

FDP MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE
MINUTES
14 January 2005
Las Vegas, Nevada

Members present:

Joanna Rom, Donna Helm, Co-Chairs
Beth Israel, Derek Van Schmus, Norm Braaten, Tolliver McKinney, Susan Sedwick, Jack Puzak, Jim Randolph

Guests:

Byron Helms, Cynthia Case, Brian Day,

The meeting began with a review of the September, 2004 Minutes. There were no changes.

Joanna reported on the Emerging Research Institutions (ERI) session held the previous day. It was a “swap meet” where three of our ERI institutions reported on issues and how they were handling them. The representatives from both Rowan and Morgan State talked about effort reporting and the representative from the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Studies talked about ITAR and Export Controls.

A representative from Creighton University, a possible ERI applicant, was in attendance. There have also been inquiries from Cardinal Stritch University and North Carolina Central. A formal application for ERI status was received from Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, via e-mail the day of the meeting. It was forwarded to Jerry Stuck for processing.

At the September meeting, the subject of providing travel assistance to ERI representatives, especially those from Minority Serving Institutions, was raised although no research into the possibility has taken place to date. Norm Braaten volunteered to look into the situation and report back in May with recommendations..

Donna reported on the ASISPA (Alliance of Small Institution Sponsored Program Administrators) meeting that she, Nancy Wray and Dick Keough attended on behalf of the FDP. Although there was a lot of interest expressed at the meeting, a chance encounter with Franc LeMire at NCURA revealed that they might be disbanding the Association for lack of volunteer support. Donna will follow up and report again in May.

National Sponsored Programs Administrators Alliance (NSPAA) had at one point been pursued as an Affiliate but there has been no progress. On the other hand, The Association of Independent Research Institutes (AIRI) has officially joined the FDP as an Affiliate.

The discussion then turned to the subject of policy. How do we, as the Membership Committee, ensure that member schools meet the obligations outlined in the MOU, i.e. commitment of money and representatives, institutional commitment to effect changes? Joanna reported that the Executive Committee is currently working with one institution who has not been sending representatives and whose dues are considerably in arrears. However, this type of activity is undertaken on an “ad hoc” basis when problem arise. There is no policy for enforcement. The MOU is on the web and obligations are clearly spelled up. It was the original hope that this might be a sufficient reminder but that is evidently not the case. After considerable discussion, it was agreed that Donna and Joanna, with volunteer assistance from Beth Israel and Susan Sedwick, would draft a policy for an e-mail discussion. Once we are in agreement as a Committee, it will be submitted on our behalf to the Executive Committee.

A side issue raised during this discussion involved bringing forward new leaders in an attempt to boost institutional participation. One way may be to assure ERI representation on all standing committees. This will bring some new faces into the mix. A fixed rotation among co-chairs may also be a way to bring new participants forward. The Committee also asked if there could not be a “set” time for all standing committees to meet. There is a lot of competition with faculty activities.

The possibility of FDP Phase V was raised again. As expressed at the September meeting, it was felt it is still too soon, especially with Nancy Wray just taking over as FDP Chair. Further discussions will take place as her agenda evolves.

Finally the Committee took yet another look at increasing our federal agency representation. There are 35 federal reps in attendance but no new agencies have joined. Joanna has renewed contact with NOAA and feels that progress is being made. Commerce was not originally interested but may be more amenable now. Homeland Security appears to still be interested but they are still constituting themselves as a funding agency. The FDP community is pleased to see that DHS awards, issued through ONR, at least have FDP terms and conditions. We will continue to keep a dialogue with them open. USGS has assured us of their intentions to join but so far we have not seen the MOU. It was suggested that the Bureau of Industry and Security be approached. Sue Sedwick has contacts with them and will report on their level of interest at the May meeting. No progress has been made with the Department of Education.

FDP Membership Committee Minutes
23 May 2005
Washington, DC

Members Present: Co-Chairs Joanna Rom and Donna Helm, Vijaya Melnick, Susan Brauhut, Jim Randolph, Jack Puzak, Beth Israel, Charlee Heimlich, Tolliver McKinney, Norm Braaten

Guests: Nancy Wray, Gilda Barabino, Bob Killoren, Ann Pascucci, Tom Egan, Merrilea Mayo

The Minutes of the January meeting were reviewed and no corrections were suggested.

