

FDP - Steering Committee - June 11, 1996

I. Overview of Committee of the Whole Meeting

On June 10 and 11 the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable hosted the kickoff session for "FDP III," so named in recognition that this is the second expansion—and so third phase—of this initiative, which began in 1985 as the Florida Demonstration Project. (See Attachment A for Meeting Agenda. See Attachment B for the Origins of the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable and the Federal Demonstration Project.) Joining the 45 academic institutions and the ten federal agencies that constituted the membership of FDP II were 20 additional research institutions, one new federal agency, and five professional associations that make up a new class of participants called "Affiliate Members."

The meeting, attended by roughly 200 participants, was characterized by a new level of enthusiasm and creative thinking. While the original purpose of the FDP was to free investigators from unnecessary paperwork, and so ensure greater scientific value for the public's investment in research, few faculty members remained active in this initiative in recent years. Requirements for membership in FDP III included designation of both an administrative and a faculty representative for each academic or research institution, and more than 25 investigators attended this first meeting. Additionally, Dr. Harold Varmus and Dr. Neal Lane both participated in this christening event, challenging the group to think boldly and to present results of their work to the Fundamental Science Committee of the President's National Science and Technology Council, which—together with Dr. Ernie Moniz—they co-chair.

Numerous original suggestions streamlining federal research grants and grants administration were presented during the meeting, and task forces were appointed to develop some of these ideas into proposals for actual demonstrations. The Steering Committee will convene next September to select the best of these for implementation. The high spirit of energy and enthusiasm that pervaded the meeting was reflected in the group's decision to change the name of the FDP from the Federal Demonstration Project to the Federal Demonstration Partnership.

II. Final Meeting of the FDP Phase II Steering Committee

Earl Friese and Allison Rosenberg (members of the FDP Executive Committee) called to order the final meeting of the Phase II Steering Committee. The meeting was attended by members of the Committee of the Whole as well as other invited guests.

1. Selection of the Phase III Steering Committee

The Committee on Membership and Organizational Structure distributed a "strawman" Steering Committee for the FDP membership to consider. (See Attachment C.) Several clarifications were made to the list: the University of North Carolina represents the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,

and the University of California represents the University of California System. Representatives from the University of Hawaii indicated that they did not wish to serve on the Steering Committee. Columbia University was given a spot on the Steering Committee in place of Hawaii. With no representative present from Florida International University, Kent State was asked to fill a slot on the Steering Committee. All other institutions listed on the hand-out expressed a willingness to serve on the Steering Committee. The membership unanimously elected these institutions to serve as the Steering Committee for Phase III of the FDP.

2. Selection of the Executive Committee

Next, the membership turned its attention to the election of a new executive committee. Under the terms of Phase III membership and organization, the executive committee is comprised of two university representatives, two federal agency representatives, one senior science official, and one staff member from the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable. Previous to the meeting, Dr. Karl Erb, senior science advisor to the Director of NSF, was asked to serve as the senior official, and Anne-Marie Mazza, program officer at GUIRR, was asked to fill the Roundtable slot. After caucusing, the Agency officials nominated Dr. Judith Greenberg, NIH, and Charles Paoletti, ONR, to fill the two Federal Agency slots. Barbara Siegel, Northwestern University, and Mary Ellen Sheridan, University of Chicago, were nominated for the university administrator slot, and John Walsh, Dartmouth; Ed Bresnick, University of Massachusetts Medical Center; and Tony Starace, University of Nebraska were nominated for the university principal investigator slot. The university members elected Barbara Siegel and John Walsh.

3. Article 35, FDP Terms and Conditions

Ann Stuart and Jean Feldman placed before the membership a proposed new article, #35, to the FDP Terms and Conditions. (See Attachment D.) There was much discussion and disagreement over the proposed article, specifically over item b. Some Agency officials felt that one could read item b to mean that the FDP was going to decide Agency policy, accepting or rejecting an Agency change. The Terms and Conditions Task Force was asked to rewrite Article 35, and to present a new version to the Steering Committee at the upcoming September meeting.

4. Membership for the University of Western Washington

Prior to the June meeting, and after the March deadline for new members, an official from the University of Western Washington had inquired about membership in the FDP. The Membership and Organization Committee suggested that the university representative attend the June meeting, and that the Steering Committee consider Western Washington's request for membership. After much deliberation, the following motion was offered:

If the University of Western Washington submits a proposal within one week from today (June 11), and if this proposal meets the criteria specified in the February solicitation, the FDP will extend membership to the University of Western Washington. This will officially close the application process for Phase III.

The motion was seconded. A vote was taken, and the motion failed. The Membership and Organizational Task Force was asked to formalize a policy for future applicants.

5. Conclusion of Phase II

With all business completed, the Executive Committee concluded the second phase of the Federal Demonstration Project. The membership extended their gratitude and appreciation to Earl Friese, Allison Rosenberg, and Chuck Paoletti for their dedication and hardwork as members of the Executive Committee.

Return to [Meeting Minutes Page](#)

Return to the [FDP Home Page](#)

Send all suggestions, comments and questions about this Website to [John C. Pezzullo](#).

Send all questions about the FDP to [Barb Siegel](#).

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).

This page was last updated on 12/06/96.

FDP - Steering Committee - September 20, 1996

I. Welcome

Barbara Siegel, chair of the Executive Committee, along with the other members of the Executive Committee (Karl Erb, Chuck Paoletti, John Walsh, Judith Greenberg, and Anne-Marie Mazza) welcomed members to the Fall Steering Committee Meeting.

Siegel reminded members that each institution has two votes. Universities with more than two members in the FDP need to designate their Steering Committee representatives. This information should be provided to Wanda London at wlonson@nas.edu.

II. CFS Briefing on the FDP

Members were provided an overview of the June FDP briefing before the Committee on Fundamental Science (CFS), along with a letter from Dr. Moniz, OSTP, to the Roundtable requesting additional information, and the Roundtable's letter responding to Dr. Moniz's request. (See Attachments A and B.) Members attending and participating in the briefing included Karl Erb, Chuck Paoletti, Bob Hardy, Geoff Grant, Bill Raub, Allison Rosenberg, and Anne-Marie Mazza. Erb, Paoletti, Hardy, Grant, and Mazza gave their impressions of the meeting each stressing that the members of the CFS, which is co-chaired by Drs. Moniz, Varmus, and Lane, are very interested in the work of the FDP and are looking forward to innovative demonstrations developing during Phase III. Cliff Gabriel, Deputy to Associate Director Moniz, stated that they hoped to make this relationship a two-way street, with the FDP bringing forward new pilots and the CFS proposing specific tasks for FDP consideration. Gabriel stated that the CFS and OSTP are looking forward to cementing this new relationship and looking for achievable accomplishments. (See Attachment C for the names of the members of the Committee on Fundamental Science.)

III. Report of the Membership Committee

The Membership Committee, chaired by Bob Hardy and Jack Lowe, reported on five issues the Executive Committee had requested them to consider: Reopening Membership; Characteristics of Affiliate Members; Steering Committee Rotation; Committee of the Whole Meetings; and Terms for Members of the Executive Committee. (See Attachment D.)

1. **Reopening Membership:** The Committee recommended closing membership for Phase III. The Committee will monitor member participation and review the activity of each member at periodic intervals. The Committee will advise the Steering Committee of those members who do not participate actively with the intent of terminating these members. In this event, new members would be sought to fill the open slots.

2. **Characteristics of Affiliate Members:** The Committee recommended limiting affiliate membership to organizations acting in a representative capacity for non-profit professional groups, organizations or associations of individuals in science and engineering. Affiliate membership status is primarily informational in nature. Affiliate members may participate, in a non-voting status, in FDP meetings and on FDP task forces. Requests for affiliate member status can be initiated by formal letter at any time.
3. **Steering Committee Rotation:** The Membership Committee will nominate institutions for Steering Committee rotation. A strawman will be distributed at the December Committee of the Whole Meeting indicating rotation for the remainder of Phase III. Institutions wishing to switch their period of assignment can make such arrangements on a individual basis with comparable institutions.
4. **Committee of the Whole Meetings:** The Committee recommended two Committee of the Whole meetings, held in June and December, with the June meeting hosted by the Roundtable and the December meeting hosted by a member institution or agency. The Committee noted that early December typically does not conflict with other scheduled meetings, and that the Federal agencies may have more travel money available to participate in December meetings located outside of Washington. The Committee recommended that during the Committee of the Whole Meetings, the Steering Committee convene on the morning of the first day with the afternoon reserved for meetings of task forces and committees. The second day should be devoted to the Committee of the Whole Meeting, with the task forces and committees reporting-out to the Committee of the Whole.
5. **Terms for Members of the Executive Committee:** The Committee recommended that members of the Executive Committee serve two-year terms, with elections occurring in alternate years during the June Committee of the Whole Meeting. The Committee recommended that the full membership vote for both the institutional and the agency representatives. In the event of a vacancy, the Steering Committee would fill the seat.

