Welcome!
Today’s session will begin shortly. There will be no audio sound until the session begins.
Zoom Webinar Reminders

- Zoom technical support at 1-888-799-9666, option 2
- Audio streamed through your speakers
- Submit questions at any time in the Q&A box at the bottom of your screen
- Webinar recording, slides, and session summaries posted shortly after the event at thefdp.org
Strategic Plan guiding Phase VII

**Strategic Plan Goals**

**Goal 1:** Demonstrate positive impact on administrative efficiency and effectiveness

**Goal 2:** Institutionalize evaluation to determine the relevance and impact of FDP

**Goal 3:** Strengthen resources and infrastructure to sustain FDP growth

**Goal 4:** Actively engage community partners—administrator, faculty, and federal representatives

**Goal 5:** Tell a powerful FDP story to internal and external audiences

Establishment of Strategic Planning Oversight Committee
Charged with Ensuring Implementation of the Phase VII Strategic Plan
Examples of Significant Work Initiated or Ongoing

- Strategic Planning within committees, including ERA, Communications
- Focus on membership engagement, led to implementation of the engagement survey and a database of interest related to the FDP and working groups on Faculty and Federal engagement
- Significant expansion of number and diversity of types of FDP members
- Continuation of virtual meetings to broaden participation of engagement initiated during Covid
- Initiation of evaluation strategy for the FDP to assist with making the case to Federal sponsors related to impacts of our work
- Adoption of new technologies and platforms to support FDP work
Implementation of Oversight

Establishment of Strategic Planning Oversight Committee

• Thank you to members: Jim Luther, Dick Seligman, Kim Moreland, Denise Moody, Michelle Bulls, Alex Albinak, Michele Masucci
• Outreach to committee chairs/co-chairs to learn about ongoing strategic priorities and needs
• Budget assessment conducted to ensure resources for initiatives are available
• Evaluation planning underway, led by Robert Nobles to connect initiatives to action steps
• Rethinking FDP Meetings Working Group established
• Outreach to Federal partners and National Academies on impacts of FDP
• Executive Leadership transition planning
Next Steps

1) Learn about committee activities and feedback
2) Implementation of evaluation strategy
3) Engagement with committees connected to FDP leadership changes
4) Continue to identify ways to connect between meetings to advance FDP goals and demonstration projects
5) Continue to connect with membership to gain input and feedback on current initiatives and consider new opportunities for FDP engagement
Michele Masucci, PHD, Vice President for Research
Temple University
masucci@temple.edu

Alex Albinak, MBA, JD, Associate Vice Provost for Research Administration
Johns Hopkins University
amckeow1@jhu.edu
Communications Committee
Responsibilities

• Develops an overall communication and outreach plan for FDP.

• Set style guidelines for all FDP committees, and publications.

• Provide oversight and direction of the FDP web site.

• Edit and approve publications that will have broad viewership.

• Review materials upon the request of the other FDP Committees.

• Compile and disseminate high-level meeting summaries.

• Develop outreach materials, including brochures, PowerPoint templates, etc.
Committee Structure

• Four main working groups, with leads:
  • Session Summaries – Jeff Petsis, Annie Publow, Julie Renkas
  • Marketing – Barb Gardner
  • Policies & Guidance – Csilla Csaplar & Tolise Dailey
  • Website – Rasha Abed & Jamie Sprague

• Liaisons:
  • Faculty – George Uetz
  • Infrastructure: Project Management Resources & Tools – Mora Harris
    • Develop project management resources for FDP committees to utilize
  • Internal Systems – Aubrey Schoenleben

• Communications Strategic Planning
  • Stephanie Scott & Jennifer Taylor

• NCURA Magazine column – FDP Update
Quick meeting summary

The FDP conducted its Winter 2022 conference virtually from Monday, January 10, 2022, through Thursday, January 13, 2022. The following document provides a quick review of the sessions and topics, along with links to slides and video of the presentations.

