

FDP Membership Standing Committee
Minutes for January 25, 2010
Washington, DC

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:50 p.m.

2. Introductions – Erica Kropf, Committee Co-Chair

Present: Co-Chairs *Erica Kropf*/University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, *Joanna Rom*/National Science Foundation

Monique Anderson/University of Maryland, College Park, *Charisse Carney-Nunes*/National Science Foundation, *Sarah Cusimano*/University of Southern California, *Maggie Griscavage*/University of Alaska at Fairbanks, *Becky Hayes*/Kent State University, *Beth Israel*/Arizona State University, *Carole Liedtke*/Case Western Reserve University, *Deborah Marsh*/University of Oklahoma, *Anne Sherman*/University of Houston, *Larry Sutter*/Michigan Technological University, *Jane Zuber*/Texas A&M Research Foundation

3. Annual Report

Only two-thirds of the annual reports were submitted by the deadline given to members. Therefore, the FDP leadership was unable to provide a report summary at the January 2010 meeting. The committee discussed methods for improving the report submission process. The ability to edit and print all of the report would make it easier for members to comply, the committee felt. Another issue is that individuals leave their university and though they may have been very involved in FDP their replacement does not seem aware of the obligation to complete the report. A suggestion was made that David Wright should emphasize to members their institution's obligation to submit the report on time. Erica suggested that the report notice should go to the main list instead of just to administrative representatives. Other suggestions included having the registration list categorized by institutions, ensuring that the directory information is correct and perhaps validating the entire list prior to the next report deadline. Also, a dropdown menu of institution names for registration purposes (whether for meetings or completion of annual report) needs to identify the type of member and their membership affiliation.

Some committee members ended up writing reminder notes to members who had tardy reports. Future reminders will need to be sent sooner and perhaps the committee as a whole will need to be involved in phone calls or other personal reminders. We will also need to make sure when the report is successfully completed that the submitter is informed so they are aware that no further action is required.

It was agreed that the form/format of the annual report template needed to be updated given available technologies.

4. Mentor program

Beth Israel said that the activities for this meeting went fairly well. We needed to recruit additional mentors for this meeting. Some registrants were erroneously identified as needing mentors when they were not first time attendees. Carol Liedtke and Beth Israel talked to new attendees and made sure they were aware that they could have a mentor for the meeting. Committee members discussed their experience as mentors for this meeting. Beth maintains a lot of contact with new attendees before the meeting to ensure abundant information is provided. A separate room for the mentor/mentee breakfast is ideal but its location needs to be clarified. The FDP meeting registration desk needs to have a sign telling people where to meet for the first time attendees' breakfast.

5. New Attendees' Breakfast and Orientation

Beth expressed her appreciation to Erica for her help with the orientation. The committee felt the orientation was a good idea and suggested having food in the back of the orientation room for first time attendees, rather than in a separate room. Two members requested mentors after the orientation. A suggestion was made that this session should be called "New Attendees Orientation and Breakfast". Joanna clarified that "first time attendee" and "new member" are not necessarily synonymous, so it is important to make this distinction in our meeting materials.

Action Item: We will follow up with a request to David Wright to see if food in the orientation room is possible.

6. Registration

Joanna and Erica commented that volunteers graciously provided registration and greeting support at the registration desk. Registration went very well, according to Joanna and Erica. It went much better this meeting and was well organized by FDP staff prior to registration, which helped to facilitate the registration process.

7. Federal Members' Participation

FDP will continue to seek enhanced federal membership and involvement. Attendance by federal members was higher for this meeting. The DHS attendee retired so they will have new representation at the next meeting. A comment was made that we need to have the OSTP representative attend regularly. We would also welcome OSTP leadership's involvement.

Again, members discussed having DOT participate and it was suggested that NEH become a member. Erica suggested adding bullet points to the new FDP brochure, explaining to federal agencies how they would benefit from FDP participation. Joanna suggested that FDP university members talk to federal agency contacts and discuss participation in FDP. Erica suggested that we discuss the benefits of FDP membership with all federal agencies with whom we work. FDP has had such conversations with NOAA, NIST, and an ongoing conversation with DOE. Joanna suggested that committee members contact the agencies who we would like to join FDP and then send Erica a note so that she can follow up with those agencies.

