

**FDP Membership Standing Committee
Minutes for Tuesday, May 15, 2012
Washington, DC**

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:02 a.m. A sign –in sheet was circulated.

2. Welcome and Introductions – Maggie Griscavage, Institutional Co-Chair
Joanna Rom, Federal Agency Co-Chair, was not able to attend the meeting.

Present:

Co-Chair *Maggie Griscavage*/University of Alaska Fairbanks

Susanne Alstadt/University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, *Charisse Carney-Nunes*/National Science Foundation, *Andrea Deaton*/University of Oklahoma, *Joe Eichberg*/University of Houston, *Becky Hayes*/Kent State University, *Katherine Kissmann*/Texas A&M University (scrivener), *Brenda Lacy-Roberts*/Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, *Robin Remotigue*/Mississippi State University, *Anne Sherman*/University of Houston, *Susan Sloan*/National Academies/GUIRR, *Larry Sutter*/Michigan Tech University

3. Approval of Minutes from January 2012 Meeting

Maggie thanked Katherine Kissmann for acting as a scrivener at the January meeting and indicated that a draft of the minutes were available on the FDP website for review. Maggie asked that the committee members review the minutes and send Maggie an email indicating approval or requests for changes.

4. Mentor Program

Maggie thanked Anne Sherman, Becky Hayes and Robyn Remotigue for coordinating the mentors for the meeting.

5. Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

6. New Business

a. Annual Report

- Maggie recognized Gila Budescu of Rockefeller University for summarizing the results of the annual report.
- The report results were passed around for review.

- 10 suggestions were made for demonstration possibilities with more than one request each, as follows :
 - export controls (5 requests)
 - FCOI (3 requests)
 - Streamlining and standardization of federal invoicing and financial reporting across agencies (2 requests)
 - F&A recovery models and administrative costs (2 requests)
- Other demonstration possibilities were mentioned with one suggestion each, as follows:
 - Just-in-time compliance
 - ERI reporting
 - Submission consolidation for proposals
 - Foreign subrecipient monitoring
 - RCR
- The requests were passed on to the appropriate committees for their review and consideration.
- Additional feedback from the annual report included:
 - Suggestion to enlist additional federal agencies to participate in FDP
 - The payroll certification demo is being closely followed
 - Subrecipient monitoring and effort certification are important discussions for FDP
 - Suggestion to use Quali Foundation Open Source Software as a solution to create FDP subawards and open it for all institutions
 - The larger the institution, the more they are using FDP resources
 - Subaward forms, A-133 data and troublesome clauses database are the most used FDP resources.
- Maggie indicated that the Executive Committee feels that overall the revisions to the standard annual report (shortening it and making it more simple) were a success. Data collection can be further clarified in future reports by asking institutions to specifically identify the official reps for the institution by name and role as well as identify the specific individuals serving on committees for the institution.

b. Faculty Survey

Larry Sutter of Michigan Tech University addressed the membership committee on behalf of the faculty committee. The faculty committee has been in discussion regarding how to improve faculty engagement in the FDP. The committee is having difficulties identifying the institutional faculty reps, whether or not they were attending the meetings and if they were attending, why they may not be engaging in the committee.

Larry reported that 58 faculty reps have attended at least one of the last three FDP meetings, however 55 faculty reps have not attended at least one of those meetings. Larry contacted those that have not attended to inquire about their lack of attendance. Of the 55, he received feedback from 16 faculty reps as follows:

- The timing of the fall meeting does not coincide well with the start of the academic year
- Some did not realize that they were their institution's faculty rep
- Some have left the institution for which they were the faculty rep and have not been replaced
- Not sufficient funds to travel to attend the meeting.

The takeaways from the inquiry of the faculty reps:

- There appears to be a communication breakdown within the institution and/or between the institution and the FDP with regard to identification of the faculty reps
- Faculty reps need to be more fully engaged and have a better understanding of their role.

Suggestions for improvement, with committee consensus:

- Establish a formula for determining which faculty would best serve as a faculty rep
- Faculty committee could provide a welcome letter to the faculty rep that would:
 - explain the role of the FDP
 - explain the role of each institution rep
 - suggest ideas for participation in FDP
 - encourage attendance at the meetings
- Send out a blast to confirm the current reps for each institution
- Recommend that administrative reps be allowed update access to the FDP site in order to maintain and update the list of institutional reps
- Add a list of faculty rep alternates for each institution and post to website
- Follow up with faculty reps that do not attend meetings to inquire the reason for not attending
- FDP Faculty Co-Chair send email to all faculty reps prior to meeting to encourage them to attend and indicate items that will be discussed on the agenda.

7. Adjourn

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