Monday, January 10, 2022, Plenary – Update from President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) – Moderator Dr. Richard Seligman introduced speaker, Dr. Maria Zuber, co-chair of PCAST and Vice President for Research at the
Interactive Brochure

- [https://thefdp.org/default/about/fdp-operations-information/](https://thefdp.org/default/about/fdp-operations-information/)

**FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP**

**PHASE VII**

Redefining the Government University Research Partnership
### Summary of Near-term Phase 7 Actions

**Note** – these high priority deliverables are to start at the beginning of Phase 7 and be completed in the first couple years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Demonstrate positive impact on administrative efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Set up new working group or committee to standardize templates and guidance related to demonstrations and pilots with an emphasis on data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Institutionalize evaluation to determine the relevance and impact of FDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Set up new working group or committee to develop and oversee creation of metrics and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Strengthen resources and infrastructure to sustain FDP growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengthen infrastructure to sustain and grow FDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Actively engage community partners—administrator, faculty, and federal representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue to enhance federal engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop and implement strategies for better integrating faculty into ongoing FDP activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitor participation closely and provide more personal outreach to members who have lapsed in representation – whether it’s the entire institution or a certain representative. Encourage members to send backup institutional counterparts to represent their institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tell a powerful FDP story to internal and external audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a comprehensive communications and marketing plan for FDP. Prepare and update annually a compelling FDP story in brochure or online format. Summarize key accomplishments, upcoming activities, and the benefits of joining and participating with FDP. Share the story broadly with federal partners, FDP institutions and non-FDP institutions. (Explore options for getting expert professional support.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communications Strategic Plan

• Hired Vanguard Communications, a marketing & PR firm, to develop FDP’s communications strategic plan: https://www.vancomm.com/

• Task 1: Strategic Communications Plan
  • Currently doing stakeholder interviews

• Task 2: Modernize and Update the FDP website
Progress of Task 1: Strategic Communications Plan

• Nov 2021 – Jan 2022:
  • Two stakeholder meetings, one-on-one stakeholder interviews, attended FDP Jan 2022 Meeting

• March 2022
  • Received 1st draft of Plan
  • FDP stakeholders reviewed, provided feedback

• Apr 2022
  • Received 2nd draft Plan
  • FDP stakeholders reviewed

• May 2022
  • Getting ready to finalize it
Plan Goals

Communications Goal

- Establish FDP as a trusted partner to enhance the national research enterprise by increasing efficiencies in the research environment.

Objectives

Objective 1:
- Increase communication coordination within the FDP.

Objective 2:
- Expand understanding of the value of the FDP.

Objective 3:
- Increase communication collaborations with federal agencies and research institutions to establish FDP priorities.
Plan: Primary Audiences

• Federal/governmental agencies:
  • Federal research agencies who are members
  • Other federal agencies who are critical strategic partners (DOJ, HHS, OSTP, OMB, etc.)

• FDP member institutions (includes the administrative, technical, and faculty representatives)

• FDP leaders and participants (as leaders and members of committees, subcommittees and working groups)

• Non-members
  • To show the value, high-level awareness and interest to what FDP is doing
  • To show the value of the work to any research institutions that receive federal funding for research
Plan, cont’d

• Includes ‘Key Message Concepts’ for each audience
• Strategies and Tactics: Materials, Activities, and Events
• Examples:
  • Tailored message concepts for key audiences
  • Comprehensive public-facing FAQs
  • One-page fact sheets
  • Onboarding toolkit
  • Talking points for presentations
  • Newsletter
  • Infographics
  • Potentially social media – exploratory
  • **Website**
• Defining Measures of Success
• Two-year Plan
Progress Task 2 - Website

- Kick-off meeting, end of March
- Rasha Abed, Jamie Sprague, and Sara Pietrzak – leads!
- Vanguard and web designer – conducting website audit
  - Audit results/recommendations
  - Wireframes
- Transfer
  - Moving from Mura to WordPress
  - Transfer of databases/systems
More to come!!!!

Welcome your suggestions.

New volunteer opportunities will become available once plan is complete.

Email communications@thefdp.org if you have questions or suggestions.
Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) Evaluation Update

Robert Nobles – Vice Chair, Faculty Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Bales</td>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Brock</td>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe Campbell</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alene Denson</td>
<td>University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Foley</td>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Gonzalez</td>
<td>University of Tennessee, Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Grace</td>
<td>Mayo Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Hoffman</td>
<td>University of California, Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felicia hou</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kenney</td>
<td>Beckman Research Institute City of Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Kim</td>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Kingsley</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Leonard</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Lynam</td>
<td>Tennessee Technological University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Madnick</td>
<td>University of Alaska, Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Masucci</td>
<td>Temple University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward McKoy</td>
<td>George Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Mollen</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Nickerson</td>
<td>University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyssse Orchard</td>
<td>William Marsh Rice University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Paffrath</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Pennington</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Petsis</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panda Powell</td>
<td>North Carolina Agricultural &amp; Technical State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Romagnoli</td>
<td>Geisinger Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Rosenbloom</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Schailey</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Schiffer</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Shaver</td>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Sherwood</td>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Splittgerber</td>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Stores</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Sullivan</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laszlo Szabo</td>
<td>Temple University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ara Tahmassian</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Taylor</td>
<td>Tennessee Technological University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Wells</td>
<td>University of California, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane C Yaciuk</td>
<td>University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Framework for Evaluation