A vote was taken on each of the five recommendations proposed by the Membership Committee. The members of the Steering Committee accepted all five recommendations.

The Executive Committee applauded the efforts of the Committee which includes Doris Lyons, Ed Miller, Geoff Grant, Jim Lewis, John Kavanagh, Jilda Garton, David Slusher, Ann Datko, and Jean Morrow, in addition to the co-chairs, Hardy and Lowe.

IV. Terms and Conditions Committee

Kathleen Hargett provided members with a revised Article 35, Changes to Terms and Conditions. (See Attachment E.) University representatives were troubled by paragraph b, specifically the language, "Notwithstanding this review and recommendation, the federal agency proposing the change retains the right to make the change if it determines it is in the best interest of the Government." Hargett agreed to have the Terms and Conditions Committee reconsider the wording of paragraph 35.b. and provide members with new language prior to the December Committee of the Whole Meeting. Members include: Ann Stuart, Jean Feldman, John Showman, Susan Hill, Carolyn Austin-Diggs, Cherry Seckinger, Dan Shackelford, Harry Haraldsen, Jean Morrow, Melanie Krizmanich, Richard Kall, and Larry Travis.

Hargett distributed the Department of the Army's Agency Specific Requirements. (See Attachment F.)

V. New Task Forces

1. Staff Support for the FDP

Jean Morrow discussed the idea of establishing a staff position at the National Academy of Sciences to provide support to the FDP in "designing, developing, monitoring and terminating pilot demonstrations." The duties and terms of employment remain to be developed by the members of this Task Force which includes Bob Hardy, Geoff Grant, Brad Stanford, and Chuck Paoletti. There was quite a bit of discussion over whether the staff person would be full-time and whether the responsibilities would be limited to electronic commerce initiatives.

The Executive Committee asked the Steering Committee if they were in favor of having the Task Force, along with the Executive Committee, consider the issue of additional staff support in the area of electronic commerce. The Steering Committee voted in the affirmative. The Task Force and the Executive Committee will convene a conference call to define possible models for this staff position.

Morrow proposed that the Steering Committee abolish the Electronic Commerce Committee as so many of the new task forces will be covering issues that overlap with electronic commerce. Instead of abolishing the EEC, the Executive Committee decided to accept oversight responsibility for the Electronic Commerce Committee, pending the outcome of additional FDP staff support.

2. Internal Communications

Nancy Wilkinson distributed a list of the various listservs developed for the Committee of the Whole, the Executive Committee and the various committees and task forces. (See Attachment G.) The Task Force recommended restricting the FDP listserv FDP members and affiliate members, only. The Steering Committee accepted this recommendation. Georgetown University is developing a home page for the FDP that will be linked to the FDP sites on the home pages of both the National Science Foundation and the National Academy of Sciences.

The Executive Committee thanked Nancy for the fine work her group and the folks at Emory have done to bring electronic communications to the FDP. Members include: Joanne Treat, Wanda London, Jean Feldman, Linda Meadows, and John Pezzullo.

3. Institutional Profiles

This Task Force, co-chaired by Jack Lowe and Diane Jaeger, intends to design and test a standard set of data for institutional profiles, to identify where and how the data set will be filed, and to determine who will be responsible for maintaining the data set. Members include: Ann Datko, Brad Stanford, Julie Norris, Elaine Simmonds, Gerry Stuck, Connie Whitley, Nancy Wray, and Jean Morrow.

4. Electronic Notification of Awards

Jilda Garton and Carolyn Austin-Diggs co-chair this Task Force which will identify models of electronic award notification, describe the key factors necessary for success, and identify the risks and benefits associated with each model. Members include: Doug Backman, Jack Lowe, Mareda Weiss, Pam Johnson, Marcia Smith, Pam Webb, Kathleen Hargett, and George Stone. (See Attachment H.)

5. Contracts

Mareda Weiss, co-chair, sent an e-mail survey to all FDP members asking them about their experience with contracts. (See Attachment I.) Institutional representatives were asked to provide their comments to Weiss as soon as possible. Members include: Jean Feldman, James Taylor, David Slusher, and Mary Armstead.

6. Common Form for Biosketches, Reps and Certs

Ann Wilks-Penrod, co-chair with Jean Feldman, distributed a workplan for this task force which intends to develop common form electronic application pages for biographical sketches and certifications. (See Attachment J.) Members include: Earl Friese, John Kavanaugh, Guy Mittleman, Cathy Thurman, and Joann Treat.

7. Minimal Proposal/Just-in-Time

Linda Meadows will co-chair this Task Force along with a representative from NIH. This group will define the essential elements needed to assess the adequacy and appropriateness of a grant proposal. Members include: Jean Vorhaben, Marilyn Cornwell, Sandy Mann, Chris Haufler, Tom Jones, Joann Treat, Ed Bresnick, Jean Morrow, Lee Kaplan, and Janet Cuca.

8. Basic Assistance Award

Joanne Cahill and Ann Stuart are co-chairs along with Bob Hardy and David Slusher. This group will consider developing a grant mechanism that provides a level of support based upon a program of work rather than a specific project. Members include Olivia Pope, Larry Travis, Ann Wilks-Penrod, Bob Hardy, David Slusher, Dave Mears, Cherlyn Seckinger, Jerry Fife, Marilyn Surbey, Lee Kaplan, James Lewis, Earl Freise, John Showman, James Taylor, Harry Haraldsen, Douglas Backman, and Linda Engel.

9. Effort Reporting

Jerry Fife and Sam Silverstein, co-chairs, reported on their recent visit with staff from OMB indicating that no one is satisfied with the current system. They will work with their Task Force to redefine the current effort reporting system so that it is less burdensome, more accurate, and more accountable. Members include: Marilyn Surbey, Sarah Wasserman, Lennie Carter, Nancy Wray, Joann Cahill, John Fini, Ed Bresnick, Paul Parker, and Pat Winters.

10. Monitoring Subrecipients

Dave Mears, co-chair with Sarah Wasserman, discussed the monitoring requirement of A-133. He indicated that OMB has fixed this requirement so that the primary recipient relies on the subrecipient to submit audit reports. Subrecipients must submit only if an A-133 audit identifies findings on the prime subaward.

11. Cost of Unfunded Mandates

This issued was tabled until further notice.

12. Access to Surplus Equipment

The Steering Committee created a new task force to consider issues associated with gaining access to surplus equipment. ONR will identify a co-chair. Tony Merritt, John Walsh, and Jane Youngers volunteered to serve on this task force.

VI. December Meeting of the Steering Committee and Committee of the Whole

Georgetown University will host the December meetings of the Steering Committee and the Committee of the Whole on December 12 and 13. The cost of the two day meeting is \$90. A notice of the meeting will go out in late October.

The Steering Committee formed a planning group including Linda Meadows, Ann Datko, Jilda Garton, Carolyn Austin-Diggs, and members of the Executive Committee. A conference call will be scheduled in October.

Return to [Meeting Minutes Page](#)

Return to the [FDP Home Page](#)

Send all suggestions, comments and questions about this Website to [John C. Pezzullo](#).

Send all questions about the FDP to [Barb Siegel](#).

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).

This page was last updated on 12/06/96.

FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP

December 12th , 1996 Steering Committee Meeting

I. Welcome

Barb Siegel, chair of the Executive Committee, welcomed FDP members to the December meeting of the Steering Committee. Siegel expressed the appreciation of the membership to Doris Lyons and her staff at Georgetown University for hosting the Steering Committee Meeting and the Committee of the Whole Meeting.

II. Terms and Conditions

Ann Stuart, co-chair of the Terms and Conditions Task Force, presented the Steering Committee with a revised Article 35. Concerns had been expressed by the FDP research institutions over article 35.b., as the universities wanted to ensure that the federal agencies would consider and review suggestions and recommendations put forth by the community regarding any proposed changes to the Terms and Conditions. Members were pleased with the revisions and voted unanimously to approve Article 35.

