties in University Research according to established, uniform procedures.

It shall be the policy of the University to acquire and retain legal title to all Inventions created by any person or persons to whom this policy is applicable. It is established in furtherance of the commitment of the University to the widest possible distribution of the benefits of University Research, the protection of Inventions resulting from such research, and the development of Inventions for the public good. Inventors shall retain rights in Inventions, which the University has chosen not to claim under this policy or pledged to a third party as a result of a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other Sponsored Research agreement. Rights to Inventions and Works made under Sponsored Research are determined by the contractual or grant agreements between the University and the sponsor. (See Board Policy 210.1 for full explanation).

**RELEASE TIME**

Provisions are made for reduced teaching and/or workloads for those persons participating in funded projects. The reduction in workload is equivalent to the percentage of time spent on the project. Work created by teaching-load reduction is reallocated by either: 1) reassigning responsibilities where applicable, 2) hiring adjunct faculty, or 3) hiring full-time faculty. The University will honor its commitment to release those persons who will be involved in funded research efforts.

All release time during the academic year associated with externally funded projects that do not require cost share must be fully paid by the sponsoring agency. Proposal budgets for projects with no cost share must, therefore, reflect the full cost of release time (salary, fringe benefits, and indirect costs) to the funding agency.

Awarding release time to carry out activities associated with an externally funded project not paid by the funding agency is at the discretion of the department chairpersons. It is recommended that such release time would be awarded to faculty members only for projects that mandate cost share, and only if cost share obligations can not be met by unrecovered indirect
costs. No additional resources will be available from the University to the departments to assist with release time not paid by the sponsoring agency.

Faculty members who have release time for the academic year may not defer that time in order to gain more release time in any one semester. For example, faculty may not combine two semesters of release time into one. Also, faculty investigators may not have more than 50% release time. Any exceptions to this policy will require the recommendation of the dean of the School and the approval of the vice chancellor for academic affairs.

In implementing this policy, it shall be the responsibility of the vice chancellor for academic affairs to inform the faculty-at-large. Informing all persons preparing proposals of the existence of the policy will be the responsibility of ORSP. And monitoring will be the responsibility of the grants officer, academic deans, director of research and sponsored programs, and the vice chancellor for academic affairs.

**PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS BY ADJUNCT UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS**

A person holding less than a full-time position at the University, e.g. adjunct professors, must name an individual who holds a full-time faculty position as co-investigator, in order to receive University approval to submit a proposal. Both individuals will be required to sign proposals. However, it will be the responsibility of the regular UAPB employee to ensure that required technical reports are submitted, equipment is inventoried, and students are hired as stipulated in the approved proposal. The director of research will have the responsibility of ensuring that appropriate co-investigators are named in proposals submitted by adjunct faculty.

**DRUG FREE WORKPLACE**

The University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff requires a workplace (all facilities and vehicles owned, operated, or leased by UAPB for the purpose of conducting University business) to be free of drug abuse and promotes the prevention of abuse through educational programs. In order to achieve this, the University has established a Drug-Free Awareness Program. It has the responsibility of providing information such as: 1) the dangers of drug abuse in the workplace, 2)
the University drug counseling, 3) rehabilitation, and 4) other assistance programs available to the employees.

The implementation of the provisions of the University Drug Free Workplace Policy—as stated herein—represents the good faith effort of the University to continue to maintain a drug free workplace. Also, a copy of this policy will be distributed to all current employees, inserted in employee handbooks, and given to each employee who will be engaged in work funded by a federal grant or contract. Employees who are found guilty, under this policy, of substance abuse violations are subject to existing University disciplinary action and personnel policies. The specific provisions of the policy are:

1. In compliance with the U.S. Congress Omnibus Anti-Drug Act of 1988, employees of the university are prohibited from the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession or use of controlled substances in the workplace.

2. A University employee must notify his/her department head or director (or other appropriate supervisor) in writing of any criminal drug statute conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace not later than five days statute conviction. The department head, director or supervisor of the employee shall immediately convey this information, through appropriate channels, to the vice chancellor to whom he or she reports. If the convicted employee is engaged in a project funded by federal monies, the vice chancellor will notify the granting or contracting agency within ten days after receiving notice of the conviction.

