



Reporting, Analytics, and Metrics

Point of Contact

Mark Sweet

Activities/Progress to Date

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

Participation

Key Risks/Issues

Meeting Summary

This panel discussion focused on reporting, analytics, and metrics at three FDP member institutions. The University of Washington discussed a data analytics program where departments are notified of high-risk transactions and provided training, information and support on how to reduce these types of transactions. Partners Healthcare discussed the use of metrics/analytic reporting to monitor major business processes and daily grant administration workflow. Northwestern University presented an approach to pre and post award reporting on sponsored activities.

Additional FDP resources for Reporting, Analytics, and Metrics can be found here:
<http://go.wisc.edu/w3u8iy>

This website is designed to be a dynamic resource. If you have ideas you wish to share with other FDP members, please add them to the document.



Subawards Subcommittee

Point of Contact	Jennifer Barron
Activities/Progress to Date	<ul style="list-style-type: none">*Face page, Att 1 and Att 2 changes made, awaiting input from Compliance committee. Formatting and typo fixes made to other attachments and uploaded to website*Foreign subaward template updates almost complete.*Review of OMB clarification on required data elements
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">*Use of name language for face page to be finalized.*Face page, Att 1 and Att 2 changes awaiting input from Compliance Committee.
Participation	Jennifer Barron, Co-chair Amanda Hamaker, Co-chair Amanda Humphrey, Co-chair Alice Reuther, Foreign subaward working group Stephanie Scott, Guidance documents working group
Key Risks/Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">*Looking towards a streamlined Att 2 to eliminate agency specific forms*Gathering together a new working group to update subcontract template
Meeting Summary	See slides for specifics.



eRA – DATA Act Follow-up

Point of Contact	Mark Sweet & Richard FEnger
Activities/Progress to Date	Worked with DATA Act PMO (DAP) to understand further participation and test model execution needs. Hopeful for 60 FDP volunteers over a variety of test models.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	Volunteers, test participation and timing
Participation	General audience mostly carried over from previous general session
Key Risks/Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Continuing to work with PMO to ensure most constructive support for upcoming test and feedback activities.•Grants vs Contracts pilot. The contracts pilot may be considered trailing the grants progress
Meeting Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Reviewed test execution schedule•Detailed Test Model review via Grant Pilot Fact Sheets provided•CDER-L test discussed specifically 112 public facing data elements with over 9000 still being refined within and amongst federal agencies•Discussed data challenges such as the acceptability of investigator indicators across agencies (PI vs Co-PI vs Co-I)•Desire from all parties expressing the need to reduce the ever accumulating # of data elements•Agreement to recruit the most appropriate experts to participate in test model execution•Agreement to use FDP as a forum for educate and shape Federal offices and implementation policies concern practical and appropriate measures•Communication: GitHub and USASpending.gov are linked efforts. Twitter is the way to track the DAP's efforts. Please see meeting slides for all communication channels @HHS_DAP



eRA & Open Government – DATA Act Update

Point of Contact	Mark Sweet and Richard Fenger
Activities/Progress to Date	1) Finished usability survey and submitted feedback on USASpending.gov to Treasury 2) Submitted feedback on standardized notice of award to PMO
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	n/a
Participation	General audience
Key Risks/Issues	Continuing to work with PMO to ensure most constructive support for upcoming test and feedback activities. Additionally, monitoring a variety of communication channels to understand progress as we head toward our Sept meeting. (best day to day information, twitter: @HHS_DAP)
Meeting Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Intros: FDP and DAP• DAP supplied slides for their overview. Generally:<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Chris Zeleznik, PMO Lead, introduced DAP team:o DA handed out folders to support the following conversationo Overview of Demo: 14,000 constituents contacted, looking for 60 volunteers to participate over time (75 attendees so more FDP reach out and marketing necessary?). Sign-up sheets and online survey providedo Reviewed Grant Pilot Fact Sheetso Test Model briefing on completeness and execution including scheduleo Standard NoA workgroup feedback was mentioned and considered very useful to the PMO• Bulk of effort was spent poking at test models and scheduling• Further details and coverage slated for following session “eRA – DATA Act Follow-up”