III. FDP Staffing

Bob Hardy and Geoff Grant briefed the Committee on their task force report, "Coordination of Electronic Research Administration Thru the Federal Demonstration Partnership." A key change in the report is the recommendation that funding for the new position come from the FDP federal agency members only. While the formal terms of employment have not been finalized, it is assumed that the position would fit into the GUIRR structure and the individual filling the position would report to the chair of the Executive Committee. Members of the Task Force were asked to develop further the employment terms and qualifications. The Steering Committee accepted the Task Force report and recommendations.

IV. Proposed Demonstration

Gil Brown of Georgetown University put forth a proposal, "Maximizing the Indirect Costs to Benefit the Academic Research Mission," for Steering Committee consideration. After discussion and debate, a vote was taken on establishing a task force to develop the Brown proposal into a demonstration. The members opposed establishing a task force.

V. Selection of a Host Institution for the 1997 December Committee of the Whole Meeting

Jane Youngers from the University of Houston Health Science Center at San Antonio volunteered to host the 1997 December Committee of the Whole Meeting. The other Texas institutions will assist her in this effort. The meeting is scheduled for December 4-5.

VI. Committee of the Whole

The Committee of the Whole met on the afternoon of December 12th and all day on December 13th. Formal minutes are not kept of the Committee of the Whole Meetings. Included with these Steering Committee minutes are copies of the slides used by Bill Kirby in his presentation on the cost of submissions, as well as hand-outs distributed during the reporting of each of the task forces and committees.

Return to the [Steering Committee Page](#) or to the [FDP Home Page](#)

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).

This page was last updated on 05/22/97.

FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP

March 7th , 1997 Steering Committee Meeting

I. Welcome: FDP Executive Committee

Barbara Siegel, and members of the Executive Committee---Chuck Paoletti, John Walsh, Judith Greenberg, and Anne-Marie Mazza---welcomed members to the Spring FDP Steering Committee Meeting. (Karl Erb was unable to attend.)

II. Briefing on the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) - Implications for Federal Research Agencies and University Research

The Steering Committee benefited from a very interesting discussion on the Government Performance and Results Act provided by Robin Nazzaro, GAO; John Uzzell, NIH; Judy Sunley, NSF; and Irwin Feller, Penn State. In 1993, Congress enacted the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) to encourage greater efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability in federal programs and spending.

GPRA requires all agencies to set goals and to use performance measures for management and ultimately, for budgeting. Since the enactment of GPRA, federal agencies have been developing a variety of procedures to comply with the Act. Some agencies also have participated in pilot projects. During Spring 1997, the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) will report to Congress on agency readiness for implementation and may recommend changes in the statute. By September 1997, all agencies must provide Congress with their strategic goals and plans in the GPRA framework.

Concern has arisen over finding an effective approach to quantitative performance goals and indicators. In the case of research, what can be measured quantitatively may not provide a complete picture of a program. Qualitative measures are needed also. Moreover, important outcomes usually do not appear until years after initial funding. In order to properly evaluate the outcomes of research, annual performance planning and reporting must build in recognition of the importance of a range of important time horizons.

Members of the Steering Committee participated in a very lively discussion with many questions raised: Will only the least speculative research receive funding? Will there be room for creative, novel projects? What methods will be used to measure the outcomes of an individual program, as compared to a set of initiatives, each with a degree of risk of failure?

III. FDP Staff Support: Bob Hardy & Geoff Grant

Bob Hardy and Geoff Grant provided the Steering Committee with a position description for the FDP Coordinator of Electronic Research Administration. The FDP Staff Task Force will be working with agency representatives to secure approval and support from each of the FDP member agencies.

The Task Force also provided a proposal to locate the Coordinator at Logistics Management Institute, as

well as a proposal to develop a memorandum of understanding for commercial contractors to participate in open meetings of the FDP. The Executive Committee referred proposal #2 to the Membership Committee, asking this committee to re-evaluate the cost/benefit of formalizing a relationship with commercial organizations that are involved in initiatives that are of particular interest to FDP, such as electronic research administration. Questions such as access to the listserv, membership on task groups, mechanisms to regularize participation, comfort level of the NAS, and maintenance of the neutrality of our partnership should be considered. While the FDP does not want to become a marketplace for software vendors or consulting firms, these organizations are currently involved and will continue to play a role in ERA and other initiatives that are of interest to the FDP.

IV. Protocol for Introducing Proposals: Executive Committee

The Executive Committee distributed new procedures for proposing demonstrations. Several suggestions were made to improve these procedures, including adding information regarding the aim and benefit of the proposal, the number of institutions and agencies expected to participate in the demonstration, and the criteria for accepting a proposal. A revised protocol will be distributed at the June meeting.

V. Invitation to FDP Institutions to Participate in NSF's Fastlane: Gerry Glaser

Gerry Glaser, NSF, encouraged all FDP institutions to participate in, and help set the direction of, NSF's Fastlane project. NSF is sponsoring regional meetings to introduce PI's to Fastlane. Glaser encouraged members to contact him at gglaser@nsf.gov, if they are interested in participating in Fastlane, or have questions regarding this project.

VI. Task Force Reports

Several of the task forces provided updates on their activities.

VII. Miscellaneous

Report on Stresses Convocation...

Russ Lea and Geoff Grant reported on the recent National Science Board/Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable Stresses Convocation held in Washington in late February. This meeting highlighted the results of a survey NSB/GUIRR conducted of twenty-five universities which asked these institutions to identify current stresses on campus. Among the many issues identified were: mixed messages coming from granting agencies, lack of public understanding of the role of research in the overall mission of the university, conflict between research and education, and impact of information technology on the academic community.

Selection of Planning Committee for June Committee of the Whole Meeting...

Several members (Barbara Pifel, Jilda Garton, Ann Datko, and Linda Meadows) volunteered to work with the Executive Committee on the June 17-18 Committee of the Whole meeting. This meeting will be held at the National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.

Update on December meeting...

Jane Youngers reported that she reserved rooms at the Hyatt on the Riverwalk in San Antonio for the December 4-5 Committee of the Whole Meeting. Hyatt has guaranteed a standard room rate of \$129 per night; the registration fee for the two day meeting will be \$130. As more details are available, they will be posted to the FDP web site.

Return to the [Steering Committee Page](#) or to the [FDP Home Page](#)

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).

This page was last updated on 05/22/97.

FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP

June 17th , 1997 Steering Committee Meeting

I. Introduction

Barbara Siegel, chair of the Executive Committee, along with members of the Executive Committee (John Walsh, Karl Erb, Judith Greenberg, and Anne-Marie Mazza) welcomed FDP members and guests to the June 1997 meeting. Charles Paoletti was unable to attend this session.

II. FDP Staffing

Bob Hardy and Geoff Grant provided members with an optimistic report regarding support for the FDP ERA coordinator. Hardy indicated that all but one or two agencies had indicated their willingness to provide funds to support the new position. Agency support will be for two years and will not exceed \$10,000 per year per agency. The position will be an IPA assigned to the Office of Naval Research, and located at Logistics Management Inc. (See Attachment A for the position description.) The ERA coordinator position will report to the chair of the Executive Committee. A job announcement will be developed shortly, and placed in the Chronicle of Higher Education as well as various websites, including the FDP. Currently, it is anticipated that the position will be filled by the end of the year.

III. Terms and Conditions

Ann Stuart provide members with proposed changes to the FDP terms and conditions. (See Attachment B.) Members voted, accepting changes to Article 2.f., Article 2.h.3, and Article 27.a. Article 7 was reworded and accepted. The new Article 7 reads as follows:

Federal Cash Transactions Report. For awards receiving advance funding either an original and two copies of a Federal Cash Transactions Report (SF272) or an electronic equivalent shall be submitted within 15 days following the end of each funding quarter.

These changes will be effective July 1, 1997, and they will be posted on the FDP website.

IV. Membership and Organizational Structure

Bob Hardy and Jack Lowe reported on the issue of participation or membership of vendor and for-profit organization in the FDP. The Committee recommended that membership not be granted to for-profit organizations, and that vendors should not be given access to the FDP listserv. However, the Committee does not want to preclude vendor participation in committees and task forces. As such, they proposed the following protocol for vendor participation:

1. Task force chairs must provide the Executive Committee with notification that an invitation is going to be extended to a vendor to participate in task force activities.
2. The letter of notification to the Executive Committee should indicate how the vendor was selected, and should state that the vendor will receive no commercial benefit from participation in the task

force.

