Quick meeting summary

The FDP conducted its Winter 2024 meeting from Monday, January 22, 2024, through Wednesday, January 24, 2024. The following document provides a quick review of the sessions and topics, along with links to slides and video of select presentations.

Monday, January 22, 2024, 11:00am-12:30pm EST

Opening Plenary: Demystifying the Academic Research Enterprise – Welcome and Opening Remarks, Maria Koszalka, Alex Albinak and Michele Masucci:

- **Welcome and overview**: Maria Koszalka, the executive director of FDP, welcomed the participants and recognized the contributions of the program committee, the communications committee, and the National Academies team. She highlighted the achievements and priorities of FDP, such as the financial audit, the meeting structure, the evaluation process, the strategic plan, and the federal engagement agenda.

- **Co-chairs' remarks**: Alex Albinak and Michele Masucci, the co-chairs of FDP, thanked Maria Koszalka and Sarah Pietrzak for their leadership and service, and congratulated Alex Albinak on her re-election as the administrative co-chair. They also thanked the volunteers and members for their involvement in FDP's projects and demonstrations, such as the data management and sharing plan and research security initiatives, the CUSP protocol inventory, and the FCOI audit clearinghouse. They encouraged more participation from faculty and federal partners and discussed the opportunities for collaboration with the National Academies and other stakeholders.

- **Faculty-specific items**: Michele Masucci invited the participants to join the faculty forum, the faculty happy hour, the faculty-administrator collaboration team meeting, and the faculty business meeting. She also mentioned the faculty workload survey working group and the workshop on strengthening scientific leadership and responsible research that was held by the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine.

Demystifying the Academic Research Enterprise, Kelvin Droegemeier:

- **Introduction**: Kelvin Droegemeier, a professor of atmospheric science and a former director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, introduced his new book, Demystifying the Academic Research Enterprise, which is published by MIT Press and available for free online. He explained the motivation and purpose of the book, which is to provide an educational resource for anyone who works in or relates to the research enterprise, such as researchers, research administrators, federal agency program officers, policymakers, and media.

- **Book structure and content**: Kelvin described the structure and content of the book, which consists of 14 chapters that cover various topics.
related to the research enterprise, such as research funding, research compliance, intellectual property, research ethics, research communication, and research leadership. He said that each chapter starts with an overview and learning objectives and ends with questions and deep dive exercises to assess comprehension and facilitate learning¹. He also said that the book has a facilitator guide for those who want to use it as a course or as part of a course.

- **Book benefits and relevance:** The presentation concluded with a discussion of the benefits and relevance of the book for different audiences and disciplines. Kelvin explained that the book aims to empower the next generation of researchers and research administrators by providing them with the knowledge and understanding of the research enterprise that they typically acquire over the course of their careers. He also said that the book tries to address the challenges and opportunities that the research enterprise faces in a changing societal landscape, and to connect with the efforts and initiatives of organizations like FDP.

**Federal Agency Updates** – Agency representatives from the National Science Foundation, Environmental Protection Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, United States Department of Agriculture/National Institute of Food and Agriculture, and National Institutes of Health presented on news, updates, and changes within their respective agencies. A compilation of summaries of each agency update can be found [here](#).

**Subawards Subcommittee** –

- **Subcommittee Updates:** The new standing subcommittee has 18 active participants from various types of institutions and meets quarterly to discuss and decide on subaward-related issues. The subcommittee is looking for two more co-chairs and volunteers to join and help coordinate subaward activities.

- **Subaward Templates Updates:** The subaward templates working group has collected feedback from the community and revised the templates based on the suggestions. The draft revisions were posted in December 2023 for feedback and the survey closed on January 15, 2024. The working group is now finalizing the templates and plans to release them around March 1, 2024. The updated templates will include changes such as adding a 45-day invoice option for lower tier subawards only, updating references and links to federal regulations, and modifying the amendment template header.

- **Subaward Guidance Updates:** The guidance working group is also working on updating the FAQs and related guidance documents to reflect the changes in the templates and address common questions and concerns. The guidance documents will be available on the FDP website along with the templates.