1. **Internal Working Group**
   - Conduct an annual survey of membership
   - Collect top 3 activities being implemented from each operational and programmatic committee annually

2. **External Evaluation**
   FDP will engage with an external evaluation center to create an evaluation plan that focuses on:
   - Effectiveness of resource allocation to accomplish goals (including time/effort)
Framework continued

- Documenting the level of success in accomplishing FDP Vision
- Demonstrating that accountability requirements to stakeholders are fulfilled
- Aggregating information from each programmatic and operational committee evaluations to estimate the overall outcomes of FDP
- Creating a report that incorporates the successes and opportunity areas for FDP that will be shared with stakeholders to enhance visibility and accountability
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?
Key questions continued

- 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 Members? What activities have been implemented by FDP to increase the value of programming and outcomes to Members?
- What activities or initiatives does FDP implement that targets or assists institutions serving underrepresented groups, including young researchers?
Proposed Methods

Qualitative and Quantitative Data Collection Approach

- Administrator and Faculty representatives – engagement, relevance of FDP activities based on roles, perceptions of impacts to institutions, impact of demonstrations, improvements to grant life-cycle implementation

- FDP Executive Committee – function, decision making processes, and effectiveness, assessment of committee function, assessment of strategy
Proposed Methods

Quantitative Data Collection (current and proposed activities):

- Faculty Workload Survey
- Potential Administrative Workload Survey
- Usage of FDP toolkits by members
- Tracking of participation in meetings and activities
- Tracking of participation in demonstrations
- Measuring FDP’s Outcomes and Impact
Evaluation Next Steps

- **Draft Report sent to Executive Committee 11-21**
- **Pending approval, next steps include:**
  1. Collaborate with the Oversight Committee Meeting to establish KPIs in conjunction with committee chairs
    - Anticipated Implementation June 2022
  2. Release a Request for Information (RFI) and identify an External Evaluation Center affiliated with an FDP member institution
    - Anticipated screening and selection process completed by July 2022.
  3. Develop the Evaluation Working Group annual survey and approve the External Evaluation Plan by September 2022
FIWG Members

- Alex Albinak, Johns Hopkins
- Lynette Arias (U of Washington)
- Douglas Backman (U of Central Florida)
- Pam Caudill, (Yale U)
- Robin Cyr (Northeastern U)
- Amanda Humphrey (Northeastern U)
- Kim Moreland (U Wisconsin)
- Mark Sweet (U Wisconsin)
- Laura McCabe (Michigan State)
- Brian Ridenour (Texas A&M)
- Susan Anderson Rivaleau (College of Charleston)
- Shandra White (Northwestern U)
- Alice Young (Texas Tech U)
- Michele Masucci (Temple U)
- Twila Reighley Michigan State
- Jim Luther (FDP and Yale)
- Kim Moreland (U of Wisconsin)
- Lori Ann Schultz (U of Arizona)
- Pamela Webb (U of Minnesota)
Major Groups within FIWG

- BIG
- FIWG
- KIC
- MART

Foreign Influence Management
Major Focal Areas

- **NSPM-33 Implementation Guidance** (BIG FIWG)
- Development of a Key Investigator Clearinghouse (KIC)
- Development of an Institutional Tool to Guide Disclosure Assessments
  - **Matrix for Assessment of Risk and Transparency** (MART)
5 working groups from FDP Foreign Influence Working Group (FIWG) involving faculty, technologists, and research administrators identified:

- Areas needing additional clarity
- Ideas for implementation
- Definitions in need of more precision

Listening Sessions (2/16 and 2/17) with federal agency representatives (NIH, NSF, DOD, DOE)

- FDP FIWG Evaluation of NSPM-33 Implementation Guidance Discussion Document (distributed)

OSTP Engagement Hours Presentation (2/28)
DPI Webinar (3/24)
FDP May Meeting session (Wednesday, 5/11, 1-2:30 pm)
Detailed Guidance Areas in NSPM-33 Implementation Guidance

