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ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Next Meeting: September 15th, 2011 – 9:30 am to 11:00 am
  Woodruff Health Sciences Administration Building (WHSCAB) Auditorium
  1440 Clifton Road N.E. – 1st Floor

- Find information about ERAZ at http://www.or.emory.edu/About_Us/ERAZ.cfm

- Email topics and suggestions for future meetings to eraz@emory.edu.

- Your opinion and thoughts matter. Please complete the survey that will be sent out after this meeting.
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Preparing for Fiscal 2011 Close
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Topics

• Definitions

• Advance Warning Process

• No Action Results

• Where We Are Now

• How to Avoid UTBG/PFBG/GOOB/Suspense
## Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Reference</th>
<th>Full Description</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTBG</td>
<td><strong>Used To Be Grant</strong></td>
<td>A salary was funded 100% by a grant, but the grant end date has passed. Compass will not allow the charge to hit the grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFBG</td>
<td><strong>Partially Funded By Grant</strong></td>
<td>A salary was funded partially by a grant (less than 100%), but the grant end date has passed. Compass will not allow the charge to hit the grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOB</td>
<td><strong>Grants Out Of Bounds</strong></td>
<td>Non-salary transactions (Emory Express, travel reimbursement, Division of Animal Resources, Campus Services, etc) attempt to charge a grant that has passed the end date. Compass will not allow the charge to hit the grant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OGCA

- Sends Grant Salary Distribution Lists with upcoming Grant End Dates to Operating Units
- Runs UTBG/PFBG balance and Smartkey queries
- Updates Master UTBG/PFBG Spreadsheet with new and cleared transactions
- Adds details from Labor Reports, ALLTRANS, etc
- Sends monthly email updates of Department specific portions of UTBG/PFBG Spreadsheet or queries to Department

Department

- Receives their specific portion of updated UTBG/PFBG Spreadsheet or query
- Responds to OCGA by providing correct and appropriate Smartkeys on Spreadsheet
- Creates RSTs (salary) and journals (non-salary) to transfer charges to correct Smartkeys

OGCA

- Runs UTBG/PFBG balance and Smartkey queries
- Updates Master UTBG /PFBG Spreadsheet with new and cleared transactions

UTBG/PFBG Suspense Clearing Process Diagram
If No Action is Taken . . .

- If the grant period is not extended,
  - *The transaction will post – but not where you want or need it to go*
  - *Employees will be paid*
  - *Vendors will be paid*
  - *Cash is “out the door”*

- UTBG and PFBG will go to the “holding” location specified by the operating unit (generally Dean’s Office)
  - *For most, a single project within each operating unit will hold the transaction*

- GOOB will go to the “holding” location with low visibility to the department. *Beginning in FY12, the GOOB transactions will follow the UTBG and PFBG transactions.*
Where We Are Now

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total UTBG Project</th>
<th>GOOB Issues</th>
<th># of Departments with UTBG</th>
<th>Departments with Balances Over $5K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>(12K)</td>
<td>3K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>30K</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>3.5M</td>
<td>12.5K</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory College</td>
<td>47K</td>
<td>2.5K</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>1K</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>7K</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yerkes</td>
<td>142K</td>
<td>(20K)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.7M</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2K)</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bottom line:** We have a lot of work to do to clear these so you have the transactions where you need them to manage effectively.
Ways to avoid suspense

• Update HRAFs

• Verify inactive SmartKeys are not used when charging against grants

• Verify projects have not expired when charging against grants

• Verify other systems (Fed Ex, DAR, Verizon Wireless etc) are updated with new Smartkeys
Closing the Year

• You or your staff may receive emails or phone calls from the central offices requesting your assistance in clearing as you desire.
  • OGCA: Julie Anne Autrey (for UTBG items)
    • 404-727-1790
    • jautrey@emory.edu
  • OGCA: Linda Erhard (for GOOB items)
    • 404-727-2879
    • lerhard@emory.edu
  • Controller’s Office: Nancy Mears (for other Suspense items)
    • 404-727-5746
    • nmears@emory.edu

