

FDP Membership Standing Committee
Minutes for January 26, 2011
Washington, DC

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:03 a.m.

2. Welcome and Introductions – Maggie Griscavage and Joanna Rom, Committee Co-Chairs

- Maggie's first meeting as acting co-chair of the committee. Erica Kropp stepped down as co-chair due to taking on a new position. She sent her regrets as she was unable to attend the FDP meeting.

Present:

Co-Chair *Maggie Griscavage/University of Alaska Fairbanks, Joanna Rom/National Science Foundation*

Marcie Avery/Texas A&M University, Gila Budesco/Rockefeller University, Charisse Carney-Nunes/National Science Foundation, Sarah Cusimano/University of Southern California, Andrea Deaton/University of Oklahoma, Stephanie Endy/Lehman College, CUNY, Beth Israel/Arizona State University, Katherine Kissmann/Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Toni Lawson/University of Maryland, College Park, Carole Liedtke/Case Western Reserve University, Deborah Marsh/University of Oklahoma, Sue Ross/Northwestern University, Anne Sherman/University of Houston, Susan Sloan/National Academies/GUIRR

3. Volunteers

Maggie thanked Beth Israel for stepping up to lead the first time attendee orientation in Erica Kropp's absence. She also thanked the volunteers who assisted at the registration desk and who acted as mentors.

4. Mentor Program

- There were 40-45 first time attendees at the meeting. About 20 attended the new attendee orientation breakfast.
- There were more mentor volunteers than there were first time attendees that requested mentors.
- Some institutions are self-mentoring.
- There were not quite enough IT mentees, so there was some multiple mentee duty.
- At future meetings, Maggie will follow up with first time attendees who indicated that they did not need mentors to ensure that they did not want to take advantage of the offering.
- Joanna mentioned that there was a place on the registration form to check off if you wanted to volunteer to be a mentor or if you needed mentoring. She feels that the form could be improved because there are people who do not register themselves and there were experienced attendees

whose registration form indicated that they wanted a mentor. This could be clarified on future registration forms so as not to be any misunderstandings by the person completing the form.

- Sue Ross indicated that she never got in touch with her mentee- she sent an email prior to the meeting with no response and the mentee checked in late to the meeting. Maggie indicated that she would give more lead time in the future. She also indicated that she would gather cell phone numbers and/or email addresses from the mentor volunteers so that she could contact them at the meeting and provide her contact information as well in case someone was not able to fulfill their duties and needed to notify her at the meeting.
- The new attendee area was not easy to find – a suggestion was made to move the area to a more prominent location in the future to get the new attendees more involved in the mainstream in the future.
- Feedback was given that the first time attendee identifiers on the badges was working to help identify those that may need assistance.

5. Election Cycle

- At the executive committee meeting, Susie and David indicated that they would follow the same election cycle as the previous election.
- Call for nominees will go out in May and stay open for about 6 weeks.
- Voting will start in late June and will close about 4 weeks later.
- The announcement should be ready in late July.
- The announcement will be made and the formal introduction will be made at the September meeting.

6. Communications - Membership Webpage

- Maggie reviewed the website over the holiday break and checked all the links, pdfs, lists, etc. to determine what was working and what was not. She forwarded her findings to Jane Zuber, Andrea Deaton and David Wright for further handling.
- The member profiles are a bit out of date and the general directory and the committee member lists need to be reviewed and updated.
- The Communications Committee is working with each of the standing committees to update their content on the website.
- Joanna and Maggie will send out an email to the membership committee sign in list from the last few meetings to affirm if the attendees on the roster want to continue to serve on the membership committee.

7. Potential New Federal Members

- One of the barriers of federal membership that had been previously been identified was the need for a list of benefits of membership provided by the FDP for federal agencies. The list has been compiled and has been included within the new FDP portfolio that the Communications Committee put together. Andrea will ensure that it is included on the website as well.
- NIST and NOAA have been identified as potential participants, although previous discussions with those agencies have not been successful.
- Discussions with the Department of Education have continued. They had indicated that they wanted to join but have yet to work out financial arrangements with the FDP Executive Director,

David Wright. While in the past they attended several meetings for free, they are now required to be paid registrants, similar to other non-members.