1. Disclosure Requirements and Standardization
2. Digital Persistent Identifiers
3. Consequences of Violation of Disclosure Requirements
4. Information Sharing
5. Research Security Programs

Warm-UP for Weds!
1. Disclosures
(details expected within the month)

- Add clarity for investigators and institutions
  - Harmonize requirements to the extent practicable
  - Harmonize the forms and data elements to the extent practicable
  - Match NDAA Section 223 about who should be required to disclose to the extent practicable (and if not, alternate clearly defined)
    - Students should generally be excluded
  - Ensure definitions of data elements are clear
  - Clarify how, when and what to disclose (and what not to disclose)
  - Ensure errors can be corrected
  - Ensure updates can be made (and when/how)
2. Digital Persistent Identifiers
(details expected January 2023)

• Agencies must establish policies about when and how to require investigators to register with a service that gives them a DPI (e.g., Orchid ID)
  • DPIs cannot be made mandatory
  • DPIs must be available to investigators at no cost

• Agencies encouraged to have at least one common DPI service across agencies

• Investigator authorizes release of his/her information to agencies

• Investigator certifies information is complete, current & accurate
3. Violations

• Consequences include the types of administrative actions already in place
  • Suspension and debarment
  • Enforcement actions listed in the Uniform Guidance
  • Examples - proposal rejection, award termination, removal of the investigator from the award or peer review or federal employment

• Consequences will take specific circumstances into account
  • Intent, pattern, self-disclosure, harm to agencies or the national interest, awareness of the rules
4. Information Sharing

- Agencies may share information with each other, and in some cases, prior to a case being finally decided
- New “routine uses” of data may be authorized by the federal government
- Generally, individuals and institutions will have advance notice and a process to contest the proposed action
5. Research Security

• Mandatory research security program if an organization has more than $50M in federal funding for past two years
  • Cybersecurity
  • Foreign travel security
  • Research security training
  • Export control training

• Institutional certification required (being developed)

• Mandatory research security point of contact

• Timing likely the longest
  • 90 days for stakeholder input + 120 days to develop requirement + time for OMB to consider + 1 year implementation period
Now on to KIC and MART!

• And don’t forget to join us on Wednesday for

NSPM-33 (1:00 – 2:30 pm)
KIC Team

- Lori Schultz, University of Arizona (chair)
- Alex Albinak, FDP Admin Chair
- Michele Masucci, FDP Faculty Chair
- Lynette Arias, University of Washington
- Jackie Bendall, COGR
- Zach Chandler, Stanford University
- Robin Cyr, Northeastern University
- Stephanie Endy, Brown University
- Stephanie Gray, University of Florida
- Jim Luther, Yale University/FDP
- Peter Schiffer, Yale University & AAU Senior Fellow
- Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota
- Alice Young, Texas Tech University
The Challenge:

“Investigators and their institutions are challenged to easily / efficiently / timely collect all necessary information for reporting (Other Support/ C&P, Biosketch, RPPR, etc.) from both agency/sponsor and institutional sources. KIC will be designed to provide access to this information along the lines of the other successful models that FDP has developed (FCOI and Expanded Clearinghouse).”

The Response:

Development of a national on-line repository that would serve as a single point of entry for investigators relative to appointments, current and pending/other support, and basic conflict of interest/commitment information, with the data able to be harvested by agencies and institutions
KIC Objective (revised)

- Defining data sources and lifecycle/ecosystem/taxonomy of “disclosure” data
  - Proposal applications
  - JIT
  - Postaward changes
  - RPPR
- Overlap of data
Status from Jan-May 2022

• Reviewed completed documentation for congruency with OSTP January implementation guidance

• Worked with SciENcv team to identify faculty and administrative testers for upcoming functionality (new UI, NIH other support)

• Diagram of data, sources next – describing the “disclosure” universe

• Multiple sessions (NCURA, SRA, FDP) on NSPM-33 and ORCID
• Objective: Develop a **risk-based tool/decision matrix to aid in determining if a specific outside activity is reportable on Other Support and/or Biosketch**. The work group will define the parameters of the MART, its likely benefits and its major challenges, and make a recommendation as to whether the idea should be further pursued.
FDP MART (Matrix for Assessment of Risk and Transparency) Working Group

- Over-Commitment / Capacity
- Conflict of Interest
- Other Support / Current & Pending
- Biosketches
- Publications
- Programmatic Report
- National Security, Economic Security, Integrity of Research
- Visiting faculty, scholars, & scientists / postdocs, students and trainees
- In-kind or Donated Resources
- Foreign Travel
- Outside Activities (Appts & Affiliations)
- Departmental Annual Review Information

