



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

January 11 - 12, 2016

Subawards Subcommittee

Point of Contact

Jennifer Barron

Activities/Progress to Date

- *Updating templates-mostly fixing typos, clarity issues
- *Ramping up Attachment 2 development-need more volunteers
- *Guidance documents continuing to be released-more FAQs
- *Clinical Trials template finished, needs approval
- *Risk Assessment Questionnaire continues to be tweaked for improvement, data collection.

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

- *Finalization of Compliance Attachment
- *Final approval of clinical trials template

Participation

Lots of people attended! Asked for more volunteers for working groups.

Key Risks/Issues

Meeting Summary



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

January 11 - 12, 2016

eRA DATA Act Working Session

Point of Contact

Mark Sweet/Rick Fenger

Activities/Progress to Date

Open Government and eRA have been following the various DATA Act activities. FDP has participated in several discussions with OMB/Treasury and the HHS DATA Act Section 5 Pilot PMO to ensure that FDP has a voice in the implementation of the DATA Act.

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

Any DATA Act Pilot activities that need FDP participation will be communicated via the FDP DATA Act email list. Please subscribe to follow or participate.

Participation

Key Risks/Issues

FDP will continue to work with OMB/Treasury and the HHS PMO to ensure that we have accurate and up to date information regarding the DATA Act.

Meeting Summary



FDP Expanded Clearinghouse

Point of Contact	Lynette Arias, University of Washington
Activities/Progress to Date	<p>Activity to date for this workgroup includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Collected, inventoried and analyzed over 100 FDP institution Subrecipient Forms and contents•Developed matrix of institutions and who has what type of form, timing of collection, etc.•Developed matrix of standard form content•Developed "Entity Profile Form" utilizing standard content/questions•Updated working group webpage – consolidating A133 and FCOI clearinghouse information into updated page•Drafted Proposed Pilot and submitted to Executive Committee (approval for pilot received 1/10/16)•Drafted v.1 of a possible Transaction Specific Form•Coordinated involvement with RA working group and eRA Committee
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	The next decisions that are pending are confirmation from the institutions that had previously volunteered to help with these efforts, that they agree to terms of participation.
Participation	Working group members as well as over a 100 participants were in attendance. There was active discussion about the pilot and next steps. Continued support was given for the Expanded Clearinghouse.
Key Risks/Issues	Risks moving forward include previously volunteered institutions now not agreeing to participate. In addition the pilot responsibilities could prove too cumbersome or otherwise not doable or cost/resource prohibitive or the pilot could demonstrate that there is not a substantial reduction in administrative burden. These outcomes are not expected but are possible.
Meeting Summary	



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

January 11 - 12, 2016

ERA Working Group - Streamlining Proposal Submit

Point of Contact

Debbi Nixon, Ron Splittgerber

Activities/Progress to Date

Rotating working group discussions on Tuesday January 12

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

Participation

Rotation of 2 groups - about 40 participants

Key Risks/Issues

Action items:

>Listserv for reporting problematic agency issues

>Bring back the agency matrix showing agency on one axis, common issues on other

Meeting Summary



ERI Faculty Working Gro

Point of Contact	Jeffrey Underwood
Activities/Progress to Date	Initial meeting at May 2015 FDP and subsequent meeting at September 2015 FDP. Fact finding and growing group membership were primary activities. Progress includes growth in group membership and a diversity in group membership.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	<p>Survey of Institutional Complementarity was not conducted so this is of utmost importance going forward</p> <p>Requesting ERI faculty representation on a broader set of FDP committees</p> <p>Scheduling federal agency workshop geared to needs of ERI's and ERI faculty</p> <p>Requesting an ERI subset of the FDP Faculty Workload Survey</p> <p>ERI based demonstration projects</p>
Participation	Jeffrey Underwood, Georgia Southern University Jo Wilson, Wright State University Femi Adecoyin, Lincoln University Jamie French, NSF
Key Risks/Issues	<p>Group still have very few continuously active members--recruiting members is necessary for the viability of this committee</p> <p>Difficulty for ERI representatives to disseminate information from FDP meetings to faculty at institutions--most ERI RA offices have limited means for this task. If this task is not done expertly then the group's usefulness is in question.</p>
Meeting Summary	



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

January 11 - 12, 2016

ERA and Open Gov - DATA Act Update

Point of Contact	Richard Fenger and/or Mark Sweet
Activities/Progress to Date	
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	none
Participation	open forum
Key Risks/Issues	This group JDAWG (Joint DATA Act Working Group) a combination of FDP's Open Government and eRA will continue to partner and monitor DATA Act pilot activities and beyond.
Meeting Summary	