3. Outcomes and products resulting from vendor participation in a task force must be made available to all FDP participants and the larger university community.
4. Any exception to #3 must be brought to the attention of the Executive Committee.
5. Task Force chairs and members must disclose any conflict in their association with the participating vendor to the Executive Committee.

V. Proposed Demonstrations

Pam Webb put before the membership a proposal that she and Nancy Wilkinson are developing on behalf of NCURA. This proposal, Electronic Approval and Routing System (EARS), will consider models for an electronic research administration system to do institutional routing and approval of grant proposals and contracts. (See Attachment C.)

VI. New Business

Tony Mazzachi of AAMC briefed members on a letter from AAMC to Dr. Charles McPherson, NIH, regarding the revised NIH Cost Analysis and Rate Setting Manual for Animal Research Facilities. (See Attachment D.) In this letter, AAMC asks McPherson to consider utilizing the FDP to conduct a test of the revised animal costing manual. The FDP Executive Committee will send a letter to Dr. McPherson briefing him on the FDP and indicating our willingness to consider this type of pilot test.

Anne-Marie Mazza asked the membership if they were interested in devoting additional time to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), perhaps a whole day session during one of the Committee of the Whole meetings. The membership is in favor of this.

Sandra Mann discussed elimination of the 25% rebudgeting regulation that requires tracking at the institutional level and reporting to NIH. She agreed to draft a letter from the Executive Committee to the Director of NIH.

VII. Steering Committee Rotation

Jack Lowe provided the membership with a revised Steering Committee Rotation list (See Attachment E.). The following institutions will rotate off the Steering Committee: University of Memphis, Georgetown University, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, University of Wisconsin, Texas A&M Research Foundation, Ohio State, Cal Tech, University of Central Florida, Cornell University, and Columbia University. These institutions will be replaced by University of Texas-Dallas, Colorado State University, Texas A&M, University of California-Santa Barbara, University of Michigan, University of Virginia, Case Western Reserve, University of Chicago, University of Mass-Med, and Oakwood College. The new members of the Steering Committee are expected to attend the September 12th Steering Committee meeting.

VIII. Committee of the Whole

The primary focus of the Committee of the Whole meeting on June 18th was the Presidential Review Directive on the Government-University Partnership. The FDP heard from Dr. Jack Gibbons, Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). OSTP is leading this review, and Dr. Gibbons presented a letter to the membership asking for FDPs input. (See Attachments F, Fa, and G.) Following Dr. Gibbons, the FDP focused on identifying several issues that might be addressed in its formal response to the PRD. These issues included: matching/cost-sharing; use of electronic commerce in the grants process; cost-shifting; and the interrelated nature of teaching and research. A task group was formed to work on the FDP response.

The remainder of the morning was devoted to a discussion of NIHs new approach to funding research. This discussion was led by Geoff Grant. Information presented during this discussion can be found on NIHs web page.

Wanda E. London, Research Associate
GUIRR/National Academy of Sciences
Tel: 202-334-3486 Fax: 334-1505
Email: wlondon@nas.edu

Return to the [Steering Committee Page](#) or to the [FDP Home Page](#)

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).
This page was last updated on 08/08/97.

FDP - Steering Committee

Meeting: Sep 12, 1997, Washington, DC

Minutes

I. Welcome

Barbara Siegel, chair of the Executive Committee, along with the other members of the Executive Committee (Karl Erb, Chuck Paoletti, John Walsh, and Anne-Marie Mazza) welcomed members to the Fall Steering Committee Meeting. Judith Greenberg was unable to attend.

II. ERA Coordinator Position

On behalf of the Selection Committee, Bob Hardy briefed the membership on the search to select an ERA Coordinator. According to Hardy, 15 applications were submitted in response to the job announcement. Over conference calls the committee narrowed the number of candidates to two and conducted interviews with these individuals on September 19. The Selection Committee will be forwarding its recommendation to the Executive Committee, and a decision is expected shortly thereafter.

III. NSF Fastlane and Electronic Reporting System

Gerry Glazer, NSF, updated the Steering Committee on recent Fastlane activities. To date:

- 750 registered institutions
- 3,000 proposal submissions
- 75% of all cash outlays are via Fastlane
- 15,000 proposal reviews
- 50,000 proposal status checks

Glazer asked the FDP members for their help in guiding the direction of Fastlane, insuring that the modules meet the needs of FDP members, and in testing new modules.

Thomas Baerwald and Jean Feldman briefed members on a new electronic reporting system. (See Attachment A.) According to Baerwald, there are a number of pressures requiring NSF to gather additional information on projects. The new system would create a single project report instead of a series of reports. FDP members were asked to provide Baerwald and Feldman with the names of principle investigators who might be interested in testing the system.

John Pezzullo of the Internal Communications Task Force agreed to establish a listserv for Fastlane and the Electronic Reporting System.

IV. Presidential Review Directive on the Government-University Partnership

Sybill Francis, Acting Deputy Associate Director for Science, Office of Science and Technology Policy, spoke about the PRD on the Government-University Partnership. She indicated that OSTP had received approximately 40 responses to their request for input, and was pleased that the FDP participated in this effort. (See Attachment B.) The top three issues raised by the responses were: restrictions on the use of funds for graduate students; cost-sharing; and cost accounting standards. The central issue raised was the need to develop a "first principles" document that would define what the partnership, as well as the roles and responsibilities of each partner. Francis extended an invitation to the FDP to provide additional input on first principles. The working group reviewing the responses and developing a report is chaired by Francis, and includes several Federal FDP members: Karl Erb, Bob Hardy, Geoff Grant, and Chuck Paoletti. This group hopes to issue a report by December. The Executive Committee will consider the issue of further FDP input during its next conference call.

V. NIH Reinvention Initiative: The Master Agreement

Geoff Grant and Carol Tippetty informed the Steering Committee that NIH is in the preliminary stages of developing a Master Agreement for Noncompeting Awards. The Master Agreement would establish a partnership between NIH and an institution. The institution would identify one responsible official and NIH would assign a single point of contact for the institution. Slides presented by Grant and Tippetty are located on the FDP's homepage at:

<http://www.dml.georgetown.edu/fdp/>

VI. New Demonstrations

Dorothy Crocker of UCLA presented a proposal, Collaborative Electronic Research Administration, for consideration by the Steering Committee. (See Attachment C.) The proposal would provide a "framework within which research institutions and all federal parties can collaboratively engage in a planning process for the 'management' functions of computerized administration systems." The Steering Committee decided to establish a task force to explore this proposal further. Members interested in participating in this activity were encouraged to contact Crocker.

VII. Reports of Committees and Task Forces

Membership Committee

Bob Hardy announced that Jack Lowe would no longer serve as co-chair of the Committee. Hardy praised Lowe for his dedication and hard work. Beth Israel was named co-chair. The Committee developed a report on the issue of for-profit organization participation in the FDP. This report can be found on the FDP's web page. The Committee will now turn its attention to the conditions of membership, specifically the issue of active participation. They expect to issue a report in December.

Task Forces

Various task forces provided updates of their recent activities. (See Attachments D-F.)

VIII. December Meeting of the Steering Committee and Committee of the Whole

The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio will host the winter meetings of the Steering Committee and the Committee of the Whole on December 4 and 5. The cost of the two day meeting is \$140. The Riverwalk Hyatt will provide hotel accommodations. A notice of the meeting will go out in late September.

Return to the [Steering Committee](#) page or to the [FDP Home Page](#)

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).

This page was last updated on 08/08/97.

FDP - Steering Committee and Committee of the Whole

Meeting: Dec 4-5, 1997, San Antonio, Texas

Minutes

I. Welcome

Jane Youngers and Barbara Siegel, chair of the Executive Committee, along with the other members of the Executive Committee (Karl Erb, Chuck Paoletti, John Walsh, Judith Greenberg, and Anne-Marie Mazza) welcomed members to San Antonio, Texas for the Winter Steering Committee Meeting.

II. Introduction of the ERA Coordinator

On behalf of the Selection Committee, Brad Stanford introduced Jerry Stuck, ERA Coordinator, to the Steering Committee. Stuck was hired to coordinate the planning and conduct of electronic research administration activities between the FDP ,s federal agencies and universities. Stuck gave a brief overview of his background and the activities he hopes to pursue with the FDP Membership. During the Committee of the Whole Meeting, Stuck gave a formal presentation regarding current Federal ERA activities. His hand-outs are provided as Attachment A.