Additional categories:
- Data Theft
- Intellectual Property
- “CRIS” Countries
- Open Science
- Export Controls
- Economic Implications

Legend:
- RED = “Dots” to be connected
- GREEN = Reporting Requirements
Intended Audience: Faculty

Organization: structured by activity

Goal: help faculty understand what activities should be discussed with institution and reported to sponsors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Specific activity / level of engagement</th>
<th>Where to report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                     | • Participating in an internally funded (i.e., funded by home institution) clinical trial, but the drug/other resources are provided by an industry sponsor  
  • Serving as an overall Protocol PI for a sponsored trial (example: Dr. X is Protocol PI of ACTG Study 5303)                                                             |                       |
| Publications        | • Purely advisory, not included as a co-author  
  • Authorship on projects affiliated with and arising from research conducted at your home institution                                                                                                                                   | NSF COA TABLE         |
|                     | • Co-authorship on research conducted outside of your institution  
  • Listing other affiliation with another institution that has not previously been disclosed to relevant federal funding agencies  
  • Addition of potential foreign components, as evidenced by co-authorship of investigators not previously listed as collaborators on the applicable project (applies only to research, as opposed to meta-analysis or literature reviews, which should not require additional disclosure) |                       |
| Editorial Service   | • Peer-reviewing *ad hoc* for a peer-reviewed journal  
  • Membership on editorial advisory boards                                                                                                                                                                                               | no disclosure required |
|                     | • Serving as editor or associate editor (paid or unpaid) for a peer-reviewed journal                                                                                                                                                      | biosketch             |
| Peer Review         | • Peer-reviewing *ad hoc* for a peer-reviewed journal  
  • *Ad hoc* reviews for another institution’s P&T process                                                                                                                                                                                  | no disclosure required |
### Activity Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A</th>
<th>Generally Reportable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does the activity meet the definition of research (e.g. systematic study directed toward fuller scientific knowledge or understanding of the subject studied)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Could this activity (actual or appearance) create scientific overlap with current research endeavors conducted thru university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Could this activity (actual or appearance) create commitment overlap?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Could this activity (actual or appearance) create financial overlap?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Could the activity impact, or appear to impact, the integrity of your research due to improper in-kind resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is the activity related to national security?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Are there Animal and/or human subjects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does the activity being reviewed pose a potential research security risk considering federal standards and regulations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Any foreign resources that meet the definition of a foreign component have received appropriate prior approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Talent Program relationship or Foreign Entity relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Is the activity happening outside of the faculty member's appointment? (note: consulting that occurs within institutional guidelines is assumed to be part of the appointment and is generally not reportable). See &quot;Commitment Overlap: above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part B  --  Requires Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Requires evaluation/Indicator</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Will, or could this lead to a publication and authorship?</td>
<td>Excludes peer review services and incidental authorship on proposals of data, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Are there in-kind resources (office/lab space, chemicals, etc.) provided? (could indicate capacity concerns)</td>
<td>NIH requires NSF may not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Could the activity impact, or appear to impact, any current or future intellectual property?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Does agreement have to be confidential or NDA?</td>
<td>Review with Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Is there compensation associated with the activity? (could indicate time commitment &amp; capacity concerns)</td>
<td>Requires evaluation/Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Are there cash payments or foreign bank accounts?</td>
<td>Review with Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Does the Activity require an employment relationship?</td>
<td>Review with Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Could the activity impact the integrity of individual or the institution or create reputational risk?</td>
<td>Review with Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Academic appointment related to scholarly teaching activities</td>
<td>Could be a violation of institutional policy/preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Is activity related to designated countries? (China, N Korea, Iran, etc.)</td>
<td>Requires evaluation/Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Is there a titled academic, professional, or institutional appointments</td>
<td>Requires evaluation/Likely reportable / could create commitment conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part C  --  Generally Not Reportable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Informal collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Informal sharing of data related to previously published work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>The activity is a provision of service, as opposed to independently working on a specific research aim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

