FDP Business Meeting

Michele Masucci – Temple University, Co-Chair
Alexandra Albinak – Johns Hopkins University, Co-Chair

September 20, 2021
Strategic Planning Phase VII

• Implemented organization-wide strategic planning process from 2018-2019

• Goals and Objectives Established for Phase VII
  1. Demonstrate positive impact on administrative efficiency and effectiveness
  2. Institutionalize evaluation to determine the relevance and impact of the FDP
  3. Strengthen resources and infrastructure to sustain FDP growth
  4. Actively engage community partners—administrators, faculty, and federal representatives
  5. Tell a powerful FDP story to internal and external audiences

• Overview of Activities to date
• Goal 1 – Discussion of new Definition of Demonstration – Alex Albinak and Michele Masucci
  • Compliance Unit Standard Procedure (CUSP)
• Goal 2 – Evaluation Working Group Activities to date – Robert Nobles
• Goal 3 – FDP Future – David Wright
  • Financial Update – Kim Moreland
  • Reimaging FDP Meetings – Miriam Campo and Ron Splittgerber
• Goal 4 - Engagement
  • Federal Engagement Working Group – Jim Luther and Maria Koszalka
  • Volunteer Engagement – Jason Carter, Michael Kusiak
  • eRA – Lori Schultz
• Goal 5 - Communication Strategic Planning Effort – Stephanie Scott
Administrative Support

- Searching for new administrative/program support
- Moving from 25% position to 100% position
- Help with general administrative support for the FDP (40%)
- Supporting committees/subcommittees/working groups (60%)
• FDP electronic systems have been created in silos
• Clear that FDP will be developing more systems inward/outward facing
• The working group is creating standards for all system development and will work to migrate all existing systems to those standards
• Need to integrate systems so to not duplicate effort and make maintenance more efficient
• Developing RFP to locate a technology company to work with the FDP on systems development and maintenance
ThoughtExchange

• ThoughtExchange is a tool to crowd source ideas (not survey tool)
• We have been using it on a test basis for some time and will be purchasing it soon
• We are developing a roll out plan that will include training for the core users of the tool
• Use the tool in conjunction with FDP groups to engage the membership to find common threads with which we can develop demonstrations
Meeting & Hotel Update

• We had hotel contracts for all meetings through 2025
• The Marriott Wardman Park Closed
• Currently two hotel contracts in place, Jan. 2022 & May 2023 (Mayflower Hotel)
• Working Group created to Reimagine FDP Meetings
  • Miriam Campo, Florida Atlantic University
  • Ron Splittgerber, Colorado State University
Personal & Institutional Profiles

• Reminder that the FDP web site hosts Personal & Institutional Profiles
• Please review your profile to make sure that it is up-to-date
• If you don’t have a profile, please create one (FDP members only)
• Official Administrative Reps, please make sure that your institutional profile is up-to-date.
• Profile Instructions are located at http://thefdp.org/default/assets/File/Documents/FDP%20Profile%20Maintenance%20-%20personal%20and%20institutional.docx
FDP Funding
A Report from the FDP Finance Committee
September 2021
Finance Committee Members

- Edwin Bemmel, University of Miami
- Doug Backman, University of Central Florida
- Gunta Liders, University of Rochester
- Tim Reuter, Stanford University
- David Robinson, Oregon Health & Sciences University
- Alex Albinak, Johns Hopkins University, ex officio
- Michele Masucci, Temple University, ex officio
- Susan Sauer Sloan, GUIRR, ex officio
- Kim Moreland, University of Wisconsin – Madison, co-Chair
Federal and Non-Federal Partners

Federal Agencies (10)

Institutions (217)*

*Member institutions increased from 154 to 217 with Phase VII
Sources of Funding

Federal Awards

Member Dues

Mtg. Fees, Clearinghouse

National Academies

FDP Foundation

FDP Foundation

FDP Operating Budget
• Created in 2009 to assist in the management of funds from member dues
• **No Federal agency involvement is allowed**
• Provides flexible funds to backstop Federal awards
• Allows spending without incurring indirect costs
• Excess funds are invested with the goal of accumulating 150% of annual operating budget
• Foundation Board includes FDP Chairs, Finance Committee Chair, 2 other FDP members plus FDP Executive Director (non-voting and *ex officio*)
FDP Foundation Board