Stuck can be contacted at jstuck@lmi.org or 703-917-7555.

III. Membership Committee

Bob Hardy and Beth Israel, co-chairs, indicated that two institutions did not appear to meet the participation requirements for FDP Phase III. Hardy and Israel asked the Executive Committee to meet with them to define appropriate next steps with respect to these institutions.

Hardy and Israel interpretation of the "two consecutive meetings" requirement is

- a. in the case of Steering Committee members, 1 Steering Committee meeting and the next scheduled Committee of the Whole meeting (so that the expectation is participation in at least 3 meetings per year);
- b. for non-Steering Committee members, two consecutive Committee of the Whole meetings (two meeting per year). Non-Steering Committee members, however, are strongly encouraged to attend all Steering Committee meetings.

Next, Hardy and Israel discussed election of the Executive Committee. The current Executive Committee ,s term will expire June 1998. Siegel asked the Membership Committee to develop procedures for nominating and electing the next Executive Committee.

IV. Membership Dues

Discussion on this topic was deferred. Siegel asked Mareda Weiss to chair a group that would look into the issue of membership dues. Kathi Delehoy and Dick Seligman agreed to work with Weiss on this matter.

IV. Selection of a Host for the 1998 Committee of the Whole Meeting

The Florida Consortium offered to host the winter meetings of the 1998 Steering Committee and the Committee of the Whole in Orlando. A notice of the meeting will go out in late September.

VI. Committee of the Whole Meeting

The Committee of the Whole met on the afternoon of December 4th and all day on December 5th. Dr. John P. Howe, President of the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, gave the keynote address.

Formal minutes are not kept of the Committee of the Whole Meetings.

Return to the [FDP Home Page](#)

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).

This page was last updated on 02/27/98.

FDP - Steering Committee Meeting: Fri, Mar 27, 1998 Washington, DC

	<p>The Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable is pleased to be able to facilitate arrangements for the March Steering Committee Meeting.</p> <p>Steering Committee meetings are open and any member of the FDP is welcome to attend. If you plan to attend please return the below response form by Monday March 16, 1998.</p>
When:	<p>Friday, March 27, 1998 8:30 am to 4:00 pm</p>
Where:	<p>the Lecture Room of the National Academy of Sciences (Main Building) 2101 Constitution Ave. NW Washington, DC</p>
Registration:	<p>There is no registration fee for this meeting.</p> <p>To register...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Click here to branch to a Registration Form page; ● use your browser Print function to print it out; ● fill the out; ● then mail or fax it to: Wanda London Research Associate, Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable NAS/NAE/IOM 2101 Constitution Ave. N.W. (NAS 340) Washington, D.C. 20418 202/334-3486; Fax:202/334-1505
Hotel:	<p>A room block has been secured at the:</p> <p>Wyndham Bristol Hotel 2430 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037</p>
Room Rates:	\$126/night

Reservations: To make a reservation in the Room block, call National Academies Travel (NAT) at 800/801-6696 or 202/296-9046.

Provide the NAT agent with the Meeting ID # BE02883

NOTE: HOTEL CUT OFF DATE: March 5, 1998

Agenda: Our first item of discussion will be a presentation by Gerry Stuck on recent activities in electronic research administration. Gerry will inform us of university activities as well as government efforts in this area. In addition, he will discuss the joint FDP/NCURA EARS meeting being held on March 26. For more information on the EARS meeting, visit the FDP homepage.

The Presidential Review Directive (PRD) on Government-University Relations will be the focus of the next session. We will be joined by Dr. Artie Bienenstock, the newly-appointed Associate Director for Science, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, who will discuss the status of the PRD and possible projects for FDP involvement.

The Executive Committee will report on a briefing conducted for Dr. Bienenstock on March 24 regarding the FDP, our PRD response, and ERA activities.

Next, Bob Hardy and Beth Israel, co-chairs of the Membership Committee, will update us on the status of two non-participating institutions. This will be followed by a discussion of vendor participation in the FDP. We are receiving more and more inquiries from vendors wishing to participate in the FDP. In addition, several vendors have asked if we would allow them to demonstrate their wares at our meetings. These issues and other related ones will be discussed.

Finally, the membership committee will propose a protocol for electing a new executive committee this June.

Over the past year it has become clear that the FDP might benefit if it had a fund to draw on for specific activities, i.e., seed money for demonstration projects, travel for speakers to the December Committee of the Whole Meetings. Mareda Weiss, Kathi Delehoy, and Dick Seligman will put this issue before the membership, and ask the membership to consider the possibility of dues/registration fees, and potential uses of these funds.

Just before lunch, Melanie Krizmachin will report on USDA's response to our comments regarding changes they proposed to their agency specific terms.

In the afternoon we will consider new initiatives, allow the university and agency representatives to update the membership on new activities/concerns, select a planning committee for the June Committee of the Whole Meeting, and hear from our committees and task forces.

As you can see we have a very busy agenda. I look forward to seeing all of

you in March.

**STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP**

**LECTURE ROOM
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
March 27, 1998**

AGENDA

8:00	Continental Breakfast
8:30	Welcome: FDP Executive Committee - Barbara Siegel, Chuck Paoletti, Karl Erb, John Walsh, Judith Greenberg, Anne-Marie Mazza
8:45	Electronic Research Administration: Gerry Stuck
10:00	Presidential Review Directive: Artie Bienenstock, Associate Director of Science, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy
10:45	Break
11:00	Membership Committee: Bob Hardy and Beth Israel Non-participation by two institutions Vendor participation Protocol for electing executive committee members
11:45	Membership Dues: Mareda Weiss
12:15	USDA Terms and Conditions: Melanie Krizmachin
12:30	Lunch
1:30	New Initiatives
2:00	University-Agency Dialogue
3:00	Selection of Planning Committee for June Committee of the Whole Meeting Update on December 1998 Committee of the Whole Meeting
3:20	Committees and Task Forces
4:20	Miscellaneous
4:30	Adjourn

For more info, contact : Wanda London, Wlondon@nas.edu
Research Associate, GUIRR
Fax: 202/334-1505

Also, check out the [Washington DC Convention and Visitors Association](#) web site.

Return to the [Calendar of Events](#) page or to the [FDP Home Page](#)

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).

This page was last updated on 02/27/98.

FDP - Steering Committee and Committee of the Whole

June 1998 Meeting: Washington, DC

(updated: 08/20/98)

Contents

- [I. Introduction](#)
 - [II. Mission Statement/Vendor Policy](#)
 - [III. Finance Committee](#)
 - [IV. Steering Committee Rotation](#)
 - [V. Institutional Reports](#)
 - [Election of Executive Committee](#)
 - [Tribute to Wanda London](#)
 - [Committee of the Whole](#)
 - [Dr. Baldwin's Remarks](#)
 - [Dr. Lane's address](#)
 - [Faculty Panel](#)
-

I. Introduction

On behalf of the executive committee (Karl Erb, Chuck Paoletti John Walsh, Judith Greenberg, and Anne-Marie Mazza), Barb Siegel (chair) welcomed members to the June Steering Committee.

II. Mission Statement/Vendor Policy

Siegel asked members to review a draft statement dealing with the mission of the FDP as well as the issue of participation versus membership. (See Attachment A.). Some members expressed concern that the draft sounded a bit mean-spirited with respect to vendor participation. Siegel indicated that the document is an attempt to better articulate the relationship that the FDP wants to have with everyone in the community; whether they're institutional representatives but not members of FDP institutions, whether they're service providers; or whether they're those FDP members who wear other hats.

Several suggestions were put forth to put the document in a more positive light. Jim Taylor suggested deleting the last four lines of the first page. Sue Keene asked for clarification of the meaning of

"marketing.? Karl Erb suggested that marketing could take the form, of influencing a recommendation that the FDP might make concerning the nature of the system, and it might be worth thinking about how to handle that. Erb suggested that one solution would be just to emphasize the importance of being aware of the sensitivity of that.

Another member suggested that instead of saying the FDP mission is to optimize the investment of research funds, "while maintaining appropriate stewardship," we might say "identifying mechanisms or ways of assuring proper stewardship."

Siegel stated that it is very important that whatever goes on within this forum is public information and made available to anyone. The Executive Committee will continue to work on the document and expect to provide a final document at the September 25th, Steering Committee Meeting.