• Offer Suggestions on what would help you manage this area more effectively:
  – Evelyn Balabis
    • 404-727-2138
    • evelyn.balabis@emory.edu
  – Belva White
    • 404-727-2584
    • belva.white@emory.edu
  – Kerry Peluso
    • 404-727-0551
    • kerry.peluso@emory.edu
Research administration,
Phase 1 Project Overview
ERAZ
Office of Business Process Improvement
July 21, 2011
Office of Business Process Improvement

Emory’s Office of Business Process Improvement (BPI)

- Created in December 2010
- BPI has dedicated resources to help address problematic business processes and policies
- Committed to working collaboratively with Emory leadership, schools, and units

LET US STAND BY WHAT IS GOOD AND TRY TO MAKE IT BETTER.
—ATTICUS HAYGOOD

BPI Foundational Principles

Serve the overall best interests of Emory University, its faculty, students, and staff, in pursuit of Emory’s vision, by facilitating business practices that are:

- effective to accomplishing purpose
- cost effective
- service oriented
- include reliable and effective internal controls
- provide responsible fiduciary behavior
- meet regulatory compliance requirements in a sensible way
Project Charge: research administration

- Emory University is a leading research university, receiving $535M in research funding awards in FY2010

- However, given the size and growth of the University’s research enterprise, redundancies and inefficient processes have developed across the institution

- A holistic, systematic review of the research administration function has never been completed

- The EVPs and Emory leadership have tasked the Office of Business Process Improvement with leading a cross-functional team to identify opportunities for improvement in research administration

- This will be accomplished over several years, starting with a ~6 month long Phase 1, which consists of two parts
Research administration, Phase 1: Roadmap & Issue Identification (Project A) – Project Purpose and Goals

We seek to further **improve key elements** of the complex, broad function of **research administration**. This project will undertake four initial tasks to heighten understanding and **document the current state** of research administration:

1. **Map current state** of research administration activities at Emory
   a. Macro level: high-level process map of research administration activities across all levels of the university
   b. Micro level: detailed understanding of organization structure and key processes at departments, major units, schools, and central

2. Gather information and **identify good practices and issues** with the current state of research administration

3. **Implement** “quick-win” improvements real-time

4. **Prioritize** areas of potential improvement for future phases of work; prepare for future phases
Concurrently with the Roadmap & Issue Identification project, this project will seek to do the following:

1. **Benchmark innovative organizational designs, design elements, and practices** in research administration at other research universities

2. **Identify potential new designs** for Emory research administration that answer the question: “If you could start with a blank slate, what could research administration look like at Emory?”
## Key Activities & Timeline (Preliminary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Kick-off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate Project to Schools, Units, and other Key Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Current State: Macro Level (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Current State: Micro Level (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Good Practices/Issues/Needs (A&amp;B) <em>(Interviews, Focus Groups, Online Survey)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated Design Session(s) (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Recommendations &amp; Report; Identify Phase 2 Projects (A&amp;B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going communication with key stakeholders, schools &amp; units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Blue = Project A
- Red = Project B

*Note: Activity dates are approximate and subject to change.*

*July 20*
## Project Deliverables & Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create Project Deliverables</th>
<th>Develop Recommendations</th>
<th>Decide on Phase 2 Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High-level macro “Roadmap” of research administration activities at Emory University</td>
<td>Deliverables will be used by Working Group to develop recommendations:</td>
<td>Recommendations will be refined and agreed on by Project Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research administration processes, resources, and organizational structure at departments, major units, schools, and central</td>
<td>1. “Quick-wins” for immediate implementation</td>
<td>• Decision for Phase 2 Projects will be made by EVPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritized list of issues with current process</td>
<td>2. Phase 2 improvement &amp; innovation projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritized list of PI &amp; research administrator needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Benchmark report on innovative designs in research administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritized list of innovative ideas and/or design elements for research administration at Emory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Project Executive Committee will oversee the strategic direction of the project.