- Michelle Masucci, President
- Alex Albinak, Vice President
- Kim Moreland, Treasurer
- Tim Reuter, Member-at-large
- Twila Reighley, Member-at-large
- David Wright, Exec. Director, *ex officio*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021 Budget Revenues</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Dues</td>
<td>$509,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Awards</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Fees</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearinghouse Fees</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,089,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>$288,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Ops</td>
<td>$48,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation-related Costs</td>
<td>$18,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Activities</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs (NAS)</td>
<td>$120,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$549,821</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2021 New Budgeted Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Cost Mitigation</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Initiatives</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Workload Survey Deposit</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$549,821</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2021 Expense Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,049,821</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Organization has grown in members by 40%
• Focus of FDP has expanded
• Strategic investments in the infrastructure are necessary – people and systems – to support:
  • Changes in how the organization functions
  • Development of electronic systems for members and non-members
  • Utilization of new communications approaches to tell the FDP story

Phase VII: Expanded Scope of FDP
Thanks!
Why was the RFM Working Group Established?

The RFM is a working group under the Program Committee. RFM was established to evaluate and redesign the FDP meeting format to best meet the goals of the organization.
Reimagining FDP Meeting (RFM) Working Group

RFM Goals:
• Reimagine the FDP Meetings
• Identify and encourage participants to join the RFM Working Group
• Survey the FDP membership to solicit input regarding meeting preferences
• Evaluate cost analysis of in-person vs. virtual meeting
Reimagining FDP Meeting (RFM) Working Group

RFM Committee Members:

Ron Splittgerber, Colorado State University
Miriam Campo, Florida Atlantic University
David Wright, Federal Demonstration Partnership
Lawson Culver, University of Tennessee Health Science Center
Ashley Whitaker, NOVA Southeastern University

RFM is seeking additional members to the Working Group. If you are interested in being part of this dynamic team, please email Ron or Miriam.
Please contact Miriam or Ron if you are interested in serving on the team.

Ron Splittgerber, Co-Chair
Colorado State University
ron.splittgerber@colostate.edu

Miriam Campo, Co-Chair
Florida Atlantic University
campom@fau.edu
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karen Bales</th>
<th>University of California, Davis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 Nickeson</td>
<td>University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elysse 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>
Federal Demonstration Partnership Evaluation Framework

Type of Evaluation
- Process
- Outcome
- Impact

Standards
- Utility
- Feasibility
- Propriety
- Accuracy

Engage Stakeholders
Describe the Program
Focus Evaluation Design
Gather Credible Evidence
Ensure Use and Share Lessons
Justify Conclusions

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Framework for program evaluation in public health. MMWR 1999;48 (No. RR-11)
Key Initial Questions of the Working Group
- What will be evaluated?
- What assessment information does FDP currently collect?
- What aspects of the program will be considered when judging program performance?
- What standards (i.e., type or level of performance) must be reached for the program to be considered successful?
- What evidence will be used to indicate how the program has performed?
- How will the lessons learned from the evaluation be used to improve FDP’s impact?
Initial 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?
- How many demonstration projects have been planned, implemented, and/or completed each year? During each phase of FDP?
- What activities or initiatives does FDP implement that targets or assists institutions serving underrepresented groups, including young investigators?

Next Steps:
- Evaluation Working Group Finalizing Draft Plan
- Evaluation Plan Stakeholder Feedback: Oct./Nov. 2021
# Federal Engagement Working Group (FEWG)

## Phase 1 – Planning Recommendations

**FEWG Members:** Jim Luther, Duke University, Co-Chair  
*Maria Koszalka*, National Science Foundation, Co-Chair  
Susan Sloan, Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable  
Jerry Cohen, University of Minnesota, Faculty Representative  
Susan Anderson, College of Charleston, Administrative Representative  
Cindy Hope, Georgia Institute of Technology, Administrative Representative  
Julie Thatcher, Institute for Systems Biology, Project Manager

**Federal Consultants:** Maria Koszalka, National Science Foundation  
Debbie Rafi, Office of Naval Research  
Michelle Bulls & Kristin Ta, National Institutes of Health
• **No clear process** for targeting, recruiting, engaging, and sustaining federal partnerships.