Expanded Clearinghouse

Point of Contact	Lynette Arias
Activities/Progress to Date	The working group has successfully launched the Pilot in March 2016 with 40 entities and 55 Entity Profiles. Instructions were provided and welcome calls held to ensure all Pilot members fully understand how to complete and maintain their profile and utilize the centralized clearinghouse. A working group website has been created and continues to be maintained with all key documents relevant to the Pilot. Additionally the actual clearinghouse website has been created and is being reviewed, updated and maintained regularly. Both websites and profiles updates are maintained with the great assistance of David Wright!
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	Key decisions pending include official approval to move forward with development and go live of an online system for the clearinghouse, to potentially include the FDP member institution profile, A-133 clearinghouse and FCOI clearinghouse as well. Also pending is a decision to add more entities to the current Pilot and eventually to consider adding non FDP organizations.
Participation	Session was attended by approximately 100 individuals, many of whom are part of the Pilot and many others who are interested in joining the Pilot in the future.
Key Risks/Issues	Risks moving forward include entities not using the clearinghouse profiles as originally planned for, not keeping their profiles current and entities still continuing to use their forms that they are comfortable with. Issues identified include the current highly manual process of maintaining the excel Profiles, the limited resources to increase the size of the pilot and any hurdles that might be encountered when moving to develop an online system.
Meeting Summary	An overview and purpose of the Pilot was discussed for anyone that had not yet heard about the Clearinghouse, including the significance to FDP and success criteria for how we will know that the Pilot has been successful. The goals of the Pilot were discussed in the context of the subaward lifecycle with recommendations for how entities can move to using the clearinghouse and away from using forms and collecting extra unneeded data at proposal time. The steps to prepare for and execute the go live for the Pilot were reviewed, both as a review for the current Pilot Entities and as a means of informing non Pilot Entities of the responsibilities and steps they would have to go through to join. Timelines for the Pilot were reviewed along with the Pilot websites, entities and current status of the Pilot. Information was shared related to an initial survey that the Pilot Entities recently completed, as well as initial tracking information shared from the working group members. Brief discussion took place related to some supporting documents for the Pilot that all are encouraged to review, use and provide feedback on. And finally the next steps in the Pilot were discussed along with how entities can get involved in the future.



Contracts

Point of Contact	Alexandra McKeown and David Mayo
Activities/Progress to Date	Contracts is collaborating with Data Stewardship to develop a template Data Transfer and Use Agreement (DTUA). The subcommittee is also closely watching for the release of the FAR implementation of UG notice. At the time of the meeting it had not yet been released.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	Comments have been requested on the DTUA basic template. All comments should be submitted no later than May 17 to Melissa_Korf@hms.harvard.edu
Participation	There are nearly 30 participants working on this initiative.
Key Risks/Issues	Looking to engage as many universities as possible to ensure broad use of the template. Several federal participants are included in the group and it is the hope that a next step would include adoption of this template for federal data exchanges.
Meeting Summary	<p>Melissa Korf and Jill Frankenfield are the co-chairs of the DTUA working group. Drafts of both the template and the glossary are expected sometime in the summer for input from the full membership.</p> <p>David Mayo discussed the UIDP FAR contract clause document that was just recently printed and which was distributed at the meeting. This was developed several years ago and provides talking points for university contract negotiators when negotiating with corporate sponsors. David was also hoping to go over some of the proposed FAR changes to implement UG, but they have not been released yet. Most likely this will be a topic for September's meeting.</p>



Human subjects working group

Point of Contact	Jane McCutcheon
Activities/Progress to Date	After a review of the NPRM changes, the discussion was started by a review of the current 45CFR46 regulations concerning consent templates. This was followed by example exempt/excused and expedited consent templates with a lively discussion.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	Post more consent forms. Please label with institution (not just initials) and the type of form e.g. biomedical, SBE etc.
Participation	Jonathan Miller has generated a template for analysis and will spear head this part of the project.
Key Risks/Issues	A larger pool of consent templates is needed. Everyone, regardless of whether or not they are a part of the working group are invited to submit.
Meeting Summary	Based on the NPRM, we have been trying to create a toolbox of consent forms to be used to provide examples of "good" consent forms. Too few forms were submitted for the January meeting, so while waiting to have more forms submitted, it was agreed to start with some examples. Suggested language for excused/exempt and expedited forms were provided to generate discussion. A lively discussion ensued. If you can obtain examples of your consent templates, contact David Wright for the drop box link and please label with your institution and type (e.g. biomedical, SBE) and post. Full meeting notes are provided.