- Susan Sloan indicated that Homeland Security had been a member in the past but does not have a current MOU in place. They are interested in re-joining FDP and GUIRR and Susan is working to put together a joint membership for them to participate in both.

8. Emerging Research Institutions

- Charisse Carney-Nunes discussed the ERI luncheon held on 1/25/11
- There were 13 attendees at the luncheon including Joanna and Charisse; one attendee was from a non-ERI institution.
- At the last meeting the ERIs were polled regarding 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.
- At this luncheon, the prior meeting results were reviewed and the discussion focused on determining the next steps to be taken. Discussions included:
 - Leveraging FDP participants that may have been at ERIs in the past but are now at larger institutions that are not ERIs. The group was concerned about developing a silo because the issues that impact ERIs are the same as those that impact non-ERIs.
 - Discussion about how the FDP can encourage the federal agencies to support researchers that also teach because of tremendous teaching responsibility at the ERI and how they can compete for research funding against faculty that do not teach or have smaller teaching loads. The discussion included the possibility of having agencies reserve a portion of their budget for faculty or clinicians and a determination was made that the FDP cannot lobby for specific programs but that the FDP could provide an opportunity for volunteers to dig deeper into exploring the ideas of doing surveys on teaching burdens, etc. and presenting it back to FDP and the agencies.
 - For the next meeting it was suggested to put together a panel to show value of ERIs to non-ERI institutions. ERIs can serve a very specific role in strengthening the prime non-ERI's application – perhaps the collaborating ERI can offer more applied research, may have a success rate higher than average success rates or may have more expertise than a prime may have in a given area and would be a good partner for collaborations.
 - For the next meeting ERIs are looking for support in explaining the value of FDP to their faculty. Perhaps a faculty panel that could focus on faculty issues beyond that of faculty burden. It may provide a hook for the faculty at the ERI to attend the FDP meetings.
 - Charisse has looked at the annual report for ideas for potential pilots and ideas for demonstrations.

9. Annual Report

- Joanna indicated that there was a great deal of trouble/frustration with the technical aspects of the annual report (data was not filled in, the submit button was not hit, cookies were not turned on, etc) as well as an extensive effort needed to get members to submit their reports. Many were late.
- Improvements in the instructions are needed.
- Timing was a real problem – the executive committee has expressed an interest in data mining of the annual report for information on membership compliance issues such as payment of dues, attendance, committee attendance and compliance with reports. Susie Sedwick has tasked the Membership Committee with looking into crossover data from the annual reports and historical

data to determine who has not paid dues in the last couple of years, who has not filed the annual reports, who did not file the ARRA special survey and who has not been attending the meetings.

- Maggie indicated that the membership standards and the MOU need to be revised prior to the new Phase of FDP to ensure that members are contributing to the partnership.
- Volunteers were requested for the data mining – Andrea Deaton, Stephanie Endy and Katherine Kissmann volunteered.
- The annual report responses seemed to indicate that more people saw themselves as members of committees than FDP committee records indicated. The next round of annual report requirements will require specific names, not just check boxes, on the committee membership/participation question.

10. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

**FDP Membership Standing Committee
Minutes for May 6, 2011
Washington, DC**

1. Welcome by co-chairs – Maggie Griscavage and Joanna Rom
 - a. The meeting was called to order at 8:03 a.m.
 - b. Committee members were introduced
 - c. A sign-in sheet was passed around
 - d. Minutes from the January 26, 2011 meeting were approved

Present:

Co-Chairs *Maggie Griscavage*/University of Alaska, Fairbanks and Joanna Rom/National Science Foundation

Gila Budescu/Rockefeller University, Charisse Carney-Nunes/National Science Foundation, Andrea Deaton/University of Oklahoma, Vonda Durrer/University of Virginia, Becky Hayes/Kent State University, Kelly Hochstetler/University of Virginia, Beth Israel/Arizona State University, Katherine Kissmann/Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Deborah Marsh/University of Oklahoma, Robyn Remotigue/Mississippi State University, Anne Sherman/University of Houston, Jane Zuber/Texas A&M Research Foundation

2. Registration
 - a. Maggie thanked the registration desk volunteers for their assistance. The general feeling was that the membership committee worked well with the FDP staff to provide good coverage in this area.
 - b. Claudette mentioned that it might be helpful to have a third person at the registration desk for the Thursday morning registration since more people seem to register then. We also need a second printer at the registration desk in order to facilitate the registration process.
 - c. Becky mentioned that a significant number of people came to the registration desk at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday and wanted to go ahead and register though the registration was supposed to be closed at that point. The committee discussed this issue and recommended that the registration desk remain open a little later the next time and we'll see if that helps with this issue.