• Federal agency participation has become **increasingly inconsistent** over the past several years.

• 2018 Federal Summit: in part to reengage federal partners, which resulted in essential **guidance for incentivizing and enhancing** the value in federal participation.

• **Phase VII** planning process, in which Federal Engagement was identified as a **key priority**.
During Phase 1, the primary goal is to create guidelines and processes for thoughtful, strategic FDP mission-enhancing federal recruitment, onboarding and sustainable engagement. Specifically, the FEWG plans to:

- Define levels of federal participation (attend, update, working groups, co-chair)
- Develop guidance to identify appropriate and effective engagement at the agency level
- Develop guidance to identify appropriate and effective engagement for individuals within an agency
- Develop guidance for strategic federal recruitment
- Develop process to on-board federal participants (both agency and individual)
- Develop mechanisms to sustain engagement throughout Phase VII
- Draft FEWG Phase 2: Implementation
- Consider federal agencies and/or individuals to pilot new guidance
Considerations & Challenges:

• FDP is **larger and more complex** than at its inception. Used to work with consistent key players.

• Number of admin reps has grown exponentially and **federal resources remain limited**.

• Each agency has internal mandates, priorities and budget, so **prioritizing FDP participation is difficult**.

• Agencies experience internal evolution of systems, processes, etc. and **may be focusing within**.
Suggestions:

• Be strategic about engagement because time and attention are limited resources.

• Solicit agencies for their “current topics” rather than from an FDP organizational framework to maximize agency investment and garner participation approval.

• Ensure that broad agency input is solicited early and often; consider when and how to deploy demonstrations.
1. Create **Federal Liaisons** that check in at least quarterly to solicit federal needs, initiatives, concerns, etc.

2. Seek opportunities to create "**pop-up** listening groups" for any current Fed initiatives.

3. Provide **Agency Update Templates** and create Agency **Webpage(s)**.

4. **Consider levels** of Federal Engagement (e.g. “Member” vs “Affiliate” or “Visitor”)

5. **Continue to evaluate opportunities** to seek meaningful engagement, including working groups, committee participation, formal demonstrations, etc.
FEWG: Next Steps

• Continue vetting with agency partners, as needed
• Present and discuss with Faculty Group(s)
• Present highlights/plan at September 2021 FDP Meeting
• Develop Phase 2 Implementation Plan
• Execute
FDP Volunteer Engagement & Nominating Working Group Survey

Jason R. Carter, Montana State University (Faculty)
Michael J. Kusiak, University of California System (Admin)
The Volunteer Engagement and Nominating Working Group will work to enhance broad participation of the FDP membership. It will promote broad participation by:

• Identifying qualified candidates for potential placement on programmatic and operational committees and working groups.

• Developing and maintaining current descriptions for co-chairs and members of committees and working groups in light of the FDP committee charges, determines reasonable estimated time commitments and identifies eligibility requirements.

• Recruiting, screening, and interviewing candidates for placement in leadership and membership and maintain a list of eligible candidates for future opportunities.

• Working with committees and work groups to develop standard practices in how individuals are included in committee and work group activities.
Overview and Response Rate

• Survey sent to chairs/co-chairs of all committees, subcommittees, working groups to collect data on recruiting and engaging volunteers/leadership.
  • Survey questions focused on size of groups, how often they meet, how members and leaders are selected/rotate (including diversity indicators).

• 82% response rate to survey
  • 92 surveys sent out; 76 responses received.
  • 59 unique individuals provided due to multiple committee duties.

• Responses were received that covered every committee, subcommittee, and working group.
Size of Group

- Widely variable, ranging from 2 (i.e., working groups) to 60 (Compliance and Animal Care).

- When asked “What would be the ideal committee size?” it rarely matched current size, but was split between if group should be larger or smaller.
  
  - 39 of 76 respondents (51.3%) suggested a number/range between 10-20 members, with 10-12 and 12-15 as commonly listed ranges.
  
  - There were several with much larger expectations (i.e., 20-25 range), likely due to needs.
    
    - *Unclear how some committees/subcommittees/working groups differentiate the membership vs. leadership responsibilities.*
How often do groups meet?

- Data about how often groups meeting at FDP’s three yearly meetings was incomplete. However, it appeared that most groups regularly meet at an FDP at least once if not more per times per year.

