

FDP Standing Committee on Membership  
Friday, January 10, 2003, 7:30-9:00 a.m.  
Irvine California

Attending: Braunhut, Helm, Nevin, Nan Parry [for Puzak], Randolph, Rom, Seligman, Wray  
Absent: Fernandez, Israel, Puzak, Smith

The following topics were discussed:

Orientation for new attendees: Donna noted that orientation meeting that she and Louise Griffin coordinated on January 9 was successful. She also noted that the May meeting might not require a full-blown orientation, since relatively few new attendees would be expected, but that some informal coffee should be considered. We will request that "new attendee" be included in registration form so that it will be easy to identify appropriate invitees. Susan also remarked that faculty reps are likely to turn over more frequently than admin reps due to teaching demands, grant demands, etc. She noted that the faculty committee will stay on top of this particular issue. It was agreed that Susan and Dick will provide a new attendee orientation if there is sufficient demand, based on registration numbers.

Directory data base: Still needs work. Nancy agreed to work with Don Denson and Tammy Custer to identify improvements.

Agency outreach: Increasing participation of other federal agencies and broadened participation by currently participating agencies is strongly encouraged. Donna Helm agreed to contact CDC, Joanna will follow up with Education, NIST/NOAA?. Also, Homeland Security, once up and running, would be a good candidate. Volunteers are needed to do outreach with other agencies. There was interest expressed in bringing the VA into the fold. VOLUNTEERS ARE NEEDED.

Minority-serving institution participation: A working group will be established by FDP IV to increase minority serving institution participation, including emphasis on faculty, peer to peer outreach. Communication with groups such as HBCU association, HACU and SACNAS were also discussed and inviting them to the May meeting should be made a priority. [Note: Kathy McManus of ARO has contacted me and expressed interest in Membership's work on this issue. I have referred her to Julie Norris as a working group participant.] A related issue will be grappling with appropriate way to open up membership again if we want to increase participation, as well as dues paying issues. Joanna promised to research which schools would be eligible as ERIs.

Leadership: It was noted that Nancy Wray had decided to step down as co-chair and recommended Donna Helm as her successor. This is subject to the concurrence of the Executive Committee of FDP IV [which concurred later that afternoon.]

Membership management. Membership is responsible for tracking attendance. JR has been reviewing the registration list to see which schools weren't represented and to identify any attendance issues to keep an eye on. Also, will coordinate with Finance Committee as necessary to address any dues non-payment issues. This will also need to be a policy area for executive committee's new policy project.

Reporting-- Another membership committee responsibility is to design and solicit the periodic reports from member institutions. Ideally a web based format should be used. The previous set up, via LMI, is not available. Nancy may have examples to draw upon. David Nevin volunteered to help develop web application. Marcia Smith was "volunteered" to help in absentia.

Increasing participation in committee-- A note to the FDP membership will be developed and sent in the next few weeks.

**FDP Membership Committee**  
**2 May 2003**  
**Minutes**  
**7:30-8:30 a.m.**

Co-Chairs: Joanna Rom  
Federal representative, National Science Foundation

Donna Helm  
Administrative representative, Johns Hopkins University

Attendees: Charlee Heimlich, Norm Braaten, Derek Van Schmus, Susan Sedwick, Antony Seluadurai, William Corbett, Nancy Wray, Neta Fernandez, Beth Israel, Stephen Horan, Susan Brauhut, Jim Randolph, Kathryn McManus, Tolliver McKinney

The co-chairs reminded the attendees, many of whom were new, of the basic charge to the committee (as taken from the website).

First order of business was to discuss attracting new federal partners to the FDP. Suggested agencies were the VA, NOAA, FDA, AHRQ, CDC, DOJ, and DHS. Treasury and OMB were also suggested but since they are not grant awarding agencies, their participation would be defined differently. A plan of action for contacting these agencies will be developed at the next meeting.

The second order of business was a review of the various membership categories. **Affiliates** were defined as foundations and/or other charitable groups. These groups may not participate in demonstrations, may not vote and may not serve as chair or co-chair of a task force or demonstration. They can be included on the general membership mailing list and participate on task forces and committees.

**Vendors** may attend meetings and receive general announcements about the FDP but should not be on any committee list serve due to possible conflicts of interest.

The **Friends** category had been abolished at the end of Phase III but lively discussion led to the decision that it should be reinstated, pending approval of the Executive Committee. A policy regarding this category will be developed and discussed later in the summer via conference call. Susan Sedwick from University of Oklahoma volunteered to make the first attempt at drafting the policy.

The new category of **Emerging Research Institutions (ERI)** was discussed in terms of raising the threshold for eligibility from the current level of “less than \$10M in federal research expenditures.” This dollar figure was viewed as too low and might prohibit a number of institutions, including minority serving ones, from being eligible. Various dollar levels were proposed, with no final decision. The group approved, however, in principle, the idea of raising the dollar figure. Joanna Rom is to conduct further research and make a proposal.