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

5/4/2016 - 5/6/2016

Laboratory Safety Panel Discussion

Point of Contact

Robert Nobles (nobles@utk.edu or 865-974-3053)

Activities/Progress to Date

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

Participation

Key Risks/Issues

Meeting Summary



Animal Care and Use Subcommittee Meeting

Point of Contact	
Activities/Progress to Date	The major activity for the current year has been identifying the specifics of the problems related to the use of controlled substances in animal care, that were raised by the membership. .
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	None- action items will determine potential projects.
Participation	The participants were engaged in the discussions and made a number of suggestions for action items.
Key Risks/Issues	<p>Action Items identified at the meeting were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. DEA Controlled substances issue (Agenda Item #1): As this is not a regulatory issue for which a demonstration project could be developed, it was suggested that the subcommittee prepare a “white paper” articulating the problem and present a “straw-man plan”. This document could then be shared with other associations who might be able to work in resolving the issue.2. Comparison of protocols and grant application (Agenda item 5-a): Data should be collected for grant-protocol comparison methods used and provided to the membership.3. Research Administrators (Agenda item 5-b): The committee will explore available resources (e.g. training provided for NIH grant administrators) and develop a guide.
Meeting Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Update of DEA Controlled substances issue: Susan Silk provided an update on the discussion of the subject at recent ACLAM meeting. The key points were:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The variations in the applications of the DEA regulations for the use of the controlled substances are burdensome for researchers and veterinary staff.• ACLAM conducted a survey with over 180 respondents that identified variations in how regulations are applied.• Florida Pharmacy Association CEO presented ACLAM meeting with some options on dealing with the problem through state boards of pharmacy.• One suggestion from an FDP member is to encourage manufacturers to package controlled substances in aliquots below threshold regulation levels, which might be workable for some (small animals), but not all instances. This would not only address regulatory issues but also reduce waste and disposal costs.• The DEA representative at the ACLAM meeting indicated that local offices have discretionary powers on how to interpret the registration requirements.



FDP

**Federal
Demonstration
Partnership**

FDP Meeting Summary

5/4/2016 - 5/6/2016

Following the update it was agreed that problem is not regulatory problem; as some local offices do allow for single registration (e.g. by the attending veterinarian) and the dispensing of the controlled substance to individual researchers; while others do not-requiring a registration by each individual researcher.

2. Subaward Requirements: The Research Administration's subawards group is working on a checklist on the minimum legal requirements for subaward monitoring. OLAW has reviewed the checklist developed by the subawards group and made modifications. The checklist is currently under legal review and will be shared when the legal review is completed.

3. Interagency Collaborative Animal Research Education (ICARE): ICARE is a Project that includes the NIH-OLAW, USDA-APHIS, the NSF, the FDA, and the VA. The goal of the project is to enhance the functioning of the IACUCs by reducing noncompliance and self-imposed regulatory burden and enabling them to focus on animal welfare. One goal of the project will be addressed through the incorporation of active learning techniques into IACUC training curricula. The federal participants in the Project funded an award administered by NSF. PRIM&R is a partner in phase one of the ICARE Project, the ICARE Train-the-Trainers Institutes. Two summer 2016 sessions are planned through PRIM&R's grant with the intent of training approximately 60 trainers. The Feds will conduct an additional Train-the-Trainers Institute in fall 2016, bringing to 90 the total number of IACUC trainers trained in active learning pedagogy. Trainers to serve in the ICARE Academy starting in 2017 will be selected from this group. ICARE Academies will be open to IACUC members and animal program staff from US institutions.

4. Protocol Review: Susan Silk clarified that OLAW does not require an annual review of species not regulated by the USDA and it is up to the institutions to decide if they require such reviews. During the discussions it was indicated that institutions use a number of options such as requiring annual reviews; providing simple form asking if there have been changes, if yes then the researcher submits a modification for review, and if not-no further review is conducted. She also clarified that the institution's Assurance is the standard to which the institution is held. If the Assurance describes procedures that are beyond the requirements of PHS Policy, then the institutional requirements defined in the Assurance must be followed.