3. Mentoring

- a. Gratitude was expressed to Anne Sherman for helping with this effort. We had 26 volunteers to be mentors. Two people registered late and were assigned mentors at the registration desk.
- b. Joanna suggested putting something in the registration e-mail that if you register after a certain date a mentor may not be available. She said that Maggie and Anne did a great job of matching people up for mentoring.
- c. Joanna said that Carole Liedtke is no longer the faculty representative from Case Western and she was very instrumental in the past in facilitating faculty mentoring. Larry Sutter has been appointed liaison to the Membership Committee on behalf of faculty. The committee wishes to encourage long-time involved attendees to continue their involvement, and to have back-up attendees so there is some continuity in service.

4. Election

- a. Our election cycle is beginning. A nomination e-mail was sent out last Friday and depending upon responses a reminder may be sent before the final nomination date. The process is straightforward so it doesn't seem that the committee needs to take action at this point.
- b. One technical representative asked prior to the membership committee meeting that technical representatives be included in any discussion of who can be a chair or co-chair of FDP. Joanna said that unless we are going to have a third or fourth co-chair then we will likely continue to focus on the administrative and faculty co-chairs and that all voting should represent the full delegation, not just those specific areas.. Sue Ross said there was a fair amount of discussion in the ERA group about having a technical representative as the FDP chair. Joanna said the ERA chair is on the executive committee. The bylaws currently preclude having a technical representative as chair, though this possibility may be addressed during a Phase VI. If there are any technical representatives nominated we will have to follow up on this issue.
- c. Charisse reported on the ERI group session and said the meeting room was full yesterday in the third in a series of ERI luncheons. The group spent the first two sessions doing background information and surveys but at this meeting they decided to focus on ERI partnerships and collaborations with non-ERI organizations. They integrated the workshop report discussed by Susan Sloan into this discussion. The value of ERIs and where they fit into the US research enterprise was discussed. There is a new study in development by NAS (due in the fall) on the US research enterprise that is not expected to explicitly include ERIs at all. Outcomes included creating a database (or leveraging an existing project) to help researchers find each other. The committee talked about creating a database that would focus on successful models of partnership. The group is interested in having a longer follow-up conversation at an upcoming FDP meeting. There are some such databases in Texas but it's an issue of their being focused on Texas. Joanna said there is a lot of information on NSF

websites regarding researchers' work but PIs are reluctant to contact each other. One participant had noted that contact was made through the FDP administrative contact to facilitate collaborations between PIs at two universities, this may be a model for future connections and collaborations.. Charisse said they'll wait a couple of weeks then distribute the workshop book and e-mail it around to see if people are serious about considering follow-up. An ERI-based webpage on the FDP site was discussed. Andrea suggested putting a link to the workshop website on the FDP site.

5. Annual Report – next steps and improvements

- a. Joanna said they're rethinking the process of compiling members' annual reports. It was difficult to track down people at the institutions who would complete the report and much information was submitted late. Analysis of the information needs to be further developed by working with the executive committee and other committees to develop questions. Maggie said there won't be a question on the annual report that doesn't have a data mining plan behind it. Maggie said that, for example, one question on the annual report was used to identify what commercial S2S systems are being used and that data isn't currently being used. The executive committee agreed to revise questions to support this activity. There may be fewer questions but each would have an owner with follow up action planned. Maggie said we have four committee volunteers who will help with this going forward. Joanna said it is important to be able to identify members' committee work and activities. Joanna said a conference call will be set up to follow up on this issue.

6. Other business

None

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 a.m.