Project Executive Committee

- Ray Dingedine – School of Medicine
- Lanny Liebeskind – University Science Strategies
- Edie Murphree – Finance
- David Stephens – Woodruff Health Sciences Center
- Claire Sterk – Provost’s Office
- David Wynes – Office of Research Administration
Project Working Group

A: Roadmap & Issue Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Chairs</th>
<th>Working Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat Davis – School of Medicine</td>
<td>Evelyn Balabis – Office of Grants and Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Dracos – Business Process Improvement</td>
<td>Marcie Burnham – School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Hyde – Business Process Improvement</td>
<td>Lisa Carlson – School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Kuskie – Office of Research Administration</td>
<td>Roman Damena – School of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fran Davis – School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Guidot – School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trish Haugaard – School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angela McCoy – Yerkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharen Olson – School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marc Overcash – School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerry Peluso – Office of Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Todd Polley – Emory College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brenda Seiton – Conflict of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holly Sommers – Office of Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Sparkman – School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Tillman – Woodruff Health Sciences Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBD – PI from Rollins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: Innovative Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Chairs</th>
<th>Working Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Dracos – Business Process Improvement</td>
<td>Matthew Fowler – School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Hyde – Business Process Improvement</td>
<td>Yoko Hammond – Yerkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Kuskie – Office of Research Administration</td>
<td>Camilah Hicks – Office of Research Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Tillman – Woodruff Health Sciences Center</td>
<td>Uriel Kitron – Emory College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Lawley – Office of Research Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tammy Loucks – School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolyn Meltzer – School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerry Peluso – Office of Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harriet Ruskin – Goizueta Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamie Smith – Office of Business Process Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lori Snead – School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBD – PI from Rollins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRELIMINARY
How is this project different?

• **Broad scope**, focusing on research administration within departments, major units, schools, and central

• **Inclusive Working Group** comprised of individuals across campus

• A **multi-year project** that will identify both long-term improvements in addition to “quicker” incremental process changes

• **Dedicated leadership** working in tandem to drive the project forward

• **Consensus-driven** recommendations

• **Transparency** of project process and results

• **Evolving external research landscape** is requiring internal change
## Myths and Reality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth</th>
<th>Reality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• This project is focused on central Research Administration only</td>
<td>• The project will examine research administration activities in multiple areas of the university – from the PI, to the department, to the school, to central offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This is a top-down initiative</td>
<td>• Work and recommendations will be driven by the broad-based Working Group. The project will be facilitated by BPI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This project is focused on finding the problems in research administration</td>
<td>• We do not want to single-out individuals or departments, but rather identify areas for improvement and good practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This is a cost cutting exercise</td>
<td>• The project will focus on improving efficiencies, but will welcome the resulting fiscal &amp; operational benefits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Radical redesign will immediately result from this project        | • Quick improvements will be implemented as practicable during Phase 1.  
• Phase 1 will focus more on mapping the current state, collecting information, and identifying areas to look at deeper. Phase 2 and beyond of this project will focus on feasibility and implementation. |
How you can get involved and support this effort

• Participate in information gathering activities (and encourage your colleagues to do the same)
  o Focus Groups
  o Complete Survey

• Volunteer to help with future efforts, if your skills and expertise are needed
Next Steps

• Participate in project activities and help the Working Group when asked

• We will come back to ERAZ in the winter to provide a project update
  – Visit website for more frequent updates

• Contact Kim Hyde or Bill Dracos at bpi@emory.edu if you have additional questions
What is Research Misconduct?

• “Fabrication, Falsification or Plagiarism in proposing, performing or reviewing Research; submitting proposals for Research: or in reporting Research results. It does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data”

  • 42 CFR Section 93.103
Fabrication

• “Making up of Research data or results and recording or reporting them.”
  • 42 CFR section 93.103
Falsification

• “Manipulating Research materials, equipment, or processes or changing or omitting data or results such that the Research is not accurately represented in the Research Records.”
  – 42 CFR Section 93.103
Research Records

• “Those records of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry, including but not limited to, Research proposals, laboratory records (physical and electronic), progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, journal articles, . . . “

– 43 CFR Section 93.224
Plagiarism

• “The appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results or words without giving appropriate credit.”
  – 42 CFR section 93.103
To Establish Research Misconduct

• It must be shown by a preponderance of evidence that:
  – Fabrication, falsification or plagiarism occurred.
  – It was committed intentionally, knowingly or recklessly.
  – It was a significant departure from accepted practices of the research community.
  – It did not result from honest error or a difference of opinion.
What isn’t Research Misconduct?