3. An employee who is convicted under any criminal drug statute for a violation occurring in the workplace is required to successfully complete a drug counseling or rehabilitation program. Additional sanctions, including termination of employment, may be imposed for repeated convictions.

4. Adherence to the terms of this policy is condition of employment at the University and, in particular, of those engaged in work funded by a federal grant or contract.

The University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff Health Insurance Policy does cover alcohol and substance abuse treatment. Any person considering entering into a substance abuse program should contact the UAPB Office of Personnel to pre-approve coverage of the program.

**CONFlict OF INTEREST**

In compliance with federal regulations, UAPB maintains the following standards of conduct governing officers, employees, and/or agents engaged in the award/administration of contracts using federal funds. No employee, officer or agent will participate in the selection, award, or
administration of a contract where federal funds are used and/or, to his/her knowledge, any of the following has a financial interest in the contract:

- the employee, officer or agent
- any member of his/her immediate family;
- his or her partner;
- an organization with whom any of the above individuals is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment.

Employees, officers and/or agents may neither solicit nor accept gratuities, favors or anything of monetary value from contractors or potential contractors. Violations of, or request for exceptions to, this policy will be reviewed by a committee appointed by the vice chancellor for academic affairs. If violations of these standards are found, officers, employees, and/or agents will be subject to disciplinary actions as recommended by the committee. Disciplinary actions may include a letter of reprimand, suspension, or termination of employment. The review process is to be completed within 30 days, with a written recommendation made to the vice chancellor for academic affairs at that time.

**INVESTIGATOR FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE**

In circumstances when financial considerations may compromise or have the appearance of compromising an investigator’s professional judgment and independence in the design, conduct, or publication of research, federal regulations require the University to manage, reduce, or eliminate any actual or potential conflicts of interest in covered federal programs. The University is required, therefore, to know what conflicts might exist. Thus, the University requires that investigators disclose any significant interest that may present an actual or potential conflict of interest in a sponsored project.

**Definitions**

*Investigator* – means principal investigator/project director, co-principal investigator, or any person at the University who is responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of research/educational activities—funded or proposed for funding—by a covered federal agency.

*Conflict of Interest* – exists (actual or potential) when the reviewers reasonably determine that a significant financial interest could directly and significantly affect the design, conduct, and/or reporting of research or educational activities funded or proposed for funding.

* Significant Financial Interest* – means anything of monetary value to the investigator, his/her spouse, or dependent children—including but not limited to:
• salary or other payments for services—e.g. consulting fees or honoraria;
• equity interest—e.g. stocks, stock options or other ownership interests;
• intellectual property rights—e.g. patents, copyrights, and royalties for such rights.

The term does not include:

• salary, royalties, or other remuneration from the University;
• income from seminars, lectures, or teaching assignments sponsored by public or nonprofit entities;
• income from service on advisory committees or review panels for public or nonprofit entities;
• financial interest in business enterprises or entities if the value of such interests does not exceed $10,000 or $10,000/annum of salary, fee or other continuing payments; and if the value does not represent more than a 5% ownership interest for any one enterprise or entity when aggregated for the investigator and the investigator’s spouse and dependent children.

Requirements

1. Each investigator is required to read this policy;

2. Each investigator is required to disclose the following significant financial interests:

   a. any significant financial interest of the investigator that would reasonably appear to be directly and significantly affected by the research or educational activities funded, or proposed for funding, by an external sponsor; or

   b. any significant financial interest of the investigator in an entity whose financial interest or educational activities funded, or proposed for funding, by an external sponsor.

Regardless of the above minimum requirements, an investigator, for his/her own best interest, may choose to disclose any other financial or related interest that could present an actual conflict of interest. Disclosure is a key factor in protecting one’s reputation and career from potentially embarrassing or harmful allegations of misconduct.

Procedures

1. Each investigator must certify whether or not he/she has a conflict of interest on the Internal Proposal Cover Sheet, which is completed for each application for eternal funding (Appendix C).