One final action item involved the Membership Committee website. Charlee Heimlich, from Kent State, offered to review it and report back Joanna on what changes/updates need to be made.

**Minutes**  
**FDP Membership Committee**  
**22 September 2003**

Co-Chairs: Joanna Rom

Federal representative: National Science Foundation

Donna Helm

Administrative representative, Johns Hopkins University

Attendees: Kathryn McManus, Grace Adams-Square, Steve Horan, Neta Fernandez, Antony Seluadurai, William Corbett, David Nevin, Susan Sedwick, Charlee Heimlich

Invited guest: Jerry Stuck

The first item of business was to review the matrix of membership categories prepared by Sue Sedgwick. The committee had several changes to suggest and were asked to forward any further thoughts after the meeting to Donna or Joanna. Suggested comments focused on the voting category – who can vote for what? It was specifically mentioned that Emerging Research Institutions do have the right to vote. Joanna will incorporate the changes and submit the matrix to the Executive Committee for review and adoption.

It was noted, during a review of the Phase IV solicitation and the MOU, that member schools have two reporting requirements – an annual report which focuses on the activities of the individual FDP members and the bi-annual report which adds additional text questions about what the member school's activities have been. David Nevin presented an on-line version of the annual report. There was general approval of the format and some suggested minor changes. David will e-mail the revised report to the committee for testing. It is anticipated that this will be available to the membership in November for data collection in time for the January meeting.

The committee then returned to an earlier discussion of how to attract new federal members to the partnership. Jerry Stuck, the FDP Executive Director, sat in on the meeting and suggested that we approach those federal agencies with whom we already have a working relationship. Specific suggestions are DARPA, Homeland Security, CDC, Department of Justice

and NOAA. Our DoD representative, Kathryn McManus agreed to approach DARPA. Joanna and Jerry are to initiate contact with DOJ and NOAA; Jerry will work with Julie Norris to follow-up with Mel Bernstein of DHS; and Donna Helm will approach CDC, perhaps through Charlie Havekost and the ERA possibilities. One specific approach might be to invite them to San Antonio – just to get acquainted. We should also keep our eyes on OSTP and the Business Models project. FDP is likely to be highlighted and this may also attract more federal attention to the partnership.

Jerry also suggested that we think of ways to re-engage our existing federal partners. Where once the membership was roughly 50/50 federal to academic, that ratio is now closer to 25/75. We will revisit this issue in January.

Finally Joanna gave an update on Tuesday morning session to focus on Emerging Research Institutions, particularly Minority Serving Institutions. Representatives from various federal agencies, including NSF, NASA and Agriculture, had been invited to present information on various programs in an attempt to expand their visibility and identify barriers (and remedies to those barriers) for broader participation. [Notes from that meeting will be posted separately.]

The last item of business was to decide whether or not to return to our early morning (7:30 am) time slot to avoid competition with other workshops. We will poll the committee. The early consensus seems to be that while not ideal, an early morning session will make it easier to assure a broader representation on the Membership Committee and minimize conflicts.

## **Federal Demonstration Partnership: Focus Group Notes**

### **Increasing Participation from Minority Serving Institutions**

**The following notes reflect the discussion at the focus group session held at the FDP September 23, 2003 meeting in Washington, DC. Attendees are listed at the end, as are weblinks to agency programs mentioned in the discussion.**

The intent of this meeting is to spark ideas about how we can be more inclusive. The format is intended to be informal. We have program officers from USDA/CSREES, NASA and NSF here to describe some of their programs.

USDA projects typically involve land grant institutions. In their dealings with the 1890 (HBCU) and 1992 (other MSI) land-grant institutions, neither group have been particularly competitive. Those who succeeded were usually partnered with other institutions. USDA has conducted grants workshops targeted to MSIs. Both submission and acceptance rates are problems. In one competition, only 16 of 2000 applications were from MSIs.

USDA does try to have MSI representation on review panels, but it is difficult to get people to participate. They recruit at scientific meetings.

Several suggested that smaller colleges have an additional challenge in submitting grant applications due to a lack of human resources to assist in the labor involved – both at a staff and faculty level. IPAs were suggested as a way to help gain release time for faculty. Some programs in NSF have allowed faculty to ‘buy out’ a course, or cover 3 months of salary rather than one. Financial tracking is another labor burden for smaller institutions.

Partnering MSIs with larger institutions was suggested. There were several comments about the potential for abusing that relationship. In some cases the larger institution uses the smaller one to increase diversity in its grant application, and the smaller partner gets little help in return. HBCs prefer independence. A new NSF program tries to rectify this problem by sending the money to the HBC, which is partnered with a center. It makes the service to diversity more explicit.

You cannot underestimate the condescension of the bigger institutions. Some disputed this with respect to diversity, but were more in agreement when outreach was mentioned. It’s all too common for an institution to farm out the outreach efforts to female assistant professors of education. The condescension is broad and subtle.