- **NIH Foreign Subs Policy Discussion:** The subcommittee also had a discussion about the NIH’s final updated policy guidance for subaward/consortium written agreements (NOT-OD-23-182) and how FDP can help the members comply with it. The policy requires additional documentation and reporting for foreign subawards under NIH grants and cooperative agreements. Attendees of the session shared some ideas for implementing the policy and using the FDP Foreign Subaward sample. There are no plans to update the Foreign Subaward sample at this time, but the subcommittee intends to provide examples of language that FDP Members can use to comply with NOT-OD-23-182 in a separate document.
**Conflict of Interest Subcommittee** – The Conflict of Interest Subcommittee co-chairs, Lindsey Spangler (Duke University) and Amanda Humphrey (Northeastern University) along with April Pepperdine (University of Michigan) presented updates. Note that following this FDP meeting there will be a co-chair transition from Amanda Humphrey to April Pepperdine. The subcommittee is conducting a survey of institutional practices related to COI that will close on February 28, 2024. Results of systems utilized, coordination across offices, size and scope of COI office, etc. will be analyzed and a de-identified report will be provided to institutions that highlights best practices. The subcommittee developed a template COI management plan tool with examples from 12 FDP member institutions. There is a toolbox of streamlined plan conditions divided into relevant sections, highlighting best practices. The final de-identified product provides suggested management plan headings and terms that COI offices can utilize based on institutional need. This should reduce administrative burden of creating plans from scratch or revising existing plans. The subcommittee is also in the process of developing resources for a “consulting addendum” to include simple FAQs and a web resource housed on the FDP site. The subcommittee is exploring pursuit of new projects such as risk mitigation plans for DOE and DOD, in collaboration with the Research Security Subcommittee, and the impact of AI on COI. Finally, the subcommittee welcomes suggestions for new demonstrations and is looking for new volunteer members; interested parties can email coi@thefdp.org.

**Faculty Forum** – The January 2024 Faculty Forum featured a discussion session with Sheila Garrity, Director of the Office of Research Integrity at HHS. The discussion began with a reference to a National Academies session: “On Leading a Lab” and segued into the importance of development and education around Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR), with research integrity “boot camps.” Topics discussed include what structure is needed at the university and federal agency level, the availability of RCR tools at www.wcrif.org, and new leadership at HHS, where, although there are new regulations, the emphasis is not punitive, but rather is directed at guidance for handling research misconduct. Reference was also made to an excellent podcast on the subject of RCR on the “Freakonomics” website.

Discussion then turned to the question of “how can we reduce burden of RCR?” Questions and concerns were raised by faculty concerning:

- relationships between RCR and data sharing
- concerns of smaller institutions with reduced research support resources
- are there checks and balances in “team science?”
- “mega labs” vs. solo research?
- what about non-lab research, e.g., social and behavioral sciences?
- what about data storage issues – what is their impact on research integrity?

The forum also included an update on the FDP Evaluation activities by Robert Nobles, Vice President for Research Administration at Emory University and Rachel Scott, Center for Research Evaluation (CERE). FDP contracted with an external evaluation firm in Mississippi (CERE) to evaluate progress in Phase 7. Data were collected from 223 respondents at 109 institutions, as well as key informant interviews. Overall, the surveys found:

- FDP members are committed volunteers, and there is a consistent understanding of the mission by all.
- FDP represents a wide range of institutions within a highly complex research environment.
- The FDP tripartite structure (University administration, Faculty, Federal Agencies) is unique.
- FDP members felt there was a need to strengthen federal agency participation and to increase faculty participation.
The next steps will be to finalize the survey and interview data and complete the report, with baseline performance measures and recommendations.

**Foreign Influence Working Group: Research Security Updates** – The Foreign Influence Working Group (FIWG), a working group focused on a continued discussion of issues related to NSPM 33, CHIPS Act, and research security in general presented research security updates with five Federal partners: Sarah Stalker-Lehoux and Jean Feldman from NSF; Michelle Bulls from NIH; Jason Day from DoD; and Jeremy Ison from DOE. The session was moderated by Pamela Webb (University of Minnesota) and Jim Luther (Yale University/FDP). Highlights of the session included: Common Forms release and agency adoption; announcement that the Matrix to Assess Risk and Transparency (MART tool was demonstrated to FBI officials by Amanda Humphrey and Robyn Cyr (Northeastern University); announcement of the release of CHIPS-compliant research security training modules, America Competes Act requirement for updated Responsible and Ethical Conduct of Research (RECR) and upcoming connection to research security training; and a reminder that a voluntary and anonymous OIG survey is currently underway regarding other support.