FDP Membership Standing Committee
Minutes for September 15, 2011
Washington, DC

1. Welcome by co-chairs – Maggie Griscavage and Joanna Rom
 - a. The meeting was called to order at 3:57 p.m.
 - b. Committee members were introduced
 - c. A sign-in sheet was passed around
 - d. Minutes from the May 6, 2011 meeting were approved

Present:

Co-Chairs Maggie Griscavage/University of Alaska, Fairbanks and Joanna Rom/National Science Foundation

Monique Anderson/ University of Maryland, College Park, Marcie Avery/Texas A&M University, Gila Budescu/Rockefeller University, Barbara Clayton/Florida A&M University, Sarah Cusimano/University of Southern California, Andrea Deaton/Oklahoma University, Tammy Good/Indiana University, Becky Hayes/Kent State University, Beth Israel/Arizona State University, Katherine Kissmann/Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Helena Moynahan/University of Maryland, College Park, Debra Murray/Georgetown University, Robyn Remotigue/Mississippi State University, Susan Ross/Northwestern University, Anne Sherman/University of Houston, Jane Zuber/Texas A&M Research Foundation

2. Election of Candidates

Chairs reported that the committee was not required to participate extensively in the FDP Chairs' election considering that there were two candidates.

If there will be a Phase VI then we will probably need more succession planning and discussions among the committees.

Maggie asked the committee to consider how to encourage members to become involved in FDP activities to the extent that they are willing to stand for election in the next phase. There are many willing participants but few have considered themselves candidates. The committee will need to think about that over the next three years. Joanna said that we could think about it like a mentoring opportunity, to get a sense of who might have those leadership qualities and be willing to get involved.

Beth asked if it is the committee's responsibility to plan Phase VI. Joanna explained that a next-phase committee was developed during Phase V and that will likely happen again. The membership

participant competition was run through the Membership Committee. Beth said we need to start considering what Phase VI will look like and Joanna said that the Chairs are aware of that need and are considering.

Phase V ends August 2014. Joanna said that in theory FDP could expand Phase V but there is some push from institutions wanting to become members so it is likelier that Phase VI will take place.

3. Annual Report

Maggie sent out e-mails about a month ago to co-chairs of committees and leaders of groups asking them to create a question for the annual report that was meaningful to them.

Responses to annual report questions need to be useful as data so that the data can be easily collected and analyzed. The Membership Committee chairs asked subcommittees to “own” a question so that the subcommittees could review and analyze responses to those questions.

Committees and subcommittees will respond within the next couple of weeks. The questions will be developed into the annual report

The committee agreed that we will refine data collection on individual participation instead of just having checkboxes to self-identify. Our committee will probably develop those questions.

Committee members will be encouraged to participate in this process and volunteer to help with the annual report process.

Maggie reported that we had more mentors than mentees this meeting. Only one person was not able to meet up with her mentor. The first time attendee meeting slide presentation was shortened (a full presentation is available on the website). Maggie displayed and spoke from 10-12 slides then left a lot of time for good interaction with attendees and the model was very successful. Maggie asked that we adopt this model in the future and the committee concurred.

One attendee asked a question about the next phase: “How many institutions were included in Phase V from Phase IV?” Joanna said that out of about 130 applications 120 were accepted. The committee looked at previous participation but relied more heavily on members’ annual reports and considered members’ individual & institutional involvement. The role of serving as a mentor will be added as an individual’s participation during the next competition. Joanna explained the merit review process for membership in Phase V. Two people reviewed each application then the committee considered the outcome. Applications that had mixed reviews received a third review. The same process was used for Phase IV. Participation in Phase IV allowed for all applicants due to the number of applications, but Phase V applications were more numerous and some limitations were imposed.

A Question was raised about how federal agencies become involved in FDP. Joanna said the agencies go through OSTP and try to engage members in working through their channels. OSTP has been very supportive. Through the Research Business Models and other groups there is a core group that works on encouraging participation. Involved agencies have been pretty steady. Joanna explained that agencies’ participation is often dependent upon their appointed attendees, so some are more involved than others. The Research Business Models activity should assist in federal agency participation.

The annual report will be due around the first or second week of December. The mechanics of the submission should be a little easier this year. The ARRA survey was around the same time last year, which may have hurt participation. We want the report finalized before the faculty workload survey is implemented.

It was suggested that the committee should send an e-mail communication to all current FDP members in case the administrative contact has changed or does not follow-up on the annual report.

Joanna encouraged the committee to think about any questions we might want to ask on the annual report. The mentoring issue is a good example.

4. Other Business

None

5. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.