5. Other

a. Comparison of protocols and grant application is required to ensure that the research described in the protocol submitted to the IACUC is the same as that described in the grant application (e.g. species, procedures, etc.).

b. Research Administrators: the grant administrators are not often familiar with the requirements relating to animal research and it was requested that the subcommittee should develop a brief guide for the membership.



Conflict of Interest Subcommittee

Point of Contact	Clint Schmidt
Activities/Progress to Date	<p>A summary of the group's work since the September meeting was given. The group originally decided on three projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Best practices for subcontracting to/from faculty owned companies;-Case studies with interactive website forum;-Risk analysis matrix with model management plans; <p>The first group began drafting guidelines for SBIR/STTR subs from faculty owned companies.</p> <p>At the January meeting, it was determined that the three projects naturally flow into one another, with the case studies being a good place to start.</p> <p>During winter working group phone calls, it was decided that, before investing too much time in case studies or developing best practices, it would be good to administer a national survey to collect management strategies from a large, national sample. The survey is now the focus of the group.</p>
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	N/A
Participation	<p>About 40 individuals attended. There were suggestions and questions from many people in the room. Sign up sheets for the listserv were sent around and got 40 people, some of whom were already on the list.</p> <p>One suggestion was to develop, in addition to the best practices and case studies, some slides or other materials that can be used to educate faculty on COI concepts, issues, and requirements.</p>
Key Risks/Issues	<p>Next steps are to work on brainstorming and then refining questions for the survey. Clint Schmidt will add in suggested questions from the group and email to the list for feedback before the next call.</p> <p>Future working group calls will be on the first Tuesday of each month at 4:00 p.m. Eastern time zone. The next call is June 7, 2016.</p>
Meeting Summary	N/A (see above)



MEMBERSHIP STANDING COMMITTEE

Point of Contact	Becky Hayes, Kent State University
Activities/Progress to Date	<p>Registration desk – provide assistance to FDP staff at each meeting</p> <p>Institutional mentoring – match new attendee institutions with mentors, as requested</p> <p>ERI activities – work with ERI to facilitate their efforts and become a separate committee</p> <p>Member attendance and feedback – work with FDP staff to monitor attendance and provide feedback</p> <p>Planning for transition to Phase VII</p>
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	<p>Phase VII planning subcommittee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Survey to membership to gage impact of potential meeting format changes •Location of meetings •Scheduling of meetings
Participation	<p>Becky Hayes, Kent State University</p> <p>Charisse Carney-Nunes, National Science Foundation</p> <p>Larry Sutter, Michigan Tech University</p> <p>Glory Brown - Florida A&M University; Mary Ann Deom – University of Georgia; Katherine Kissmann - Texas A&M University; John Leonard – Georgia Institute of Technology; Debra Murphy - Arizona State University</p>
Key Risks/Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Suggest to EC to combine the new attendee breakfast with the new attendee orientation and allow for one hour for the combined session. •Survey first time attendees to inquire if they attended the orientation and gather feedback on the presentation and what they wish they would have known to better navigate the meeting. •Ask mentors to be available at the new attendees orientation in the event anyone requests a mentor for the remainder of the meeting •Recommend to EC that Membership and Communications committees work together to provide briefing summaries and information on pilot/demonstration status prior to the meetings on the Guidebook App
Meeting Summary	<p>Becky Hayes was introduced as the new Administrative Co-Chair replacing Jane Zuber of Texas A&M that retired in April.</p> <p>Annual Report –</p>



FDP

**Federal
Demonstration
Partnership**

FDP Meeting Summary

5/4/2016 - 5/6/2016

- A subcommittee reviewed the annual report – Becky Hayes to share summary with membership committee.
- Potential demonstrations were identified and will be shared with the Executive Committee.
- 90% of respondents volunteered to serve as mentors in the future, if needed. Suggestion was made to combine the new attendee breakfast and the new member orientation. Suggestion made to survey first time attendees to determine what it would have been helpful to know to navigate the meeting at the meeting's conclusion.
- Impediments to demonstrations were misread as impediments to attending the meetings. These responses will be shared with the EC and will be used by the Phase VII planning subcommittee to factor into decisions for the next phase.