Federal agency representative remarks encompassed various topics. NSF reported on the research security training requirement for all covered personnel on federal awards (will be effective with PAPPG 25-1); prohibition of malign foreign talent recruitment programs for federally funded researchers; requirement for NSF to establish the SECURE Center; and reporting to NSF of foreign financial transactions and gifts and contracts above $50K associated with countries of concern. NSF is preparing for July 2024 implementation of the portal for reporting foreign gift and contracts over $50K from countries of concern; reports will be due July 31 and a “negative” report should be submitted if applicable. NSF’s implementation updates for NSPM-33 included the status of the Harmonized Disclosure Policy; Research Security Programs; and plans for oversight and enforcement. NSF is working on its goal of developing a National Security Evaluation Rubric with the goal of risk mitigation. The NSF PAPPG (NSF 24-1) includes changes relating to Foreign Influence as well as implementation of the Common Forms for the Biographical Sketch and Current and Pending (Other) Support. NIH will be taking a phased approach in adopting the Common Forms in order to align with their standard form updates. In January 2025, NIH will align the biographical sketch and current pending (other) support to the Common Forms with FORMS-I release. In May 2025, NIH Common forms will be available in SciENcv.

Mindful of differing missions, there are many cross-agency discussions relating to the various security risk matrices. DOE reiterated their broad mission encompassing both research and national laboratories and their recently updated Science and Technology Risk Matrix. DoD referenced its the policy on risk-based security review processes that the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering (OUSD(R&E)) published on June 30th in compliance with NSPM-33, covering proposals for fundamental research conducted by institutions of higher education (IHEs), along with its risk matrix and preferred option of risk mitigation but spoke to the challenges of implementation. All federal agency partners spoke to the ongoing efforts between their agencies to work collaboratively on research security goals and in partnership with FDP members, emphasizing the importance of striking a balance between research security and international collaboration and maintaining an open and secure scientific ecosystem. Possible future topical areas for the FIWG to pursue as pilots include: MART development and demonstration; Risk Management and Mitigation Decision Tools for Assessing Possible Participation in International Tools; and development of Glossary of Federally Defined Terms with detailed definitions.
The following federal agency specific updates were presented:

- NIH will send an additional email notification for closeout reminders at 90 days. Reminders now at 10, 90, 120, and 150 days. Email notifications are sent to the AOR. An NIH Grants Policy webinar is scheduled for January 31, 2024: https://grants.nih.gov/learning-center/2024-grants-policy-updates. NIH will issue an updated Grants Policy Statement following updates to 2 CFR 200; anticipated during March/April timeframe. PMS access issues due to additional security and limitations. Seek guidance from your PMS Liaison. Alan Whatley (NIH OPERA) shared information related to prioritizing FFRs. If an FFR should be prioritized for review, please reach out to OPERAFFRInquiries@od.nih.gov to make the request. Final FFR’s cash disbursements are required to reconcile to expenditures so basis of accounting must be Cash on final FFR, unique from annual FFR’s. To be in compliance with foreign outgoing subawards, it is responsibility of the signing official to have access to the subaward data, as well as the PI. The foreign subaward must provide their data to the institution in English; the data should inform the progress report and may need to be shared with NIH officials. –[discussed during the Q&A at the end of the session]

- NSF, there will be a Grants Conference in May: https://nsfpolicyoutreach.com/

- NASA, the quarterly FCTR submitted for the period ending 9/30/2023 was the last FCTR. Recipients with final FFR reports due March 31, 2024, or earlier, please continue to submit your final FFR report via email to the award’s assigned grant officer and nssc-closeout@mail.nasa.gov. Recipients with final FFR reports due April 1, 2024, or later, please submit your final FFR in PMS. Reference: https://www.nasa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/gic-23-06-b-update-2-fctr-to-ffr-transition-002.pdf. NASA transaction sampling is continuing and COGR is working with NASA on possible changes that meet NASA’s needs and balance burden.