Merilee Mayo, Director, GUIRR opened the meeting to talk about an initiative she has been working on for Emerging Research Institutions (ERIs) that focuses on how they cope with their administrative burdens and how they might address these issues, including partnering with larger institutions. Examples of issues that have been identified include:

- Small sponsored projects offices often lack the expertise to deal with the complexities of contract negotiation.
- Faculty at smaller institutions often lack the time to attend meetings where information is transmitted by word of mouth rather than through written documents that may or may not reach them.
- Small institutions often lack an expert in all fields of compliance.

She is seeking funding to support a workshop for ERIs and larger institutions to come together to discuss best practices, what is possible, etc. A report would be issued from that workshop and FDP would be a natural test for some of the expected recommendations.

Joanna reported on new ERI institutions that have joined or explored joining the FDP: Southern Illinois at Edwardsville is a new ERI member. Cardinal Stritch, whose representative was attending the FDP meeting, had inquired about ERI membership. A concern is that they may not have sufficiently diverse FDP agency funding. She will pursue this further with them.

A report on federal membership showed 48 federal agency reps registered. This was a significant increase over prior meetings. There was an attendee from the National Institutes of Justice with whom Joanna will meet to discuss their participation. The Department of the Interior has expressed interest. USGS, who is part of that agency, has expressed interest in the past but has not followed up with a commitment. NOAA and NIST have also showed interest and the Department of Education is still sending representatives although no formal request to join has been forthcoming.

The Committee reviewed one more time the new policy on attendance/payment of dues. The Executive Committee has approved it and a report will be given as part of Tuesday's committee report session.

It was reported that in prior years, the University of Kansas has volunteered to handle the annual reporting exercise. It is now possible to handle this in-house at the GUIRR FDP office. Over the summer the Committee will look over the report questions and make changes. This will be on the September agenda.

The discussion then turned to the possibility of Phase V. Nancy Wray reported that she is in the process of setting up a Strategic Planning Committee to consider, among other things:

- should there be a Phase V;
- should the FDP become a 501(c)3 organization and if so, what impact might this have on our federal partners,
- what direction(s) should the FDP take (i.e. a change of format, continue to use “phases” etc.) ;
- what is the appropriate size for the FDP (grow, shrink, develop other membership classes);
- who might rejoin if the Terms and Conditions become applicable to all federal funding and cease being an incentive for joining FDP;
- does the organization need a more articulated description of “partnership”, i.e. what are everyone’s expectations?;
- are the member organizations really streamlining their processes;
- is there a need to issue (or reissue) a list of advantages to being part of the FDP.

The issue of an official “technical representative” was also raised again. It was pointed out that the eRA committee doesn’t include all of the technical reps and there was some concern that the eRA Chair is appointed, not elected. Nancy pointed out that there is one technical representative on the strategic planning committee. There will be ongoing dialogue on this subject as well as interest in the representation of smaller schools in this area.

The last agenda item was the “draft” Travel Policy for ERIs and potential ERIs that Norm Braaten, with input from various other Committee members, had crafted. It proposes two types of “awards”: The first time an ERI school comes to a meeting, there would be full reimbursement for up to 2 representatives. Once an institution is accepted for FDP membership, there would be another award to continue participation and sustain their membership. The faculty voiced their concern that the “why the awards are necessary” needs to be more clearly articulated. Other related issues raised were whether this was the best use of funds and the most effective way to accomplish our goals. Should there be full reimbursement or should the ERI be required to invest some funds? There was also the question of whether or not renewals of the award should be automatic and, if so, how many times?

The discussion also pointed out that travel costs may not be the barrier at all to ERI attendance and that we were making an assumption, without sufficient facts. Vijaya made the point that many ERI schools don't see a clear advantage to FDP participation.

It was decided that the policy be circulated again, attached to these Minutes, for further comment.

Other suggestions included reviving the Publications Committee. They could be charged with developing press releases to professional societies to advertise for membership, particularly targeting ERIs (with emphasis on the HBCUs and other minority serving institutions). It was also suggested that we mimic the NCURA and create an ERI "neighborhood".

The Committee will revisit the issue of enhancing ERI participation at the September meeting.

New Business

Susan Braunhut raised the issue of Faculty Mentoring. She works to match newcomers to old-timers but needs the names of new attendees at least 2 weeks in advance of the meeting. It was suggested that the same be done for new administrative representatives as we did when Phase IV began. Joanna and Donna will work on this latter suggestion and develop a plan over the summer.