• Authorship disputes, other than plagiarism
• Credit disputes (e.g., who gets to be first author)
• Use of collaborative research results by one of the collaborators
• Certain IRB and FDA-related matters
• Honest error or honest differences in interpretation of data
• Policy 7.8 at http://policies.emory.edu/7.8.
  – Allegations of fraud, falsification or plagiarism – reviewed under process for Matters Involving Allegations of Research Misconduct
  – Allegations of violating other research related policies or rules – reviewed under process for Matters involving Other Allegations
  – Projects funded by any Public Health Service units (e.g., NIH) also covered by regulations at 42 CFR Part 93
  – Projects funded by National Science Foundation also covered by regulations at 45 CFR Section 689.1 - .10.
Reporting Research Misconduct

- Supervisor
- Office of Research Compliance – (404) 727-2398
- Anonymous reporting via Trust Line -- 1-888-550-8850. Line is open 24/7.
Research Misconduct: Fact or Fiction

• Much ado about something that doesn’t happen much?
• Do I need to worry?
• Well, . . . .
Real Life Cases

- Lab sabotage deemed research misconduct (with exclusive surveillance video) - April 27, 2011

Yesterday, the Office of Research Integrity (ORI), part of the US Department of Health and Human Services, issued a finding of research misconduct for Vipul Bhrigu, a former postdoctoral fellow at the University of Michigan, debarring him for three years from involvement in US federally funded research and from serving as an advisor to the US Public Health Service. The federal register carried the note today. Bhrigu, now in India, was caught on videotape sabotaging the experiments of a graduate student in his lab at the university last year. And today, Nature releases exclusive surveillance tapes, obtained through the Freedom of Information Act in Michigan.

- [http://blogs.nature.com/news/2011/04/lab_sabotage_deemed_research_m_1.html](http://blogs.nature.com/news/2011/04/lab_sabotage_deemed_research_m_1.html)
Biologist spared jail for grant fraud

A prompt confession and apparent remorse helped a former MIT researcher to secure a lighter sentence.

Eugenie Samuel Reich

Luk Van Parijs fabricated data to obtain research funding from the US National Institutes of Health. E. Quinn/Corbis

An immunologist who pleaded guilty to grant fraud in court has avoided jail after several prominent scientists wrote letters begging for clemency on his behalf. His sentence of home detention, community service and financial restitution, finalized on 15 June, suggests that coming clean promptly can be a good strategy for those who have committed scientific misconduct.

Luk Van Parijs was first confronted with evidence of data falsification by members of his laboratory in 2004, when he was an associate professor of biology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in Cambridge. Within two days, he had confessed to several acts of fabrication and agreed to cooperate with MIT's investigation. MIT fired him after a year-long inquiry, but he faced additional investigations by two other institutions — Harvard Medical School in Boston, Massachusetts, where he had been a graduate student, and the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, where he had been a postdoc — as well as by the US government's Office of Research Integrity.

Published online 28 June 2011 | Nature 474, 552 (2011) | doi:10.1038/474552a
Cases at Emory on the Increase:

- Total All New Cases:
  - 2005 -- 1
  - 2006 -- 2
  - 2007 -- 5
  - 2008 -- 9
  - 2009 -- 6
  - 2010 -- 7
  - 2011 -- 5 reviews so far w/1 confession
• Fabricated research subjects
• Fabricated gel images
• Never did any new research – took research from past years and passed it off as new
• Plagiarism
• Bad faith allegations
• Also, lots of sloppiness that looked like research misconduct but wasn’t!
Prevention

• Research management and supervision is the key!!!