Other updates included the following: (1) Members of the audit subcommittee have begun meeting. Alicia Reed and Mario Medina will lead the group. The committee would like to attract another federal partner. The group will start their work by identifying two agencies that have a finding or findings in common and examine how that might impact institutions and potentially mitigate the impact. The group is starting by reviewing the HHS OIG report to Congress for the six month period of April 1, 2023 to September 30, 2023. And (2) Reminder that the FDP subaward template will be updated to include an option for a final invoice due 45 days after the period ends but this should only be used by lower tier subawardees, not the prime award recipient.

Federal NSPM-33 Research Security Training Modules: Overview/Introduction and Panel Discussion – This session provided an overview of the NSPM-33 Research Security Training Modules, and was moderated by Dr. Mike Steele, an expert in NSF’s Office of the Chief of Research Security Strategy and Policy. There were presentations from the four teams that developed the training modules under a solicitation from NSF, NIH, DOD, and DOE. The training modules are designed to provide research security awareness and education for the US research community, covering topics such as research security definition, disclosure, risk mitigation, and principled international collaboration.

There was an overview of each module, highlighting the content, objectives, features, scenarios, and assessment methods. Discussion topics included the availability, duration, customization, and maintenance of the modules, as well as
the compliance with the federal requirements in the CHIPS and Science Act and the NSPM-33. Members are encouraged to watch the video of the presentation for full details on each of the modules.

Research Security Training modules can be found at [https://rst.nsf.gov](https://rst.nsf.gov). The four modules are as follows:

**Module 1: What is Research Security?**
**Module 2: Disclosure**
**Module 3: Manage and Mitigate Risk**
**Module 4: International Collaboration**

**NIH Data Management & Sharing Pilot** – NIH Data Management and Sharing (DMS) Plan Pilot Update – This session was led by Melissa Korf (Harvard Medical School), Christi Keene (University of Chicago), Jim Luther (Yale University/FDP), and Michelle Bulls (NIH OPERA). Background and purpose of the pilot was reviewed. At this point, two DMS pilot templates, Alpha and Bravo, have been introduced for researchers to create their DMS plans with limited text entry for Alpha and more detailed prompts for Bravo. Feedback from researcher’s experiences using the pilot and other templates and IC colleagues on the quality of submitted DMS plans was gathered through surveys and town hall meetings. Preliminary observations from IC’s indicated the following common themes: applicants used OER DMS plan format page; sometimes provided unclear reasons for not sharing data, planned only to share through publication, conferences or by request; did not name an established repository, one that was a good fit or would not commit to using a repository at all; or did not provide a budget request or sufficient budgetary details. Plans that used any template or included tables or lists were more likely to meet NIH policy requirements. Preliminary results from the FDP DMS Pilot survey to researchers on the templates and DMPTool were reviewed. Discussion then shifted to plans for monitoring and oversight of DMS plans by institutions, with responsibilities lying with the research team, and concerns regarding the clarity and amount of information required at the proposal stage. The need for tools to improve budgeting was mentioned, and costing policies will be the focus of phase 2 of the pilot. DMS costs, including storage, personnel effort, and repository fees were mentioned with a focus on providing realistic and implementable plans and establishing resources for efficient tracking of compliance with open access and data sharing requirements. The group discussed the possibility of creating a central resource center for specialized staff and engaging audit or compliance offices. The need for prior approval for changes to data management plans and accurate assessment of time and effort required for various DMS activities was emphasized. An invitation to attendees was extended to identify DMS-related considerations in the chat; resulting dialogue was lively. The pilot team welcomed any questions or suggestions, particularly regarding how to capture personnel efforts and the budgeting process. For more information, see [NOT-OD-21-013](https://www.od.nih.gov/policy/od-notices/policy/notice_of_special_interest/NOT-OD-21-013.html), the NIH Scientific Data Sharing website, and the FDP NIH DMS Pilot website. For questions, contact [NIHDMPilot@thefdp.org](mailto:NIHDMPilot@thefdp.org).