Donna Helm
Co-Chair, Membership Committee

**FDP MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 20, 2005**

Members present: Joanna Rom and Donna Helm (Co-Chairs), Susan Sedwick, Susan Braunhut, Steve Horan, Norm Braaten, William Corbett, Jack Puzak, Beth Israel, Tolliver McKinney, Vijaya Melnick, Derek VanSchmus

Guests: Becky Hayes (Kent State)

No changes to the May meeting minutes were requested.

Bill Corbett announced his upcoming retirement. This September FDP meeting will be his last. Bill was thanked for his service. Donna and Joanna will work with Jerry Stuck to determine a replacement.

Financing of ERI participants – Joanna reported that based on discussion with the Executive Committee, the draft presented by Norm Braaten at the last meeting sets up a larger, more complex framework than might be necessary or easily supportable. The Co-Chairs of this Committee put together a shorter policy document (attached) that keeps the philosophy of the original document but puts less focus on lack of travel funds and gives more flexibility to the Executive Committee. After some discussion the draft was agreed to with only minor changes.

As a follow-on to Merrilea Mayo's report at the May meeting, and in her absence, Joanna recapped the present situation. The idea of a special MSI research administration issues workshop is still alive but was not put forward originally in synch with the funding cycle. Merrilea will go back to Academics leadership in October with a funding request. So far neither NSF nor NASA have indicated that there are funds available for this activity. Committee members were urged to suggest possible funding sources.

Annual Report – The Committee looked at the elements from the last report. They requested clarification of the “expenditures” question. Faculty want to see a more detailed breakdown of schools so that they can identify like institutions, i.e. private vs public, predominately undergraduate or graduate, which have medical schools, etc. Check boxes will be added. We will also add a question that addresses the impact of making the FDP terms and conditions universal. Would agencies still want to participate in FDP without “special” terms and conditions as an incentive? FDP's role as a unique forum for participation in the research enterprise and as a “test bed” for changing federal rules will need additional emphasis.

Joanna and Donna agreed to et something out quickly about the survey to the Committee via e-mail and then back to the Executive Committee for approval and then to the general Membership before Jerry Stuck retires.

It was suggested that when the report is sent out for completion a notice go to the entire list-serve to say it is available. It was also suggested that a “read only” sample be made available on the FDP home page so that all members of the institutional team have an opportunity for input. The Administrative representative will continue to be responsible for the final submission after consultation with their FDP delegation.

New federal members – Joanna reported that NOAA is on the brink of joining and Department of Education representatives continue to attend and participate although their key interest is with the newly formed National Grants Partnership – a version of FDP for the state and local community.

Mentoring – Susan Brauhut reported that the faculty experience more turnover in membership than the administrative and technical categories. Jerry sends to her routinely a list of new faculty members. She and other faculty reps have developed a “pool” of “veterans” who have volunteered to mentor new members. The group agreed that we should do something similar for the administrative and technical reps. Beth Israel and Sue Sedwick will work to develop a veteran pool of administrators and Tolliver McKinney and Derek Van Schmus will do the same with the technical reps. Sue and Beth also volunteered to update the existing powerpoint presentation about the FDP as a tool for mentors to use.

Vijaya Melnick pointed out that if we want to attract more ERI members, the FDP should be present at their meetings. We already participate at NCURA and SRA but are open to other suggestions. Tolliver reported that there is a Memphis area administrative meeting where he could make a brief presentation. Faculty could make presentations at their professional meetings but could benefit from a few power-point slides. (see above) This will be discussed further in January.

Phase V – discussions continue about whether or not to have one and what the issues are. Nancy Wray had given a fairly detailed presentation on this at the May meeting but was unable to join this meeting. Vijaya and Susan reported that they are on the planning committee. There is a retreat in November. They will report back also in January and the Membership Committee stands ready to provide additional input as needed..

Donna Helm
Co-Chair

FDP Financing ERI Participation

The Membership Committee recommends that the FDP, when opportunities and needs arise, fund travel of potential ERI member representatives to FDP meetings and waive their registration fees. The intent of this recommendation is to assure that potential ERI members have the opportunity to learn more about the FDP and their potential role in the FDP through participation in actual meetings and to remove cost of attendance as a barrier. Rather than have a detailed policy, the Membership Committee recommends that such requests be handled on a case by case basis and are subject to approval by the FDP Chair.

The Membership Committee is also open to the FDP supporting travel of ERI members if it is determined that travel costs are a barrier to participation. We recommend that this be handled on a case-by-case basis.