Curriculum change could be a means to addressing this. A research project could be written as a course. At least one person in the meeting has done that.

Question about the NSF Planning grants for women and minorities. Planning grants for women are no longer available. Some facets of that program are folded into

NSF's ADVANCE program. Planning grants for minorities are still available, although the website is very out of date and in the process of being revised. The caps were/are pretty low on these awards.

Institutions still don't have partnering 'right.' But in the future there will be no choice. To limit research proposals to the institution's research expertise will become too restrictive.

Infrastructure assistance to HBCUs has been general in application. Could they be more specialized/focused? That would have to come from the institutions. The CREST program at NSF does allow for that specialization. There was then some discussion about the balance between research specialization and well-roundedness of a department to provide a good education.

Cost sharing (which has been deemphasized or eliminated within NSF) is a barrier to some participation – the institutional support isn't there.

Entering clerical support (and other staff support) as a direct cost in the proposal would be of help, but smaller departments that couldn't spread a staff person across several projects may still have trouble getting the human resources they need, due to the unevenness of the funding stream.

The CAREER program has low submission rates from minorities, and from MSIs. There's currently a three-year cycle of workshops taking place to raise awareness among minorities and MSIs about CAREER awards. While numbers of applications are up, the percentage of applications from minorities and MSIs is unchanged. As with other programs discussed during the meeting, the submission rates are a greater concern than the acceptance rates.

The requirement for institutional support (usually a letter) has been a problem, as it is easier for larger institutions to guarantee such support. It was also suggested that the letter should be maintained, and renewed each year of the grant.

Long discussion about how people don't really go to the website, and that letters to college presidents and other administrators seem to have much more impact (are more likely to prompt action on their part and further distribution of the message) than emails.

Major research universities typically encourage their young faculty to apply for CAREER awards, and their young faculty are typically more experienced than those at MSIs.

If the institution doesn't see NSF taking that integration as important the integration of teaching and research as important, institutional support will be a problem. Some NSF divisions do take it seriously and are extending it to other grant programs. The speaker also suggested that a problem with strengthening institutional support of CAREER projects is that there is variability in how seriously NSF treats the integration

of research and education requirement. If the institutions don't think that NSF is really serious about it, then there is less incentive for them to support it.

Some way of sharing good proposals (identifiers and other sensitive information removed, of course) would be helpful. Apparently it requires a FOIA application.

The workshops on the CAREER program will be Jan. 2004 in Washington, and March 2004 in Albuquerque. They are valuable ways to learn best practices and to interact with program officers. Other people (besides PIs) can attend. Perhaps research administrators should. EPSCoR also has workshops on these topics, and could be a source of travel funds.

The Engineering Directorate at NSF has held grantwriting workshops, which have contributed to an increase in applications. As before, selection percentages are not the problem. They do have diverse panels, but few 'fresh faces' that could help boost submission numbers. They (like all divisions) are looking for reviewers. Please forward names to program staff.

A representative from the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) program briefly described the program. He believes interdisciplinary research is relatively easy, but interdisciplinary education is not. It is very challenging to the institutions. They don't have ways to reward young faculty who participate in such work, especially in multi-institutional projects. IGERT has made an award to an HBC, and many MSIs have participated in multi-institutional applications.

Someone asked if smaller schools have an advantage in interdisciplinary research.

NASA recently merged its two educational program divisions into one, to ensure uniformity of access and opportunity for institutions. Most of their programs have a low submission rate from MSIs.

#### **Attendees included:**

Stephen Horan, New Mexico State University; Bill Harris, University of North Carolina, Wilmington; Carol Liedke, Case Western Reserve University; Catherine Watt, Clemson University; Lawrence Goldberg, Wyn Jennings, Joanne Tornow, Joanna Rom, Thomas Weber, all of the National Science Foundation (NSF); Thomas Smith, NSF and Howard University; Peter Burfening, USDA; Grace Adams-Square, Livingstone College; Donna Helm, Johns Hopkins University; Merrilea Mayo, NAS/GUIRR; Sue Paulson, University of Minnesota; Joe Ellis, National Institutes of Health; Kathryn McManus, Department of Defense; Heather Galloway, Texas State University; Katie Blanding, NASA; Emmanuel Glapke, Howard University.

## **Web links to represented agencies/programs**

USDA <http://www.reeusda.gov/>

NASA

<http://spacelink.nasa.gov/Educational.Services/NASA.Education.Programs/Research.and.Development/National.Space.Grant.College.and.Fellowship.Program/>

NSF <http://www.nsf.gov/>

CREST <http://www.ehr.nsf.gov/EHR/HRD/Crest.asp>

IGERT <http://www.nsf.gov/home/crssprgm/igert/start.htm>

CAREER <http://www.nsf.gov/home/crssprgm/career/start.htm>

NIH <http://www.nih.gov/>

USARO <http://www.aro.army.mil/>