**SciENcv and the Common Forms** – This session featured an overview of SciENcv’s current capabilities, recent updates, and future plans. For those who are not familiar, SciENcv is a tool that helps researchers create and manage biographical sketches and current and pending/other support documents for federal funding agencies. SciENcv reduces administrative burden by providing agency-specific formatting, leveraging existing data sources, and allowing users to copy and edit documents. Recent updates since October 2023 include a new interface for NSF documents, editable drop-down boxes for degrees and countries, a drag-and-drop feature for products, and an edit option for large author lists. Updates have also been made to NSF bio sketch and current and pending support documents to comply with the 2024 PAPPG and the requirements in the 2020 NDAA. SciENcv is working on adding more features and functionalities, such as a search function for products, a link to ORCID funding information, an API for institutional systems, and a listserv for users to receive updates and
notices. Users are encouraged to submit feedback and suggestions, as well as to participate in usability testing and workshops. For any technical issues, questions, or comments, users can contact SciENcv at NLMSciENcv@mail.nih.gov; there are also helpful resources and links on the SciENcv homepage and in the slides from this presentation.

**Wednesday, January 24, 2024, 11:00am-12:15pm EST**

**Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team** – This session was moderated by FACT Subcommittee member Mark Haselkorn. FACT partnered with the Open Government Research Administration Data Subcommittee (OG:RAD) and Research Systems Technologies Committee (RSTC) to bring this innovative and collaborative session. The session began with presenting a theory of burden, focusing on where burden comes from and who bears it. The theory assumes that burden is generated by change, it can be reduced by additional burden, and someone must bear the burden. The key entities in the theory model are government agencies, research administrators, and faculty. The session next provided a background on the research on burden, through both the work of the FACT and OG:RAD committees. The NSF October 2023 requirement to use SciENcv for bio sketches and current and pending support lists was used as a case study of increased burden. Discussion then shifted to the question of what should be done moving forward, notably the importance of having faculty and administrators involved with the government agencies upfront in the design, development, and deployment stages of new requirements, with distinct paths for faculty who have administrative support (such as at R1 institutions) and those that do not (such as at ERI and PUIs). Overall, this use case is just one example that represents a larger issue, and collaboration across the RSTC, FACT, OG:RAD will be crucial for FDP to continue addressing the issue of burden. For more information, members can contact the FACT Co-Chairs Steve Post and Suzanne Alstadt at FACT@thefdp.org and visit the FACT website.

**Expanded Clearinghouse** – Expanded Clearinghouse Co-chairs, Amanda Hamaker (Purdue University), Robert Prentiss (Yale University), and Jennifer Rodis (University of Wisconsin-Madison) provided an update on the Expanded Clearinghouse (EC), an FDP system that publishes on-line organizational profiles for use in lieu of subrecipient commitment forms, allows pass-through entities to utilize this publicly-available information when issuing subawards or monitoring subrecipient organizations, reduces burden at both proposal and award stages and is intended to replace unique pass-through entity letter of intent or commitment forms. Five new participating organizations were recently added bringing the total to 341 profiles as of 1/22/2024 (216 FDP members and 125 Non-members). Invitations to non-FDP members to participate will now be sent biannually instead of quarterly; next invitations will be sent in March and September 2024. An updated Profile Participation Agreement has been added to the FDP EC. Conflict of Interest fields were added to the EC 1/2023, and will be required to be completed effective 6/1/2024. FDP Expanded Clearinghouse system updates planned for mid-2024 (deferred from 1/2024) and will include: removal of the DUNS field; SAM expiration date auto-update; expansion to allow Australian and UK members subject to Single Audit or Program Audit (per Uniform Guidance); and invoicing contact for non-FDP members. Reminder that participating FDP EC organizations can authorize users with the following roles: profile editor (submits updates); authorized profile certifier (certifies updates); user manager (adds, removes, or modifies access for other users). There can be multiple profile editors and user managers, but only one authorized profile certifier. We strongly encourage the authorization of multiple profile editors and user managers and recommend that the authorized profile certifier is in a position to perform a timely and substantive review of profile updates. The Subrecipient Monitoring Tools Working Group reported that the Non-Single Audit Profile (NSAP) Pilot is coming soon with the aim of testing how much workloads are reduced by collecting information in one repository. Also, an updated Risk Assessment Questionnaire (RAQ) was identified by FDP member institutions as a priority for tools and improvement and will be available soon. The Federal Audit Clearinghouse is now operated by the General Services Administration and is located at fac.gov. The Department of Health and Human Services Office of the...
Inspector General published an audit report on 12/14/23; the National Institutes of Health did not receive 81 of 109 required audit reports for foreign grant recipients. Appendix B lists the foreign organizations subject to audit in 2019 and 2020. Did recipient organizations request and receive them from their subrecipients? Note that everyone would benefit from having an up-to-date list, as well as a public repository containing these audits.