Phase VII Planning

- Larry provided a brief summary and indicated that the subcommittee is continuing conference calls to determine the number of potential institutions and participants, the format of the meeting, the schedule of the meetings and their locations. Definition of participation and its responsibilities continue to need to be defined as a role.

ERI

- No ERI discussion due to time constraints.

Other Business

- Suggestion to have more communication of the membership committee members. Will aim to have at least one conference call for committee members prior to each executive committee meeting.



PROCUREMENT WORKING GROUP

Point of Contact

Doug Backman, University of Central Florida

Activities/Progress to Date

The Working Group has been engaged with reducing the burden of identifying and tracking procurement quotations valued between \$3,500 and each FDP institution's competitive bid threshold. The Working Group has been working with Federal representatives to discuss the impact the regulation will have on FDP member institutions based on the FDP member procurement survey data. The discussions with Federal representatives did not generate opportunities for a pilot demonstration. Correspondingly COGR approached OMB to raise the procurement threshold to \$10,000 and OMB responded with a request for additional survey data, which COGR is currently collecting.

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

There are no key pending decisions as a result of the meeting.

Participation

Members of the Procurement Working Group and other FDP member attendees.

Key Risks/Issues

The Working Group made a motion to suspend its activity while OMB engaged with COGR.

Meeting Summary

The Working Group members outlined the previous three months of discussions with Federal representatives to insure they understood the impact the regulation would have and outlined how OMB became engaged with COGR to collect additional procurement survey data. The Working Group made a motion to suspend its activity while OMB engaged with COGR.



Emerging Research Institutions

Point of Contact	Susan Anderson or David Earwicker
Activities/Progress to Date	Arrangements were made to invite a representative of an FDP funding agency member to discuss issues specific to ERI members, particularly tips that might help us enhance competitiveness of ERI member grant proposals. A decision was made to invite Dr. Randy Phelps of NSF to speak at the May 2016 meeting.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	We discussed which other federal agency (-ies) might be of interest to the group so that we can arrange a similar session. The consensus was that the next agency asked to present an ERI-specific session should be NIH.
Participation	Twenty-four representatives of twenty different institutions attended; while most represented ERI institutions, some were from larger universities
Key Risks/Issues	Work continues on development of a ERI-member survey to identify institutional resources and needs for coordinating collaborations as relevant and for working with FDP partners to reduce administrative burden in our institutions.
Meeting Summary	Dr. Randy Phelps of the National Science Foundation made a presentation about RUI/ROA processes at NSF and provided helpful information to the membership, followed by questions from the group.



PMS Project Closeout

Point of Contact	Sara Bible, Stanford University and Jim Luther, Duke U
Activities/Progress to Date	<p>For the past few years, the working group has held panels with Federal and University representatives to present and discuss 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.•DHHS Closeouts
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	<p>Sessions slides were designed to show how to see if you have delinquent accounts in the PMS system, i.e. > 270 days past the project end date. Discussion points included: University and federal interest are aligned, i.e. we need to assist each other in identifying and closing delinquent accounts, the timing issues associated with the Federal Cash Transaction Report (FCTR) and the Final Financial Report (FFR), how the FCTR is viewed as an expenditure report, and how making prior period adjustments to a filed FCTR could be viewed as "technical" non-compliance with conventional thought, but, it results in more timely PMS closeouts, and it doesn't result in negative impacts to either the federal government or a university.</p>
Participation	University representatives, NIH policy representatives, PMS processing experts, and session participants.
Key Risks/Issues	<p>Timely HHS close-outs: Universities that adopt the "revise the FCTR" approach with the intent to more quickly closeout a delinquent PMS account, run the risk of auditor questioning how to legitimately modify a filed FCTR for a subsequent event (subcontract payment for example). Since there appears to be no financial benefit to either party by modifying the FCTR, it is theorized that any potential audit finding would not survive the internal agency review process.</p>
Meeting Summary	As documented in the PowerPoint slides, two universities discussed their approach to these problems and what their solutions were, and the amount of work that needs to be done.