Membership Standing Committee

Point of Contact

Co-Chairs: J. Zuber/L. Sutter/C. Carney-Nunes

Activities/Progress to Date

Registration desk support – provide assistance to FDP staff at each meeting

Institutional mentoring – match new attendee institutions with mentors

Phase VII Transition Working Group - charged with assisting the Executive Committee (EC) with plans for Phase VII

- A 17 person volunteer committee was formed in October 2015 and held their first conference call. They decided to break up into smaller task-oriented subcommittees. The subcommittees will begin conference calls after the January FDP meeting.

- o Dates Subcommittee: Leader: Larry Sutter. Tasked with making recommendations including the timing and frequency of FDP meetings for Phase VII.
- o Format Subcommittee: Leader: Charisse Carney-Nunes. Tasked with making recommendations for possible meeting format changes including consideration of virtual meeting/sessions.
- o Growth/Space Subcommittee: Leaders: Jane Zuber and Larry Sutter. Tasked with making recommendations regarding Phase VII meeting space and location and the future growth of the FDP membership
- Annual Report Analysis and Data Mining. Working Group of 4 members led by Becky Hayes of Kent State University. The working group will synthesize answers to the report as well as ad hoc responses to provide information on member/institutional participation and suggestions/comments to the Executive Committee for review and further action by committee chairs.

ERI Committee chairs are working with David Wright to clean up their existing listserv and to identify their membership population to engage them in more committee involvement and pilots. The committee had their first FDP meeting session at this January meeting and will be engaging in future conversations via listserv and conference calls following the meeting to continue defining their direction. FDP chair is looking into putting language into the FDP administrative policy to ensure that the EC includes ERI representation.

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

Determine if times for first day of registration desk should be moved back since there did



not appear to be much activity at the desk in the first hour. The desk opened 2 ½ hours prior to the start of the reception. Claudette Baylor-Fleming suggested that we open 1 ½ hours prior to the reception. Co-chairs to discuss with EC with a recommendation to possibly poll the membership.

Determine if the new member orientation format should be modified to reduce the presentation content and allow more time for Q&A. Larry Sutter to ask David Wright for a list of the new members at the January meeting and then survey them regarding their experience.

Recommendation to the Executive Committee to share annual report results with the membership either through listserv, future plenary session or future meeting session.

Participation

In attendance for this meeting:

Susan Anderson/ College of Charleston; Charisse Carney-Nunes/ National Science Foundation; Andrea Deaton/ University of Oklahoma; Becky Hayes/Kent State University; Jeanne Hermann/ University of Tennessee Health Science Center; Katherine Kissmann/Texas A&M University; Debra Murphy/ Arizona State University; Mary Ann Ottinger/University of Houston; Sandy Schneider/University of South Florida; Larry Sutter/Michigan Tech University; Jane Zuber /Texas A&M University

Key Risks/Issues

Registration Desk Support: Registration desk volunteers for this meeting were coordinated by Katherine Kissmann. Volunteers included Becky Hayes, Andrea Deaton and Vicki Marvin. First hour of registration was slow and the volunteers and Claudette Baylor-Fleming suggested that we may want to postpone the start time for the registration desk at future meetings. Recommendation was made that this information be provided to the Executive Committee for additional discussion and perhaps poll the membership for their input.

New Member Orientation: Larry Sutter reported that he had 43 people in attendance for first time attendees' orientation. It was suggested that the presentation be decreased in length and provided to the first time attendees prior to the meeting allowing for a larger Q&A portion for the orientation session. Larry will be modifying the content for future presentations to decrease the content to 5-6 slides. It was recommended to survey the attendees from this meeting's orientation to enlist feedback for consideration.

Annual report: Members were slow to submit their annual reports. Quite a few members did not complete their report by the deadline. David Wright and Cindy Hope have followed up with those members and have reminded them of their obligation to complete the report as part of their membership. A working group was established to analyze and determine the results of the report to provide specific data to the Executive Committee, most specifically with regard to individual and institutional participation. Becky Hayes will be leading this charge. Many ad hoc responses were received and will be reviewed, synthesized and provided to the Executive Committee to determine if follow-up is needed. There was discussion that faculty representatives had expressed concern that



they did not have an opportunity for input on their institution's report. The committee discussed modifying the format to allow a routing and approval process. Alternatively, the committee discussed communicating the responsibility to the Administrative representative who is charged with completing the report to ensure that all institutional representatives had an opportunity to review and provide input to the report prior to submission.