- Generally Reportable
- Requires Evaluation
- Generally Not Reportable

Supports documentation of decision

**Part B -- Requirements Evaluation**

- Requires evaluation/Indicator
- Excludes peer review services and incidental authorship on proposals of data, etc.
- NIH requires NSF may not
- View at Keiser’s characteristics
- Requires evaluation/Indicator
- Requires evaluation/Indicator
- Requires evaluation/Indicator
- Requires evaluation/Indicator
- Requires evaluation/Indicator
- Requires evaluation/Indicator
- Requires evaluation/Indicator
- Requires evaluation/Indicator
- Requires evaluation/Indicator
- Requires evaluation/Likely reportable / could create commitment conflict

---

**Part C -- Generally Not Reportable**

- Not reportable
- Need more conversation with Agencies
- Not reportable
- Not reportable

(see Lauer list and MITRE Report)
• **Fundamental Question:** Broadly speaking, **could the activity impact a funding decision because of real/apparent impact on integrity of research and/or overlap?** If "yes, the activity is Reportable.

• **Supports the Critical Role of Documentation**

• **Sample Questions**
  • Does the activity meet the definition of research (e.g. systematic study directed toward fuller scientific knowledge or understanding of the subject studied...“
  • Will, or could this lead to a publication and authorship?
  • Could the activity impact, or appear to impact, any current or future intellectual property?
  • Are there cash payments or foreign bank accounts?
  • Does the activity require an employment relationship?
  • Could the activity impact the integrity of individual or institution or create reputational risk?
FDP MART (Matrix for Assessment of Risk and Transparency) Working Group

- Amanda Humphrey, Northeastern University (co-chair)
- Robin Cyr, Northeastern University (co-chair)
- Jim Luther, Yale University/FDP
- Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota
- Alice Young, Texas Tech University
- Kim Moreland, University of Wisconsin
- Laura McCabe, Michigan State
- Stephanie Gray, University of Florida
- Jaclyn Lucas, City of Hope
- Doug Backman, University of Central Florida
- Twila Reighley, Michigan State University
- Shandra White, Northwestern University
- Susan Anderson, College of Charleston
- Brian Ridenour, Texas A&M University
- Martha Ogilvie, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center
- Lynette Arias, University of Washington
Does the activity you seek guidance on meet the definition of "Research" when "Research" is defined as a "systematic study directed toward fuller scientific knowledge or understanding of the subject studied"?

- Yes
- No
What type of research activity are you seeking guidance on?

- Appointments
- Clinical research
- Consulting
- Gifts
- In-kind support
- IP & data sharing
- Proposal peer review
- Publication
- Start-ups & venture capital
- Visits & sabbaticals (Short-term)
- Visits & sabbaticals (Long-term)
- Other
Clinical research related activities: select the answer that best matches your activity to receive guidance.

- I am serving as PI or otherwise participating in the conduct of a clinical trial. The clinical trial is 100% funded via funds from my home institution with a separate budget and accounting.
- Participating in an internally funded (i.e., funded by home institution) clinical trial, but the drug/other resources are provided by an industry sponsor.
- Serving as a PI of a clinical trial funded via any external source – federal, industry, foundation, etc.
- Serving as an overall protocol PI for an externally funded clinical trial with no other role on the clinical trial.
- Serving as a member of the study team (i.e. responsible for recruitment and/or other conduct) on a clinical trial.
You selected: Participating in an internally funded (i.e., funded by home institution) clinical trial, but the drug/other resources are provided by an industry sponsor.

This selection indicates a reportable activity: receiving drug or other resources from an industry sponsor indicates a transfer of value that must be reported in your other support. Please contact your institution's central grant management office for guidance on how to report this activity. Thank you for using this tool.
Tool Screenshots
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What type of research activity are you seeking guidance on?

- Appointments
- Clinical research
- Consulting
- Gifts
- In-kind support
- IP & data sharing
- Proposal peer review
- Publication
- Start-ups & venture capital
Appointments: select the answer that best matches your appointment to receive guidance.

- I have an honorary appointment with or without compensation or responsibilities.
- I have an academic appointment outside of my home institution that is related to scholarly teaching activities, but I do not perform any research.
- I have another type of academic, professional, or institutional appointment at a research institution, academic medical center or university.
- I have an appointment (paid or unpaid) at a foreign university, but it is honorary and I never received an appointment letter.
- I have a current talent award from a foreign government.
Northeastern University

You selected: I have an honorary appointment with or without compensation or responsibilities.

This selection indicates a reportable activity: federal funding agencies require the disclosure of ALL appointments, regardless of time commitment, amount of remuneration or type of activity.
If you have not been able to locate your activity type here, please describe it below. Providing this information will help us to develop this tool for future use.
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