• Introducing “Canine Classification System for Research Management Methods”
  – Which one of these “dogs hunts” when it comes to preventing research misconduct?
The Mastiff
The Mastiff: Characteristics

- Too big to fail
- Lots of people, facility and resources
- Multiple, large-scale research projects
- Big dog with big picture view
- The Mastiff “towers over the project,” but doesn’t usually dig down in the details
- Counts on size to “keep ‘em in line”
The Chihuahua
The Chihuahua: Characteristics

- Small and nimble.
- Chihuahua thinks he’s a “big dog,” but often bites off more than he can chew.
- Lots of energy, but few resources.
- Gets worn out trying to chase the other dogs down.
The Retriever
The Retriever: Characteristics

• Focuses on one goal only -- chase it down and bring it back!

• One-goal orientation hampers multi-tasking

• Too busy chasing down the ball to notice what’s going on around
The Border Collie
The Border Collie: Characteristics

• Knows the ultimate goal is good results – no lost sheep
• Strong herding instinct to keep everyone in line
• Able to get the strays back on the path, while keeping an eye on the larger herd
• Plans and engages in teamwork
• Supervises
• Trains the sheep to follow its lead
For Good Research Project Management Be the Border Collie!

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qniwl2hNhDs
Questions

Kris West
Office of Research Compliance
(404) 727-2398
orc@emory.edu
Updates on Conflict of Interest

Brenda Seiton, Asst. VP for Research Admin.
July 21, 2011
Overview

- Announcements
  - Institutional Conflict of Interest Policy: [http://policies.emory.edu/7.24](http://policies.emory.edu/7.24)
  - Proposed PHS Regulations Update
- Who is an Investigator?
- Which form and why?
- What should I do . . .
Who is an Investigator?

- An investigator is anyone who is responsible for the design, conduct or reporting of research.
  - At minimum, any person whose biographical sketch is included on the grant or whose name appears on the budget
    - Any investigator on the IRB protocol or anyone obtaining informed consent
    - Completed Project Financial Interest Related to Research Form & Summaries can be submitted into eIRB by Fall 2011
  - Subcontractors do not need to complete an Emory form
    - Emory subcontracts require that the subcontractor has policies and procedures in place to meet the federal regulations
  - HOWEVER, Collaborators & Consultants might have to complete form unless home institution is willing to cover them
Which form and why?

- Three separate but related electronic forms in the eCOI program
  - External Activities – including Volunteer Activities for SOM
    - Reviewed by the Deans’ Offices (ESA Physicians – Drs. Morris & Castellano)
    - Submitted prior to the commencement of the activity
    - If client is related to research and remuneration above thresholds, then sent to COI Review Office
    - Amended and submitted within 3 business days if information changes
  - Transactional Financial Disclosures
    - Submitted at grant/contract proposal and renewal
    - NEW - Submitted with IRB protocol and annual review
    - Amended and submitted within 3 business days if information changes
  - Annual Certification
    - Faculty, Certain Administrators in SOM, ESA Physicians
    - Completed usually in late spring & summer
    - Can be amended if information changes
eCOI Homepage

My Current External Activities as of 07/19/2011 (Add New)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emory ID</th>
<th>CDI Status</th>
<th>Company / Entity</th>
<th>Total Compensation Previous 12 Months</th>
<th>Total Compensation Next 12 Months</th>
<th>Anticipated Total Days of Service</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E15781</td>
<td>Pending Completion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Complete Remove Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1580</td>
<td>Pending Completion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Complete Remove Details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My Current Investigator Financial Interest in Research Reports as of 07/19/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emory ID</th>
<th>CDI Status</th>
<th>Research Title</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Funding Agency</th>
<th>Form Status</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My Management Plans as of 07/18/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My Managed Research as of 07/19/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My Annual Certification

- Your next Annual Certification is due by 08/31/2011 (Complete)
What should I do if . . .

- A consulting relationship is not disclosed
  - Contact the Dean’s office
    - Helen McLaughlin – SOM
    - Michael Elliot – A&S
    - Dean Surbey – RSPH
    - Ken Hepburn – SON

- A Financial Interest in Research Report is not accurate
  - Contact COI Review Office
  - Contact Research Compliance Office
  - Contact Trust Line

- Questionable subcontract or accounting issue
  - Contact Dean’s Office – Business & Finance
  - University Audit Office
  - Contact Trust Line