8. ERI membership

A suggestion was made that a volunteer coordinator for ERI members' activities would be beneficial. This is the second meeting in a row that we have not had the ERI group meet. We want to establish the ERI group as a special luncheon and discuss specific issues that affect them. There should be a structured, standing ERI luncheon each Monday of the FDP meeting.

Participation among the ERI members has been sporadic, though attendance has been good. Previously, the person leading the ERI luncheon chose a topic to discuss. We need to have a couple of ERI members help out with this effort and help lead the group. The committee discussed the designation of ERI and clarified that the size of the institution in research dollars denotes ERI membership.

9. 2011 FDP Election Cycle

The current Chair and Vice Chair have three year terms. We need to think about developing succession planning. We should start conversations with any interested persons in the next few months.

Results of the next election are to be announced at the September 2011 meeting. The Chair Elect & Vice Chair Elect candidates should be able to make comments at the May 2011 meeting. The committee clarified that each phase of FDP is for six years. The Chair and Vice Chair may be reelected once, for a total of six years. They may serve two consecutive terms.

10. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

FDP Membership Standing Committee

Minutes for May 14, 2010

Washington, DC

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Erica Kropp at 8:06 a.m.

2. Introductions – Erica Kropp, Committee Co-Chair

Present: Present: Co-Chairs *Erica Kropp*/University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, *Joanna Rom*/National Science Foundation

Monique Anderson/University of Maryland, College Park, *Marcie Avery*/Texas A&M University, *Gila Budescu*/Rockefeller University, *Charisse Carney-Nunes*/National Science Foundation, *Barbara J. Clayton*/Florida A&M University, *Sarah Cusimano*/University of Southern California, *Maggie Griscavage*/University of Alaska at Fairbanks, *Becky Hayes*/Kent State University, *Beth Israel*/Arizona State University, *Toni Lawson*/University of Maryland, College Park, *Carole Liedtke*/Case Western Reserve University, *Deborah Marsh*/University of Oklahoma, *Robyn Remotigue*/Mississippi State University, *Anne Sherman*/University of Houston, *Larry Sutter*/Michigan Technological University, *Don Turner*/St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, *David Wright*/National Academies, *Jane Zuber*/Texas A&M Research Foundation

3. Volunteers

Erica thanked the volunteers who assisted at the reception desk and those who acted as mentors for first-time attendees.

- **Mentor Program**

- Erica commented that our committee has had to ask more than once for volunteer mentors for recent meetings. Until now, we have only asked committee members to volunteer to mentor first-time attendees. We will ask in the e-mail Claudette sends out before future meetings if first-time attendees would like to be assigned a mentor. If we find that we have more requests than available mentors, we will ask the general membership to volunteer as mentors.
- Joanna commented that the white ribbons on the new attendees' badges are very helpful. She asked that the term "new attendee" consistently be used in FDP materials, rather than "new member." The breakfast room set aside for first-time attendees was very helpful, although signage may be changed for future meetings to clarify that while all members are welcome to use the room, it is designated as the meeting place for mentors and first-time attendees. Also, the FDP final agenda will need to clarify the

meeting place location for first-time attendees and mentors, as well as for the general membership.

- Registration
 - The committee members were asked if improvements are needed to the on-line registration page. The committee expressed that the registration page worked well. The FDP office verified attendees' self-identification so that also worked well.
 - David Wright reminded the group that the registrant's credit card name has to match the registrant – so if an attendee is using a credit card under the name of their office then that can be a problem.
 - A suggestion was made that the agenda should be available at the early registration tables and the reception, rather than distributed the next morning. David said that FDP saved 4,500 pages of paper by not printing the registrants' list. A suggestion was made to provide the attendees' list on the website before the meeting, so people can print that if they wish. It is currently saved on the members' only page at the time of the meeting.
- ERI leadership
 - Joanna asked how many committee meeting attendees are designated as Emerging Research Institution (ERI) members. She said that the committee will revisit the ERI list so that we can put together some outreach to those schools and perhaps have a luncheon for the ERI attendees at the next meeting.

4. Annual Report – Discussion with David Wright about next version

Joanna said that there are two basic issues with the annual report, which are:

- Formatting
- Compliance

Report submission compliance was disappointing this year. It took members a long time to respond and there were quite a few members that required reminders before they submitted their annual report. Therefore, we weren't able to do an analysis by the January meeting. We received feedback that the reporting instrument could be improved; some felt it was difficult to complete and submit. There were some mechanical problems with the report submission.