III. Finance Committee

Marenda Weiss, chair of the Finance Committee, stated that the Committee would like to formally recommend that the FDP establish a flexible fund (See Attachment B.) The fund would be used for expenses such as interview expenses, speaker costs, or consultants as well as for individuals at an institution who are working on our behalf and have trouble getting some support from their institution to attend our meetings. Also, funds might be used as some seed money for some demonstrations. The funds would go solely to FDP efforts and would not be used by the Roundtable.

The FDP chair would authorize all expenditures.

The fund would be established by assessing a \$50 member fee at the Steering Committee meetings (March and September) and a \$75 nonmember fee. This would be a nonrefundable fee. However, it could be transferred. The fee at the Steering Committee meetings would be paid by institutional members, affiliate members, and nonmembers. Federal agency representatives would be excluded from the Steering Committee Fee because of the support they provide to the Roundtable and the ERA Coordinator.

The Committee of the Whole meetings would have an additional add-on fee. Whoever is running the Committee of the Whole meetings would determine what that registration fee would be. There would then be an additional fee of \$25 for members, including federal representatives, and \$50 for nonmembers.

Any budget surplus remaining from the Committee of the Whole meetings would be transferred to the flexible fund account.

Julie Norris indicated that MIT would be willing to establish and maintain the account. Upon authorization of the Executive Committee, MIT would write checks in order to pay for expenses that the FDP agreed to cover. MIT would provide the Executive Committee with monthly reports, a quarterly summary to the FDP, and an annual to the Committee of the Whole.

IV. Steering Committee Rotation

Beth Israel and Jean Feldman informed members that half of the members on the current steering committee are rotating off, with new members rotating on. This change takes effect at the September 25, 1998 Steering Committee Meeting. (See Attachment C.)

Siegel reminded everyone that all FDP members are welcome to Steering Committee meetings, whether or not they are officially designated as a Steering Committee member. Steering Committee members need to attend at least three of the four yearly meetings; non-Steering Committee members need to attend at least two of the meetings.

V. Institutional Reports

Jerry Stuck reported on his efforts to develop a form for institutional reports. In the original MOU institutions committed to continued efforts to redesign, reengineer, and streamline, and also to provide a report to the FDP membership at least every two years. The institutional report will include a section on current and planned reengineering and streamlining activities. In addition, the report will include information on institutional participation in the FDP working groups, the impact this has had on campus in terms of reducing administrative burden and increasing productivity. Information also will be collected on electronic research administration activities. There also will be a section requesting input on issues members would like to see the FDP address.

Siegel reminded members that as a condition of their membership they are required to submit an institutional report.

Nancy Wilkinson encouraged Stuck to develop an electronic format from which it would be easy to compile information and generate reports. Members would like to see what others are doing and it would be useful to develop an overall report on the progress of the FDP institution. Stuck indicated that he would do this.

Erb suggested that these reports would be useful to FDP when it reports to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. Erb indicated that the material might also provide background for our eventual joint meeting with OSTP, which Siegel and Mazza have been working on. Another member suggested that the information be used to develop best practices that might have applications to other institutions. Russ Lea indicated that he thought it would be important to the FDP to also know how many demonstrations institutions have participated in, the identity of partners, and the identity of targeted stakeholders.

Several members volunteered to work with Stuck on developing a web questionnaire.

Election of Executive Committee

Feldman and Israel, cochairs of the nominating committee, reported on the nominating process and procedures. Feldman thanked the other members of the nominating committee: Ann Datkow, John Kavanagh, Doris Lyons, David Schlessner, and Bob Hardy, as well as John Pezzullo for his website.

Nominating procedures were posted for all of the positions on the Executive Committee on the FDP home page on May 1. For the position of chair of the Executive Committee, Pezzullo developed an on-line nomination form, and asked for nominations from the FDP membership. Everything posted to the home page was also sent to the FDP listserv. Five nominations were submitted for chair of the FDP. After speaking to each of the nominees, two individuals agreed to run and provided candidate statements which were also posted on the home page and sent out on the listserv. The two individuals running for chair are Julie Norris, MIT, and Barbara Siegel, Northwestern.

In terms of the position of the faculty member, the nomination committee asked the faculty committee identify two candidates. The faculty committee nominated Susan Braunhut, University of Massachusetts-Lowell, and Carol Liedtke, Case-Western Reserve.

In accordance with the procedures, the federal agency representatives were asked to identify an administrative representative and a program representative. Neither of these positions, unlike the faculty rep and the chair, would be voted on. The administrative representative is Chuck Paoletti, executive director for acquisition management at the Office of Naval Research, and the program representative is Connie Atwell, associate director for extramural activities at the National Institute for Neurological Disorders and Stroke at NIH. Karl Erb, NSF, will continue to serve as the senior science advisor and Anne-Marie Mazza, GUIRR, will continue as the Roundtable representative.

Institutions cast their ballots electing Barbara Siegel chair of the FDP and Susan Braunhut Faculty Representative.

The new executive committee includes Siegel, Braunhut, Atwell, Paoletti, Erb, and Mazza.

Tribute to Wanda London

Siegel announced that after almost a decade of service to the Federal Demonstration Partnership and the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable, Wanda London would be leaving to become the Administration Assistant to the Executive Director of the Policy Division. Several members paid tribute to London, and Anne-Marie Mazza presented Wanda with a letter from Ambassador Richard Celeste, former Chairman of the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable.

The letter read:

Dear Wanda, I understand that you are moving on from your Roundtable service, and I wanted to join your friends and colleagues in wishing you well as you make this transition. "You know, I hope, how much I enjoyed working with you during my GUIRR years. My dependence on your quiet competence was matched by my respect for your personal integrity. You took such good care of all of us. "Thank you, thank you, thank you. "My hope is that your new position, still in the Academy family, will bring you both challenge and fulfillment. With warmest personal regards, Dick Celeste.

Committee of the Whole

Minutes are not kept of the Committee of the Whole Meetings. However, attached are the unedited speeches of Dr. Wendy Baldwin of NIH and Dr. Neal Lane, Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. In addition, the unedited transcript of the faculty panel also has been included.

Dr. Baldwin's Remarks

I want to talk with you today about our regulatory burden study, and also some specific things that are going on in and around institutional review boards. I'll try to keep my comments brief enough that there's time for us to have some discussion. Meetings like this are really truly a rare and wonderful opportunity for us to open up issues, and really talk with some of our key partners around these issues. It's important

for us to do it, sometimes it's hard for us to do it--it's hard to get out there and trek around, and meet with everyone, and so we really value these opportunities.

Now, as I'm sure you know, we are embarking on the study of regulatory burden. There is a legislative history to this, in that it comes out of the '98 appropriation bill language. I find this request totally compatible with our reinvention activities. We are committed to streamlining the processes around which we solicit fund and monitor research at the NIH, and I think that this is going to be yet another tool for us to use to find ways to make it possible for us to do this better.

This isn't the first time some of these questions have been asked. The General Accounting Office, in '96, took a general view of this issue, and there are some specific activities that are coming up. And so I'm going to try to interweave some of the regulatory burden issues with some of the IRB study issues, in part because the activities of IRBs are really one of the topics of our regulatory burden study. One of the difficulties in undertaking an activity like this is that regulations have multiple effects. They provide protection, and they impose burdens. And all throughout this we have to keep an eye on how we keep them in balance.

You know, if we were economists we might talk about maximizing and minimizing burden. If we were just looking at our reinvention sort of language, we'd look at how we're going to streamline the activities without damaging the underlying process. We would want to look at whether we'd deleted steps that aren't sort of value added in all of this, and so that I can pull in all of my reinvention jargon.

There are a lot of stakeholders in these issues, and we have an obligation to meet with and talk with, and interact with, a lot of them. These are not simple issues, that have two partners. They have multiple partners, and multiple actors, and there are a lot of benefits that are accrued to these different activities that have now fallen under our regulatory burden view.

I'll do a little sidebar here, that early in taking this position I asked each of our offices to make a list of the activities that they did, and then sort of assign them weights as to how important they thought they were--you know, how value added they were, and how much time they took. So presumably we could find ones that seemed to take a lot of time, that people didn't think were value added, and they would be candidates for our streamlining out of our activities. Needless to say, one persons burden is another person's critical activity, and so you have to be very--you have to be careful in this.

Now, I am actually in agreement with many parts of this legislative language--not all, but many--and one of them is the value of having an external person--a person outside of the scope of our particular office--involved in this. And there is reference to the Arthur Anderson study of our management practices.