Wednesday, January 24, 2024, 12:30pm-2:00pm EST
The Role of AI in Research Administration – Dr. Cansu Canca, Associate Research Professor, Experiential AI Institute at Northeastern University presented the session entitled “Integrating Ethics into AI Research Administration.” She began her discussion on AI and AI Ethics by defining AI as intelligent machines or agents that perceive their environments, function according to their perception, and take actions to maximize success. She explained that AI ethics aims to ensure that AI technologies, processes, and implementations are ethical, meaning that they protect autonomy, reduce harm, and ensure justice. She also discusses the challenges and opportunities of using AI in different domains, such as healthcare, law enforcement, education, and social media. Dr. Canca argued that AI research and research that includes AI needs to be conducted ethically, meaning that they need to follow the principles and guidelines of research ethics, such as respect for persons, beneficence, justice, and integrity. She also pointed out the limitations and gaps of the existing research ethics frameworks, such as the Belmont Report, and proposed a new approach based on AI ethics principles such as fairness, accountability, transparency, and explainability. She discussed a new tool called “The Box” which helps researchers and developers to identify and address the ethical issues of their AI systems throughout the innovation cycle. Dr. Canca suggested that AI can be used to assist and augment the research administration process, such as by providing automated reviews, recommendations, and feedback. However, she also cautioned that AI systems need to be carefully evaluated and monitored for their accuracy, reliability, and potential biases. She emphasized the need for communication and collaboration between the human and AI agents, as well as between the researchers and the research administrators. She concluded by highlighting the importance of policy and governance in ensuring the ethical use of AI in research and innovation.

Wednesday, January 24, 2024, 2:15pm-3:30pm EST
FFATA Survey – The session was presented by Stephanie Scott from Columbia University and Amanda Humphrey from Northeastern University, who were former co-chairs of the FDP Subawards Subcommittee. They shared the results of the FDP FFATA Workload Survey, which aimed to assess the administrative burden and data quality issues related to the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) reporting process for pass-through entities. They gave a brief overview of the FFATA reporting requirements, the FSRS system, and the USASpending.gov website, where the subaward data is made publicly available. They highlighted some of the challenges and inconsistencies that institutions face when filing FFATA reports, such as the lack of clear guidance, the variability in response times and quality of responses from the Federal Service Desk, the difficulty of reporting when awards are transferred between institutions, and the inability to correct key data points such as congressional districts. They also discussed some of the recent developments and implications of FFATA reporting, including a recent GAO report, GAO-24-106237: Federal Spending Transparency: Opportunities Exist to Improve COVID-19 and Other Grant Subaward Data on USAspending.gov. They concluded with some recommendations and possible next steps for engaging with federal partners, such as creating a centralized FFATA data dictionary, improving the training resources and support for both federal and institutional stakeholders, enhancing the system functionality and user interface of FSRS, and advocating for a more streamlined and accurate reporting process. A new FDP demonstration webpage contains the FDP FFATA Workload Survey Report and other resources at FDP FFATA Workload Survey.