- Erica asked David if he would like for a subcommittee to help with the changes next time around. The current instrument is based upon the original paper version. David invited some help with the changes. David said it is easy to make content changes but functionality and usability issues will benefit from others' review and feedback. David said he can take the current version and make a beta version for the committee to look at and review as he makes requested changes.

- In terms of content, Joanna said there were good responses, but some of the questions aren't membership committee driven and may be of more interest to other committees.
- Joanna suggested that we have another report cycle next fall, in time for January's meeting.
- Timeline: David can create the test version in about a week. He will need to make sure our committee members have access so that we can review the content whether or not we're the person who would normally prepare the report.

5. Attendance policies: What if an institution misses more than two meetings in a row?

The sensitivity of this issue was discussed. The Membership Standing Committee has to enforce compliance with the MOU members signed with FDP at the beginning of Phase V. We've had a few instances so far this year where institutions have failed to attend two meetings in a row, which is a basis for reconsidering their membership. Some cases involved cuts in funding so that offices could not pay for the travel. We might want to take a matrix approach and see if non-attendees are otherwise involved as participants.

Joanna said they've been reaching out and trying to find out what factors cause non-attendance. We'd rather be able to work with an institution to resolve whatever issues occur. Susie Sedwick pointed out that it is an obligation to attend meetings and for those attendees who do attend and use their travel funds for this purpose, it may seem unfair to allow non-attendees to continue to participate. Charisse Carney-Nunes stated that fairness and uniformity will be critical in dealing with these situations. Susie may need to send out a statement of policy for members restating that attendance is expected.

6. Increasing participation by Federal Agencies

- The committee continues to work to get the Department of Energy involved. We are also pursuing participation by the Department of Education. Erica said that we will also work to get NOAA involved.

7. 2011 elections?

- Although there was not sufficient time for the committee to discuss this topic, we will plan to do so at the next meeting.

8. Other:

- Based on a previous request from the Executive Committee, Joanna mentioned the idea of having separate registrations for day one and day two of the FDP meetings. While having concerns with breaking up registration, she suggested that we might consider a registration discount if a member has more than three people in a delegation. Susie said this might not be effective; her concern is that the problem was non-registrants who attend an end of day session and then attend the reception. David said a lot of Federal members come in for a session or

two and aren't able to attend the entire meeting. A lot of the NSF and NIH attendees come in for specific sessions but they do not stay for the reception. Joanna and Erica said the separate registration is probably not the best approach.

- There are two things for the committee to consider: The \$160 registration fee does not cover an attendee's entire meeting expenses. Technically, the registration system might not be able to discriminate whether a person is the third or fourth attendee.
- Another issue that was raised was the idea of identifying attendees as a compliance representative, in addition to the faculty, administrative and technical designations. Susie said this would allow those attendees to be more recognized for their efforts. We could add this designation to the registration. Institutions would not be required to have a compliance attendee; this would be just another designation of the attendee's actual role. It might help institutions to be able to send a representative to the meeting if they are attending in a compliance role.
- Joanna suggested that the letter that Susie will send out with copies of the brochures might mention the compliance role as an additional designation.
- Erica expressed appreciation to Beth Israel for coordinating the first-time attendees and mentors activities.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:59 a.m.

FDP Membership Standing Committee
Minutes for August 31, 2010
Washington, DC

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:07 a.m.

2. Introductions – Erica Kropf and Joanna Rom, Committee Co-Chairs

Present:

Co-Chair *Erica Kropf*/University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, *Joanna Rom*/National Science Foundation

Marcie Avery/Texas A&M University, *Charisse Carney-Nunes*/National Science Foundation, *Barbara Clayton*/Florida A&M University, *Sarah Cusimano*/University of Southern California, *Andrea Deaton*/University of Oklahoma, *Vonda Durrer*/University of Virginia, *Maggie Griscavage*/University of Alaska, Fairbanks, *Beth Israel*/Arizona State University, *Katherine Kissmann*/Texas Engineering Experiment Station, *Toni Lawson*/University of Maryland, College Park, *Carole Liedtke*/Case Western Reserve University, *Helena Moynahan*/University of Maryland, College Park, *Robyn Remotigue*/Mississippi State University, *Sue Ross*/Northwestern University, *Susie Sedwick*/University of Texas, Austin, *Anne Sherman*/University of Texas, Austin, *Susan Sauer Sloan*/National Academies, *Larry Sutter*/Michigan Technological University, *Jane Zuber*/Texas A&M Research Foundation

3. Volunteers

Erica thanked the volunteers who assisted at the registration desk.