There was also discussion of dissemination of the report results. Recommended that the co-chairs address the reporting of the results with the Executive Committee to determine the method of distribution of the results either through the main FDP listserv or as a part of the plenary session at the May meeting or during one of the session slots at that meeting.

Mentoring: The annual report feedback on mentoring had an overwhelming response that mentoring should be offered. A discussion took place regarding the reasons that individual mentoring was discontinued and replaced with institutional mentoring during Phase VI. This will be looked into further as the annual report results are provided to the Executive Committee for consideration for future meetings.

Phase VII Transition Subcommittees: The co-chairs reported that the Phase VII transition is the largest new project that has been assigned to the Membership Committee. Three subcommittees have been formed (Dates, Format, Growth/Space) and will begin conference calls following this meeting.



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

January 11 - 12, 2016

eRA Priorities Working Group - SAM Discussion

Point of Contact	Courtney Swaney, Carolyn Pappas
Activities/Progress to Date	Enhancing/expanding the capabilities of SAM is a priority among the eRA Steering Committee. There has been very little progress up until the January meeting due to being in the exploratory phase.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	
Participation	Participants were divided among three eRA working priorities, with one rotation. Of the two groups we visited with, there was high participation and lots of feedback about experiences in updating and accessing SAM.
Key Risks/Issues	Feedback among the participants to be analyzed into areas of change in existing functionality and future enhancements. Having this feedback is necessary when beginning to approach GSA/SAM.
Meeting Summary	



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

January 11 - 12, 2016

2012 FDP Faculty Workload Study/National Dialogue

Point of Contact	Jim Luther, Sara Bible and Sandra Schneider
Activities/Progress to Date	For the past two years, the working group has held panels with Federal and University representatives to present and discuss two important topics. Work on these topics has been ongoing between meetings through discussions with Federal representatives.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	Most effective way to maintain focus on the burden identified in the 2012 FDP Faculty Workload Study and the National Dialogue.
Participation	University representatives and session participants.
Key Risks/Issues	<p>Key risk: increasing burden due to issues identified in the subject reports are continuing to adversely impact the research mission, potentially in a manner that is not proportional to the risk.</p> <p>There is full acknowledgement in the value of the compliance rules and regulations (e.g. animals, COI, human subjects), but, like in the Tragedy of the Commons, the incremental and well-intentioned, but not adequately coordinated process of developing and implementing regulations is having a potential destructive impact on institution's ability to effectively and efficiently support the nation's research interests.</p>
Meeting Summary	



Joint Application Design Working Group, Jan 13

Point of Contact	Debbi Nixon, Duke University
Activities/Progress to Date	The Joint Application Design (JAD) group is made up of representatives from the FDP who are both Adobe forms and S2S applicants, and staff from the Grants.gov PMO. The group has made progress working together to minimize (or provide sufficient advance notice) impact related to form changes, certificate changes, and other changes to grants.gov.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• DATA Act working group to update JAD working group on concurrent meeting held on January 13 on DATA Act pilots/testing.• Two rounds of Grants.gov UAT testing for enhanced workspace functionality from Jan 27 – Feb 11• FG to add additional opportunity fields to the Funding Opportunity XML extract in May release• PAD requested a configurable parameter be added to control permissions on workspace budget forms• Additional discussion needed on workspace participants from another DUNS (for subawardees on application)• Survey monkey link will be distributed in mid-May to collect information on UTF-8
Participation	21 participants from FDP member institutions, Federal agencies, and eRA vendors.
Key Risks/Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional discussion needed on implications of workspace participants from another DUNS.
Meeting Summary	



Compliance - Laboratory Safety

Point of Contact

Robert Nobles, Alice Young

Activities/Progress to Date

WORKING DRAFT

The Role of FDP in Exploring Academic Safety Cultures

The Safety Working group of FDP explored the national discussion related to laboratory safety cultures on academic campuses; and began brainstorming potential roles that FDP can serve to identify areas of over regulation, institutional challenges, and burden to faculty. The Safety Working Group was aware of the recent work of APLU, including their intentions to develop a comprehensive set of recommendations that focuses on enhancing safety cultures by insuring commitment from academic leadership, collegial relationships between faculty and EH&S staff, and identifying tools that can be used to enhance university infrastructures.

