



FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP
Redefining the Government & University Research Partnership

Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) Faculty Forum

Michele Masucci – Chair, Faculty Committee
Robert Nobles – Vice Chair, Faculty
Committee



Agenda

1. Workload Survey Discussion
2. Evaluation Discussion
3. Updates from faculty engagement across the FDP
4. Open discussion



What is the Faculty Workload Survey

- Six-year cycle survey of Federal PIs at member institutions to learn about their time commitments while conducting research grants
- Evaluates time taken from research by required administrative tasks
 - 2005 – 42.3%
 - 2012 – 42.3%
 - 2018 – 44.3%
- Provides comparative framework for tracking changes in perceptions about workload



Impacts of the Survey

- Used to inform and prioritize FDP Activities
 - Demonstrations to reduce burden
 - Convening and reporting activities related to challenges associated with faculty workload
- Used to inform grant policy
- Used to inform institution approaches to workload impacts of research administration
 - Enabled by institution specific reports
 - Impetus for FDP activities, like FACT
- Reported in the scholarly literature on the federal grant system



Workload Survey

Involvement of Faculty

- Participation in design, scope, focus
- Taking survey at home institutions
- Scholarship related to the survey
- Incorporating survey outcomes into practices at home institutions to reduce burden
- Working on research continuity through training and mentoring next generation of researchers



Workload Survey 2024

To do list:

- Assess timing of implementation in light of impacts to all partners related to Covid-19 responses
- Convene and charge Faculty Workload Survey Working Group with tasks to provide input into survey design, implementation schedule, and logistics
- RFP for Survey Implementation team
- Coordination with FDP, FWS Working group, and prior team to ensure continuity of design and implementation and support reporting needs



Cross connections with Other FDP activities

- Phase VII Strategic Plan Connections
 - FDP Evaluation
 - Communication Strategy
- Potential Administrative Workload Survey
- Faculty Committee Priorities
 - Reporting, scholarship associated with the survey, use of survey to support policy, and use and stewardship of data gathered
 - Providing tools to decrease workload burden across grant ecosystem and lifecycle of grant implementation
 - Strengthen the research profession pipeline



Input Requested

- Survey Design – Current – 30 minute web survey to Federal PIs
 - *Appropriate scope? Duration? Focus?*
- Data Stewardship and Use – what are our priorities and suggestions
- Reporting – Plans for dissemination of survey outcome and other types of reports
- Implementation Planning



Federal Demonstration Partnership

FDP Phase VII Strategic Initiatives – Comprehensive Program Evaluation

Robert Nobles, DrPH, MPH, CIP

Vice President for Research Administration, Emory
University

Vice Chair of the Faculty Committee



Evaluation Working Group

Karen	Bales	University of California, Davis
Stephanie	Brock	Wayne State University
Chloe	Campbell	University of Florida
Alene	Denson	University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences
Tim	Foley	Wayne State University
Sarah	Gonzalez	University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Janice	Grace	Mayo Clinic
Shawn	Hoffman	University of California, Office of the President
felicia	hou	Columbia University
Michael	Kenney	Beckman Research Institute City of Hope
Elaine	Kim	Colorado State University
Beth	Kingsley	Yale University
John	Leonard	Virginia Commonwealth University
Mark	Lynam	Tennessee Technological University
Rosemary	Madnick	University of Alaska, Fairbanks
Michele	Masucci	Temple University
Edward	McKoy	George Washington University
Kate	Mollen	University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Rebecca	Nickleon	University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences

Elysse	Orchard	William Marsh Rice University
Dennis	Paffrath	University of Maryland
Kathy	Pennington	Florida State University
Jeffrey	Petsis	University of Pittsburgh
Panda	Powell	North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University
Katrina	Romagnoli	Geisinger Clinic
Joshua	Rosenblom	Iowa State University
Timothy	Schailey	Thomas Jefferson University
Peter	Schiffer	Yale University
Kelly	Shaver	College of Charleston
Leslie	Sherwood	University of Louisville
Ron	Spittgerber	Colorado State University
Katie	Stores	Emory University
Robert	Sullivan	Princeton University
Laszlo	Szabo	Temple University
Ara	Tahmassian	Harvard University
Jennifer	Taylor	Tennessee Technological University
Cynthia	Wells	University of California, Riverside
Jane C	Yaciuk	University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center



Federal Demonstration Partnership

Framework for Evaluation

1. Internal Working Group

- A satisfaction and outcome annual survey of membership will be led by the evaluation working group.
- Annually the evaluation working group will collect activities being implemented from each operational and programmatic committee (top three for each year)

2. External Evaluation

FDP will engage with an external evaluation center to create an evaluation plan that focuses on assessing the effects of FDP, inclusive of the following:

- Determine whether existing resources are being allocated effectively and where to allocate new resources (including time/attention).
- Document the level of success in accomplishing FDP Vision.
- Demonstrate that accountability requirements to stakeholders are fulfilled.
- Aggregate information from each programmatic and operational committee evaluations to estimate the overall outcomes of FDP.
- Create a report that incorporates the successes and opportunity areas for FDP that will be shared with stakeholders to enhance visibility and accountability.



Federal Demonstration Partnership

- **Key Questions of the Evaluation**
 - What are the specific program improvements that have been implemented after each faculty workload survey?
 - What is the specific and critical role that FDP plays in government-wide initiatives? What are the outcomes of such initiatives?
 - How many demonstration projects have been planned, implemented, and/or completed each year? During each phase of FDP?
 - What are the actual or projected/estimated cost savings to institutional and affiliate member institutions that can be attributed to FDP initiatives? Who are the specific beneficiaries (faculty, administration, or both)?
 - What is the value of FDP to the federal agencies? What activities have been implemented by FDP to increase the value of programming and outcomes to federal agencies?
 - What activities or initiatives does FDP implement that targets or assists institutions serving underrepresented groups, including young investigators?



Federal Demonstration Partnership

- **Next Steps**
 1. Finalize review of the Evaluation Plan by the FDP Executive Committee
 2. Develop and implement annual surveys that will be used by the Evaluation Working Group
 - Anticipated Launch March 2022
 3. Seek nominations and identify an External Evaluation Center affiliated with an FDP member institution
 - Anticipated screening and selection process occurring February – March 2022.
 4. Share the Evaluation Working Group annual surveys and the External Evaluation Plan at future FDP meetings in 2022