- 64 of 76 respondents (84.2%) reported that their group met outside of regular FDP meetings.
  - Most frequent interval was bi-weekly; others “as needed”
Leadership and Membership Rotation

• 70 of the 76 respondents (92.1%) reported that there was no regular rotation of leadership.

• 42 of the 76 respondents (55.2%) were in favor of developing some FDP-wide parameters/recommendations for appointing members/leadership.

Open Comments Section: “Having standards around this will allow a nice balance between longevity and historical knowledge and bringing in new ideas and people.”
We asked if groups currently take into account the following diversity measures:

- Institutional diversity (i.e., Emerging Research Institutions, R1 institutions, public/private, etc.)
- FDP rep designation diversity (i.e., Faculty, Admin, Technical)
- Gender diversity
- Geographic diversity
- Ethnic/racial diversity

* We emphasized to respondents that this inquiry was designed to be “educative” in nature, and not intended to compare or shame certain groups. As such, we encouraged “honest” answers on current practices.
Diversity Responses

Of the 76 responses to the diversity question:
• 11 yes responses for institutional diversity (14.5%)
• 24 yes responses to FDP representative diversity (31.6%)
• 8 yes responses for gender diversity (10.5%)
• 19 yes response to geographic diversity (25%)
• 9 yes responses for ethnic/racial diversity (11.8%)
“Generally speaking, we take anyone who is interested in helping. For my subcommittee, I have not been responsible for any of the recruitment.”

“The committee does take into account DE&I when recruiting new members. The acceptance of every individual's differences helps us make the best choices for our committee that will benefit the FDP organization.”
“For some of the phases of the working group effort, we only received two volunteers, which makes it difficult to fully consider diversity in appointing members. But, we are making a good faith effort to ensure that anyone who has expressed interest in the working group project is aware of all opportunities to participate.”

“We want to be sure we are thinking about institutional needs from a range of subrecipient and PTE organizations, so good representation is critical. We also think about how we can bolster other facets of diversity when recruiting for working group leads.”
Other General Feedback from Respondents

• Multiple comments about a better website and organizational administrative support. – *Work In Progress*

• Another theme was continued improvements to the onboarding and orientation process.
  
  • “There needs to be better onboarding and orientation for new general FDP members, plus a standard onboarding for working group members. Committees should have initiative-based charters, or at least the charge to be initiative driven. General Members should have good profiles of Knowledge/Skills/Abilities they are willing to contribute to group initiatives. If not a link to their LinkedIn profile. This would make it easier to recruit members.”
Summary

• Groups have various practices in how they organize their membership and how often they meet. Some heterogeneity is likely needed and beneficial, but over half of respondents thought some FDP-wide guidance would be helpful.

• Survey respondents observed challenges with sustained volunteer engagement.

• While some groups have or are developing procedures for selecting membership, many are open to all interested and/or feature self-selection with limited guidelines for ensuring diversity.
Preliminary Recommendations

• **Recommendation 1.** Have each committee/subcommittee working group formally establish a preferred committee size (e.g., 12-15, 20-25, etc.) that best fits their unique needs.

• **Recommendation 2.** For larger committees (i.e., 20-60), ensure there is a process for how leadership roles function and are established.

• **Recommendation 3.** Require all each committee/subcommittee working group to establish a regular rotation for the group (or leadership roles of the group) that allows for balance of new members and continuity.
  
  • Example. For a committee with target size of 15, have three-year terms (renewable once) that rotate 1/3 of the committee at the May FDP meeting.
  
  • Example. For a committee with target size of 50, have five-year terms for a small leadership team of five (including chair/co-chair) that will rotate one person per year.
Preliminary Recommendations

**Recommendation 4.** Encourage each committee/subcommittee working group to strive for membership diversity as valued by FDP (i.e., institutional size, representative designation, gender, ethnicity/race, geographical distribution), with acknowledgement that flexibility is necessary and there is no one-size-fits-all approach.

**Recommendation 5.** Encourage each committee/subcommittee working group to meet regularly outside of the three FDP meetings at intervals that make sense for given group needs and activities.
• **Recommendation 6.** Regularly visit the committees/subcommittees working groups to ensure efficiencies, and be prepared to sunset, merge or elevate working groups.
  