   In the event that a conflict of interest is indicated, the investigator with a conflict of interest must complete a Financial Disclosure form (Appendix G) and attach all required supporting documentation. The completed disclosure form must be submitted to ORSP. Supporting documentation that identifies the business enterprise or entity involved, and the nature and amount of the interest should be submitted in a sealed envelope marked “confidential”.

2. As required by federal regulation, all financial interests must be disclosed prior to the time the proposal is submitted to the agency. If a new interest arises at any time after the proposal is submitted—including the entire period of the award—the investigator must file a new disclosure form within 14 days after becoming aware of a potential/actual conflict of interest.
3. If an investigator indicates there may be a potential conflict of interest covered by this policy, the Disclosure Packet will be referred to a committee established by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Suggested title: Financial Disclosure Review Committee). Committee members are appointed for two-year periods and recommended by School deans. The director of research will call the meeting together and serve as a nonvoting member. The investigator whose financial interests are to be discussed will be invited to the meeting but will not vote. In the event of a tie, the vice chancellor for academic affairs shall make the final decision.

4. Prior to consideration by the Financial Disclosure Review Committee, the investigator must develop and present to the committee a resolution plan that details proposed steps that will be taken to manage, reduce, or eliminate any actual or potential conflict of interest presented by a Financial Interest Disclosure. The Financial Disclosure Review Committee must review the resolution plan for approval with several possible outcomes. The Committee may approve the plan, reject the plan, or approve the plan with additional conditions or restrictions—including the following:

- modification of the research plan;
- disqualification from participation in all or a portion of the research funded;
- divestiture of significant financial interest; or
- severance of relationships that create actual or potential conflicts of interest

Investigators may revise and resubmit rejected resolution plans—as well as appeal the committee’s decision. The vice chancellor for academic affairs will make the final decision regarding resolution of appeals.

If the Committee determines that imposing the above referenced conditions or restrictions would be ineffective/inequitable, or that the potential negative impacts that may arise from a significant financial interest are outweighed by interests of scientific progress, technology transfer, or the public health and welfare, then, the Committee may recommend that the research go forward without imposing conditions or restrictions.

5. The approved Resolution Plan must detail the conditions of restriction imposed upon the investigator in the conduct of the project or in the relationship with business enterprises or entities. The plan must be signed by the investigator, the Committee chairperson, and the vice chancellor for academic affairs.

6. Actual or potential conflicts of interest, as shown on the Financial Disclosure form, must be satisfactorily managed, reduced, or eliminated in accordance with these guidelines prior to accepting an award, or they will be disclosed to the sponsoring agency. The Investigator must, therefore, notify the director for research in writing once all the conditions of the Resolution Plan have been met.

7. The director for research will notify the sponsoring agency if a resolution cannot be agreed upon or if a Resolution Plan has not been followed.

8. Records of the investigator’s financial disclosure and of action taken to manage actual or potential conflicts of interest, must be retained in the office of the director of research until three years after the latter or the termination or completion of the award to which they relate, or the resolution of any government action involving those records.

9. Whenever an investigator has violated this policy or the terms of the Resolution Plan, the Committee must recommend sanctions, which may include disciplinary action ranging from a public letter of reprimand to dismissal and termination of employment. If the violation results in a collateral proceeding under University policies regarding misconduct in science, the Committee must defer a decision on sanctions until the misconduct in science process is completed. The
Committee’s recommendation of sanctions is presented to the vice chancellor for academic affairs, who will enforce any disciplinary action.

## Abbreviations

The list includes abbreviations used in the Handbook and commonly used acronyms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHHS</td>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDGAR</td>
<td>Education Department General Administrative Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environment Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eRA</td>
<td>Electronic Research Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;A</td>
<td>Facilities and Administrative (costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Federal Acquisition Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>Housing Urban and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACUC</td>
<td>Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC</td>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>Institutional Review Board (research involving Human Subjects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEH</td>
<td>National Endowment for Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST</td>
<td>National Institute of Standard Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>Office of Management and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORSP</td>
<td>Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, UAPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAF</td>
<td>Personnel Action Form, UAPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Program Director/ Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA</td>
<td>Request for Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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