And so the first thing we did was to reach for Jack Mahoney, who was the consultant who led the Arthur Anderson project, has a lot of experience with the NIH. Jack, you are here, right? Jack? You might want to stand up, because y'all need to know the good Mr. Mahoney here. Thank you, Jack. And in fact, next to him is Tony Dempsey, who is a senior member of my staff. Tony, you might want to stand up, in case any of you all don't know Tony.

Because Jack now has the project here to lead this regulatory burden study, and Tony is point person in my office to help with this. We're going to bring other staff on this, and there will be other tools available to Jack as he goes through it. But we've put senior people on this, so that we hope that we get a product at the end that we're going to be happy with. Happy. And I will define--it will be pretty clear at the end of

this what will make me happy out of all of this.

Now, we know there are many regulations. The GAO sort of cataloged regulations. One of the things that could happen as we move through this process is that other regulations that sort of weren't in the air control space might get brought into it. That's probably most likely to happen if you all share your experiences, and help identify areas that we should be looking at.

Now, what will make me happy. I want to make sure that there is a product at the end of this. I want to be able to come back, maybe this time next year, and say, okay, we did this, we found things, we changed things; we're in a position to actually make things better. This is the lemonade here.

To do that, though, I felt that we needed to take a little bit of focus on the myriad regulations that this could address, and so the first was to say, well, hmmm, are these regulations that are pretty specific to research? And are they regulations around which we have some modicum of control? And that's important, because that will increase the chances that we'd be able to come back and say, yes, in fact, by virtue of this process, we can actually say that we've got a strategy for making things better. So we've proposed that there were five areas, having culled through the work that had been done previously, work that had been done by organizations that had already made lists of things that they viewed as regulatory burden, and really came up with five that met those criteria.

They were clearly research, and they were ones around which we had some control--although that varies. The first is our human subjects protection strategies, the second would be animal welfare, third would be research misconduct, fourth would be hazardous waste, and fifth would be conflict of interest. These are not in any kind of order, although I will say that the human subjects and animal welfare ones are frequently at the top of people's lists as areas of regulatory burden. There are others that have burdensome elements that apply to researchers, but where the scope is broader, and the ownership is more remote. And we're not going to ignore these, and I would suggest probably CASS (?) is part of that, but they are not going to be in the first tier that gets the first pass of effort.

Because I want to be sure that in fact at the end we're not just generating a report, but we're actually being able to make some changes. Finally, I guess I'd say there are those that have come up in discussions of regulatory burden, they're not specific to research, and it's pretty remote to me as to think about how we would go about changing them. So, if someone in your institution wants to build a lab, and they're told that the historic preservation rules will prohibit building that lab there, or will constrain how it's built, I actually am going to tell you right now, that's not a topic I want us to take on. I think the possibility of us doing anything useful in that is pretty remote, and so I'd like to stay where we could actually make a difference.

So, while I am not going to say we will only do these five, we're certainly going to start with these five, and we will move into other areas, and this is where you can be very helpful to us, in terms of where additional effort could in fact be useful, and bearing in mind the other things I'm going to say about this report. It is extremely important that we locate the source of the burden. The burden could come from legislation, it could come from the regulations that flow from legislation, it could come from how an agency implements those regulations. It could come from the fact that different agencies implement the same regulations in different ways. It could come from the way your institutions implement the regulations, which could either be because you've generated your own system, or there's been a misunderstanding about what the regulations require. But unless we have some idea where this cascade of bottlenecks could come from, I think it's going to be pretty difficult to find a remedy, to anything.

There is also a question of how we assess burden. Now, the original language in the legislative report emphasized dollar costs, and that has a certain appeal. But we are mindful of several aspects, or problems, that I would say are associated with focusing on dollar costs. Most of the costs are not going to exist in any kind of currently ongoing records that we maintain, and they may not even exist in records that you maintain. And collection on dollar costs can be extremely burdensome and expensive in its own right. Costs may well be uneven, and that makes assessment difficult, and let me give a couple of examples about what I mean by that. Let's say we have a regulation that in fact takes up 10 percent of someone's time. We manage to streamline it, and now it only takes up 5 percent of their time. That's a 50 percent reduction in burden, but the ability to attach a meaningful cost dollar figure to that, or--not that it can't be done, but a meaningful dollar figure to that--is, I think, pretty distant. And in fact, probably you would not then hire that person for 95 percent of their effort; their time would expand into something else. So what I'm saying is, the important part of that equation is, can we reduce that from 10 percent to 5 percent, not can we associate dollars to that 5 percent of someone's time.

There are other areas, and here is where I'm going to start to weave in some of the concerns I have around IRBs, where the effort that's associated may in fact be forms of collateral duty from your IRB members. And it's unclear how you would assign dollars to that, or what the benefit or the profit would be from assigning those dollars.

But another part that concerns me is their unevenness, and I'm going to use the multiple project assurance process as an example, because we have heard people say that in fact they think renegotiating their MPA is a serious burden, and this is the kind of issue that we should be looking at. Okay? We have about 500 MPA institutions--a little under that. Renewal comes every five years. When those institutions come up for renewal, about half merely, basically, resign the forms that they had, and the other half undergoes a significant renegotiation of their MPA. And now I've got 500 institutions, I've got an activity that occurs every five years, I have half of those institutions basically having trivial burden, and the other half having significant burden. If you put a dollar analysis to that, I will contend you're not going to find much. But if you're one of those institutions that's caught up in that serious renegotiation, you probably have a lot of opinions about how that negotiation should go, and we want to hear those, because that's where we're going to actually be able to make a difference.

We have ample evidence that dollar costs are quite variable by type of institution, area of country, type of institution--intensity of some of these activities. If you do a little animal research, you might have a different profile of costs, or concerns; if you do a lot, you might have a different set. And so, aware of that variability, it would make me extra concerned about trying to go out and associate dollar costs to something that could be very variable. And if you say, well, take that variability into account, then we have a massive undertaking. I see years stretching before us, whereas I think we can do it in a different way. Dollar costs are not really able to take into account the effect of regulations on morale, on a sense of productivity, or a sense of, oh, quickness of the system. That's not necessarily--the atmosphere that is created around the supportive science is not necessarily going to be measured very well by dollar. But they are all significant parts of burden, and I think this is where we can actually make a difference.

Finally, focusing on costs, I think, could distract us from the balancing question. The question here is not, how do we get rid of regulations, but how do we maintain the protections that are embodied in these regulations while minimizing unnecessary burden? And that seems to me to go much more to the heart of what these regulations are supposed to do, and whether in fact the way they're being implemented--whether it's at the legislative, regulatory, implementation stage or what--is a much more

important question.

Certainly Representative Porter has no desire to see us weaken the protection for human subjects, and I'm sure you don't either. So the question really is much more subtle than it appears on the surface. The question is, how do you maintain these protections, and yet strip away things that don't actually benefit that?

Let me give a sidebar as to one of the areas that I think we can probably make some change [in]. Right now the Office of Protection from Research Risks is looking at the whole process of how we negotiate an assurance in the first place. And, if you look back as to why we do it the way we do it, and what we intend to accomplish, the expectation was that this would be an educational tool.

By working with you on an institutional basis, and explaining what the requirements were, this would be an educational process, so that you would develop the procedures within your own institution, and you would document them, and that that would be a tool for us to achieve that. I would say that there is kind of a general view that it probably doesn't do that. Now, if it doesn't do that, we should be redirecting our resources away from that detail on the negotiation side, and probably into other educational steps.

The FDA has a different approach. I mean, ours is sort of a prospective--we will work with you to establish how you're going to do business. The FDA has a slightly different approach, in that they have a little more retrospective--we'll come site visit you and see if you did it right. And we could do that; however, if I look at the volume of research that the NIH supports, I'm not convinced that site visiting alone certainly would have any hope of building that kind of institutional knowledge about what it takes to protect human subjects.

So we are casting this study, and we have discussed this fully with the committee, in terms of assessing burden, and not measuring dollar costs. And one of the keys to this shift is, I believe, the fact that we are not going to depend on an analysis of dollar costs to help us decide whether it's burdensome or not.

I'm willing to give it up at the beginning. I think these four areas constitute a burden. How can we streamline it? Can we streamline it? I believe we can, and that that, in fact, would be a more meaningful outcome than fine-tuning what the dollars would be that are associated with it. In the end, you have to fix the process anyway, so we might as well start there.