4. Emerging Research Institutions

- Charisse Carney-Nunes discussed the ERI luncheon held on 8/30/10
 - Discussion with the luncheon attendees included reasons why they attended and what they perceived to be the benefits of the group and whether or not FDP could meet their needs in specific ways. Follow-up items included determining the next steps,
 - Major benefits of participation, as described by the group included:
 - Enhanced communications
 - Helping ERIs better communicate the benefits of FDP to their faculty and administrators
 - Helpful discussion about certification programs and staffing issues that have uniquely impacted ERIs.

- Additional issues discussed by the group included:
 - Difficulty of some ERIs in not having access to the level of IT needed because they don't have the F&A to support such operations.
 - Possibility of having an "ERI Day" before or after an FDP meeting
 - Potential helpfulness of an ERI directory or a place on the FDP website for the ERI institutions
 - Possibility of having ERI members join FDP committees so that their feedback would be shared with all of the FDP groups
- Several research administrators who previously worked at large research institutions attended the ERI luncheon as part of their new roles at ERI institutions. They noted that the same requirements (regulations & policies) are required for ERIs as larger universities. Some offices may not be aware of how to manage all of this within a much smaller university.
- Joanna pointed out that the ERI institutions are often large universities but just have smaller (emerging) research programs.
- Joanna thanked Charisse for moving the ERI effort forward on behalf of the Membership Committee.

5. Annual Report

- There were quite a few issues this past year with compliance on the annual report; numerous members failed to submit their reports in a timely manner.
- A suggestion was made that volunteers from the Membership Committee will need to follow-up with members who are having difficulty submitting their reports.
- Feedback from the last report submission included that the report structure was difficult for some users and David Wright is aware of that and will work on it before the next report is due.
- FDP is experimenting with having comments at the end of meetings submitted electronically after the meeting. That will help with report compliance.
- Additional questions added to the meeting questionnaire will help us as our committee moves forward.

6. Mentor program

- There were 45 requests for mentors this meeting.
- Some mentors currently have more than one mentee.
- Beth Israel has done a great job of handling this work.
- Beth has some ideas on how this program should evolve.
 - According to Beth, the first proposal is that FDP needs a statement about mentoring on the website. She asked Andrea Deaton and the Communications Committee for help with this.
 - The role of mentors will need to be defined so it is clear what is being offered (FDP is not a professional development organization).
 - One idea is to expand the new members' breakfast to provide a general orientation.

- Another suggestion is to have a table at FDP meetings where members could go to request mentoring.
- Erica said we should take off the mentor/mentee notation on the registration form and instead have members note “first time attendee” and we would contact those people and would provide volunteers to meet with them as a group.
- Beth asked for clarification on the kind of questions that are being asked by mentees.
- Katherine Kissmann suggested that we include a FAQ site on the FDP website for first time attendees, since many of the questions are the same.
- Another suggestion was that everyone on the Membership Committee would wear a “mentor” tag and be available to answer questions.
- We need a small subcommittee looking at the mentoring program and we need to decide if we are moving away from the one-on-one mentor/mentee and to dealing with attendees as a group. We’d send emails to everyone and then post FAQs as well.
- A suggestion was made that first time attendees should be given a special handout at registration so that they can see specific materials to help inform them (Erica said we would do a stack of those to streamline things).
- Beth asked Anne Sherman to work with Maggie Griscavage and Marcie Avery to organize the mentoring.
- Carole Liedtke mentioned that she will continue to work with the faculty who are first time attendees.
- We will go ahead and put the first time attendee tag on the badges before they’re picked up at the registration desk.
- We will go with the one-on-one mentoring but perhaps group some activities so that our outreach is most effective.
- Jane Zuber will be the liaison to the Communications Committee from the Membership Committee.
- We’ll need to revise the website before the next meeting so that a lot of this new information is added.
- Maggie will be the registration desk organizer for future meetings.
- We’ll probably have more in-between meeting communications with our committee.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:57 a.m.