Wednesday, January 24, 2024, 2:15pm-3:30pm EST
Emerging Research Institution: Primarily Undergraduate Institutions – This was a joint discussion on NSF’s new Responsible and Ethical Conduct in Research (RECR) training requirements, facilitated by ERI co-Chair Susan
Anderson (College of Charleston), featuring members of the Research Compliance Committee Andrew Paskevich (Penn Medicine) and Melissa Korf (Harvard Medical School). The presenters first provided an overview of NSF’s broader requirements for RECR training, now covering all grant personnel, that went into effect July 31, 2023, followed by a discussion of PUI/ERI challenges and solutions in meeting the requirements. Notable challenges included time restraints and burnout among predominantly teaching faculty and limited FTEs and specialization among research administrators in supporting ever-increasing compliance mandates. Emphasis was placed on the importance of instilling positive, supportive climates for faculty research when rolling out new requirements. To this end, PUI/ERI advantages included opportunities to build more personalized, trusting faculty relationships, as well as easier coordination for oversight of diverse compliance requirements, afforded by a leaner research administration structure. Possible strategies for meeting RECR requirements included partnering among institutions to leverage training resources; using flexible options such as Zoom; developing faculty credentialing opportunities as an incentive; engaging faculty in RECR training development/mentoring; and recognizing faculty contributions to research administration in promotion/tenure. The presenters explored opportunities for a future FDP working group to develop succinct RECR tools and resources for faculty. An NSF OIG outreach page, with case studies to help institution’s develop scenarios for training, was also shared. The session closed with a reminder to sign up for the ERI listserv from “Join Listservs” at https://thefdp.org.

Faculty Business Meeting – Discussion focused first on leadership opportunities for faculty reps within the FDP committee structure. Faculty Chair Michele Masucci discussed the committees (both operational and program committees) whose leadership was changing and roles faculty might play. Important committee transitions include Communications, Finance, Infrastructure, Membership, Emerging Research Institutions, Systems Tech, Research Administration and Compliance. There was also discussion regarding how to get faculty representatives to increase their engagement in FDP, the possible addition of new committees, and the need for others to be phased out. Potential new committees included Research Leadership, Publications, and Disciplinary Engagement. Another question raised was who has primary responsibility for ensuring that the federal agencies present information that is of interest to faculty? As an example, the NIH mentioned that they have totally revamped peer review categories but did not say any more about it. That is clearly important and of interest for applicants and reviewers and represents a discussion which we could have shared with faculty at our home institutions.

The next topic covered was the planning effort for the next Faculty Workload Survey. Michelle Masucci and Kelly Shaver are recruiting a new Faculty Workload Survey working group to advise on the development and implementation of the fourth Faculty Workload Survey. The aim is to organize a small group of faculty and administrators who have expertise in conflicts of interest and commitment, responsible conduct of research, data management, survey design, statistics and analytical techniques. This group will meet both virtually on a monthly basis this spring and in person during the May FDP meetings which will be held in Washington DC from May 22 - May 24, 2024. The working group will address retention or deletion of structure/content of the previous survey, identify new burdens that may need to be addressed in the next survey, create specific data and report deliverables, elicit proposals to implement the survey project and approve the final survey. Once the plan is in place, the group will monitor the effort of developing, implementing, and reporting survey outcomes. Finally, we all enjoyed the following comment from Mark Haselkorn regarding how to explain FDP to faculty researchers at home institutions: “While you’ve been busy being amazing faculty members, we’ve (FDP) been busy working to make it easier for you to be an amazing faculty member.”
Aubrey Schoenleben presented an update on behalf of the CUSP Initiative. CUSP, which stands for “Compliance Unit Standard Procedure”, is a project to create an online space where participating institutions can share standard procedures for animal research protocols. The project aims to reduce administrative burden, increase consistency, and enhance knowledge sharing among institutions that conduct animal research. The project has resumed development after a funding delay, is on track to pilot the site and open it to the FDP community in 2024. The working group has focused on community outreach and user guidance. Member institutions interested in participating in the CUSP pilot should start by lining up institutional buy-in, considering who will serve as institutional representatives, and reviewing the participation agreement.

All current committees and working groups presented a report out which in most cases summarized information presented during a particular session. For all other committee reports, please see the topic-based session summaries for the committee or working group.

FDP Meeting Adjourned