To be responsive to the national movement, and to stay grounded with the focus of FDP, the Safety Working Group developed a set of recommendations to address challenges related to administrative efficiencies and faculty burden reduction. The recommendations are as follows:

- 1) Create a mechanism for FDP members to share specific issues/challenges within their institution and with other FDP members to facilitate the exchange of information amongst members. This could be accomplished through a list-serv specific to safety challenges and a repository of resources that have been found to be successful at affiliated institutions (linked to existing challenges). (September 2015)
- 2) Include additional safety assessment questions in the next rendition of the FDP faculty workload survey scheduled to be published in 2016. The working group was made aware of feedback received during the first faculty work load survey and would like to further explore the institutional impact of safety policies on faculty burden and on the safety cultures of academic scholarship, research and teaching. (September 2015)
- 3) Develop a longer-term strategy to gather institutional information to explore how institutions resolve safety challenges; identify best practices (model programs and ideas); implement demonstrations of best/improved practices with 3-5 institutions; gather and analyze preliminary findings; and then expand the demonstration to additional institutions. (September 2015)
- 4) Develop a faculty best practice guide/manual for enhancing safety within their respective space (e.g. laboratory, studio, space, etc.). (September 2015)



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

January 11 - 12, 2016

5) Circulate the APLU letter and associated toolbox to FDP membership, including the associated President/Chancellor. With the circulation of the letter, ask FDP affiliated institutions to develop a 2016 action plan that would be reportable back to FDP for review and knowledge sharing (January 2016)

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

Participation

Key Risks/Issues

Meeting Summary



Current Issues and Opportunities: Administrative C

Point of Contact	Sara Bible, Stanford University and Jim Luther, Duke U
Activities/Progress to Date	<p>For the past two years, the working group has held panels with Federal and University representatives to present and discuss two important topics. Work on these topics has been ongoing between meetings through discussions with Federal representatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the Uniform Guidance, including suggestions for simplification, change in the regulations, and development and incorporation of Frequently Asked Questions through technical corrections to the UG. • The NIH's change from pooled accounts to SubAccounts for Letter of Credit (LOC) draws. Partnership between NIH and FDP member institutions has facilitated improved processes.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	<p>Uniform Guidance: The following issues have been presented to OMB and the grantee community is waiting for response: Increase in the Procurement Micro-purchase threshold or other changes in the Procurement guidance and the increase in the Relative Energy Use Index within the Utilities Cost Adjustment.</p> <p>NIH timely closeout (within 120 days) and the timing conflicts caused by use of the PMS Quarterly Federal Cash Transaction Report (FCTR) and the Final Federal Financial Report (FFR).</p> <p>Should you revise a FCTR to agree with an FFR or wait for the next quarterly FCTR to file the FFR (potentially exceeding the 120 days).</p>
Participation	University representatives and session participants.
Key Risks/Issues	<p>Uniform Guidance: Institutions should do the following: review and document their internal controls using the COSO framework; communicate with their Cognizant Agency about their DS-2 updates and submission, consider changes to their travel policies.</p> <p>NIH Subaccounts: Late submission of a RPPR will delay issuing the sub account Notice of Award, impact the timing of the TFFR.</p> <p>Project Closeout: Continued lack of clarity around agencies and whether their reports are due at 90 or 120 days.</p>
Meeting Summary	



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

January 11 - 12, 2016

Communications Committee

Point of Contact	Amanda Lindsay, Melanie Krizmanich
Activities/Progress to Date	<p>Communications is one of the committees collaborating on the new Outreach working group. While past efforts included data/feedback gathering to help inform the formation of such a group, the first official meeting working session will be at this January meeting. The major goal of this combined effort is to increase the visibility of FDP.</p> <p>The Communications Committee has also continued to serve the FDP to provide feedback and editing expertise on communication efforts.</p>
Agenda/Discussion Points	New outreach group, Increasing opportunities for participation within the Communications Committee.
Pending Decisions	
Participation	Four committee members, including the two Co-Chairs were in attendance at this meeting representing a few universities and NIFA/USDA.
Key Risks/Issues	
Meeting Summary	



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

January 11 - 12, 2016

Outreach Working Group

Point of Contact

Amanda Lindsay and Laura McCabe

Activities/Progress to Date

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

Participation

There were many attendees at this session and names and email addresses of those wishing to be involved in this group were collected to help form an email list.

Key Risks/Issues

The website was the number one outreach platform discussed at this meeting. A re-design is planned and efforts are under way to gather some information on the website requirements and capabilities.

Meeting Summary