  • **Example.** There are some redundancies between this Volunteer Engagement and Nominating WG effort and aspects of both the Membership Committee and the evolving Infrastructure Committee. We recommend this WG be dissolved and incorporated into one of those efforts.

• **Recommendation 7.** Institutionalize FDP organizational efforts and infrastructure (e.g., professional staff) to assist with various committees, subcommittee working group activities and organization.
FDP Communication Committee

Stephanie Scott, Columbia University
FDP Communications Chair
communications@thefdp.org
Our work includes, but is not limited to:

- Developing and maintain an overall communication and outreach plan for FDP.
- Set up style guidelines
- Providing oversight and direction of the FDP web site.
- Editing and approving publications that will have broad viewership.
- Compiling and disseminating high-level meeting summaries.
- Marketing & Outreach
Committee Workgroups & Initiatives
Leads

- FDP Communications Strategic Plan – Stephanie Scott & Jennifer Taylor
- Faculty Liaison – George Uetz
- Session Summaries – Ben Mull & Jeff Petsis
- Marketing & Outreach - Barb Gardner & Sarah White
- Policies, Style Guidance – Csilla Csaplar & Tolise Dailey
- Website – Rasha Abed & Jamie Sprague
- Infrastructure Committee Liaisons/Project Mgt Tools & Support – Mora Harris with Denise Moody
Tell a powerful FDP story to internal and external audiences

- Develop targeted communications directed at federal agencies that explains why they should initiate or increase their involvement in FDP and how involvement will benefit them.

- Increase participation on the Communications Committee.

How?

- 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.)
To accomplish over next year

- Communications Strategic Plan
- Develop new website

- Contact communications@thefdp.org
eRA Committee Restart & Refresh

BACK TO THE 90'S

Quick Links:
- Help for Proposal Preparation
- Frequently Asked Questions About FastLane Proposal Preparation
- Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide
- Deadlines and Target Dates
- Cloud Fills to PDF

Principal Investigator (PI)/Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI) Management
What Do You Want To Work On?

Proposal Functions
- Award And Reporting Functions

Internal Science Foundation
400 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 100, Arlington, VA 22203
Phone: 703-292-3363
Fax: 703-292-3367
Email: info@irsf.org
Web: www.irsf.org

Last Updated: Nov 2001 (CR)
So much has changed....

• Research administrators don’t need the same level of support on a new “electronic” system as they did when we first started

• FDP has many new institutional members – how do we leverage their willingness & expertise?

• Research Administration technology is about system design, data interoperability and integration of systems wherever possible
eRA Strategy Sessions

• 5 facilitated sessions in August/September to:
  • Hold on to what works
  • Let go of what doesn’t
  • Reframe our purpose & mission
  • Re-evaluate & reinvigorate membership
• A new name: Research Systems Technologies Committee (RTSC)
• A new purpose:
  • Advocate for, optimize, and integrate technology solutions across the full lifecycle of the research enterprise
  • What we do: standards, best practices, quantify impacts of proposed regulatory changes to systems, conduct demonstrations
• A new commitment to ensure membership reflects the diversity of FDP institutions
• Final session was on Friday, September 24
• Review & consume output from facilitator
• Define committee structure & membership going forward
• Define priority project(s) for 2021-22
• Engage FDP volunteer community
CUSP Project

- **Goal**: Create an online repository where participating institutions can share standard procedures used in animal care protocols.
- **A burden reducing initiative of the 21st Century Cures Act**
CUSP Project

**Education & Outreach**
Michelle Brot & Scott Bury

**Help Desk**
Elaine Kim & April Ripka

**Quality Control**
Eva McGhee & Cyndi Rosenblatt

**Technical Systems**
Mark Hnath

**Federal Partners**
- OLAW: Axel Wolff, Neera Gopee
- USDA: Carol Clarke
- VA: Alice Huang, Marissa Wolfe

**Steering Committee & Working Group**
- 62 participating institutions
- >100 individuals who have contributed to the project

**Overall Project Direction & Oversight:** Aubrey Schoenleben & Sally Thompson-Iritani
CUSP Project

Learn more at our session on 9/23 @ 11am!

- Build and testing of Beta site completed May 2021
- Transition to more modern technology stack in progress!
- Testing of new site to begin October 2021