So what are the steps we're going to take? First, we're going to review the existing reports that are available, and actually there are quite a number. There's a report on misconduct that's due out quite soon, and there are reports--we have a report on institutional review boards, and the inspector general has a draft report that should be released soon. We would hope that you would share with us other reports that you may know of, and they may be--I'm thinking of the reports that are at the national level, but there may be reports at the regional level, the local level, or the international level.

I think sometimes we forget that models for accomplishing our goals could come from different sources, and it helps if all of us who see different ways of achieving the underlying goals that are in these five areas can kind of put those models out on the table. Jack Mahoney has already started meeting with what we would call our stakeholders. This is going to start with the key groups, but also needs to reach out to get a picture of the diversity of how these regulations might be burdensome.

We'll go through a little refining of the areas, and of the aspects of burden that we're going to consider. I'm bringing in a new staff person, who is specifically going to work on the human subjects issues, and

will be developing a plan for how we actually make changes in these processes. But it is an interactive process, and you are an ideal audience to help be a part of that interaction, to help us make sure that you get something out of this that in the end makes your life easier too.

Now, I'm going to now digress a little bit, and talk about some of the IRB issues, because that is really--it's a mammoth undertaking. If you look at the volume of work that's done by institutional review boards across the country, it is a huge activity. It is, as you might suspect, very variable. We have institutions that have a massive structure around IRBs, we have institutions that have very small, you know, IRBs, and a low volume of work.

If you look at almost any measure you can of how they do their business, again, it's very variable. And I'm not saying that that is a good or a bad thing; that is just a fact, and, as we look at how we might streamline it, I think we have to take that into account.

But now let me just focus on one issue that came out of our review of IRBs, and that's the use of exempted and expedited review. Because you might say, hmmm, IRBs are overburdened; maybe you ought to look at things that don't have to go to the IRB, or that can go to the IRB in sort of a less burdensome way. If I were new to this, I'd say, that sounds like a winner--let's look at that. Well, if you read the draft report that we've just commissioned, where the IRBs reported to us what they did, you might not come to that conclusion, or at least you would realize that it has to be a little more nuanced than that.

So first of all, there are sort of two categories of activity, other than full IRB review. One is exempted research. We have a list of areas, and we say these categories, exempted--doesn't have to go to the IRB at all.

So when you ask IRBs, what do you normally do with that kind of work, about 50 percent exempt them, and the other 50 percent take them to the IRB. This can be educational tests, surveys, taste tests--things like that. There are, I think, six categories.

Then there's expedited review. Now, expedited review means that you don't have to convene the whole IRB; you don't have to have a quorum. You can, in fact, assign a project for expedited review to an individual member, and that obviously has a lot of advantages, in terms of organizing your time. Voice recordings, dental plaque studies, noninvasive clinical data. Depending on the category, it's between 25 and 75 percent of these categories are expedited.

Well, I gotta tell ya, this was not exactly good news to me, because it says, well, wait a minute, I thought I just had a nifty idea, as to a way I could lower the burden on IRBs, and now you're telling me that IRBs don't in fact take advantage of the areas that they have for expedited or exempted review.

Should I believe the data? Umm, yeah, I think so. We just put out a call for areas of expansion for the categories for expedited review, and the analysis is not completed, but there is no groundswell of enthusiasm among IRBs to expand the areas that are eligible for expedited review. Well, this tells me I've got a problem. Either I don't understand what's going on here, or I've lost this kind of key tool that I thought I could use to make life better.

And so let's think about what might be leading that to happen. I think some IRBs may look at that research and say, well, we bear a certain risk, or certain liability, if that research is not done well, and we see things that aren't done well, and so therefore don't tell me I can expedite it or exempt it--we're going

to review it anyway, because it is helping to protect human subjects. I don't want to undermine that point of view here. Bear in mind, I'm not saying that these numbers are right or wrong, I don't have a value judgment. I'm simply saying they are instructive as to how we can think about what we might change around IRB functioning to lower burden.

Now, one of the things I think we could do is to help understand a little more about why IRBs might do this, and whether we can help them think of other ways to function, that would meet their needs, and be less burdensome. For example, if you have an area that's eligible for expedited review, it may be that an individual doesn't want to take responsibility for saying, yeah, that's okay. Well, all expedited review says is that it doesn't have to go to the whole IRB. It doesn't say you can't poll the other three or four members of the IRB, and let them deal with them in a less formal, less structured way.

You could spread around--you could build a little more skill amongst those members, you could specialize, they could look at particular types of research. You would get away from your quorum, your meetings, your scheduling--the things that people find sort of confining.

So what we're going to do, in the coming year, is in fact put together some national--I don't know whether they're going to be national--they're going to be broad reaching meetings--to try to draw out from the IRBs what I would call some best practices. IRBs--the functioning across IRBs is extremely variable. Some are very efficient, and others don't seem to be taking advantage of those efficiencies. So when I get--when I hear a complaint that it's hard to understand adverse event reports, but on the other hand some IRBs take those adverse event reports and go tchoo, tchoo, tchoo, here's a list. Three serious ones, twelve not so serious ones, and the IRBs are able to function very well with that. Maybe there are some management practices here that we could share around the institutions. But they have to come from the IRBs. Two things: they have to come from the IRBs, and I think they have to have some imprimatur of the OPRR.

Because, even if you're within the scope of the regs, there may be a concern that maybe somehow this could come back to bite me if I did it this way. And we would want to make sure that people understood they truly were working within the guidelines.

Now, I'm going to take one other example, at my peril, I'm sure, and that's Just-in-Time. Now, I've been a big advocate of the underlying concept of Just-in-Time. However, as you all know, this has had a little bit of a rocky history here. It's gotten rockier, actually, in that it appears that, by the report of investigators, a very, very high proportion of the research that was initially presented to an IRB is conducted, regardless of whether it's funded or not. So I've been thinking in terms of projects that come in, that they're going to come for NIH funding, and thinking, well, what can we do to sort of streamline that process.

But if those applications are going to be conducted one way or the other, they're going to go to an IRB one way or the other. And so we're in a much more subtle arena of timing, and of benefit, to the investigator and to the human subjects, than, frankly, I thought at the beginning of this. So I'm going to say, you've got to work with us on this one, because this one is not as straightforward.

We've had--I talked to one IRB member who said--really liked the concept of Just-in-Time, but you know, a lot of things come to the IRB--they find things that strengthen the application. And the reviewers look at how the project's being conducted, they look at the ethical issues involved in that project--maybe not the consent form itself, but they look at that. Well, they were viewing that IRB review as an

educational activity for those investigators. So regardless of what we do about Just-in-Time, institutions might want to decouple that, and think about--if they're thinking about an educational role, maybe they ought to be thinking about it in a different way.

This a topic, especially, that I think we need to continue discussion on, because I'm very concerned that we not jump to making a change that looks on the surface like it will reduce burden, which, if we had looked at it a little more carefully, it would be clear that it torques the whole system, but in the end doesn't amount to much. I would view that as not a good activity for us.

We are looking at a streamline assurance process, and, again, that's because we've looked back at the purpose that our current negotiated assurance process was supposed to achieve, and figured that maybe it's not doing that, so it's time to explore some other models. We're also looking at how we could deal with multisite trials. Research that goes to IRBs has changed over time, from when the regs were first developed. Multisite trials are a key area of change, and so OPRR is working with the National Cancer Institute to look at strategies to try to develop consortium universities, where there can be reciprocity in the IRB review.

And I think that sounds like a good idea, but I'm in the watchful waiting mode here, because I want to see the participating IRBs say, oh, yes, that's fine, we don't have to review it ourselves; we will accept a review from a collaborating partner. They may well do it, it may well be a wonderful time saver and a streamliner, and it may not. So, to the extent that the IRB feels that what they're doing is actually special and different, I think it remains to be seen how much streamlining that will take--that will accomplish.

There are some other things that we can do. If you were to look through this report to us and say, what is the key area that IRBs struggle with, it's informed consent. And, given that there are multiple domains that they can be concerned with, informed consent--the process of getting informed consent, the documentation around getting informed consent--that is clearly the most critical one. Last year we funded 14 research projects on informed consent, and that was the first time we ever said, wait a minute, this is actually a behavioral process, it is one that we could provide better understanding of, and help people build and improve their learning as to how they do this. And that's something that, in a way, we can do, and individual IRBs can't really do. And I view this as something that's a contribution to how we support science, but also it's a way to provide a greater knowledge base for the IRBs as they go about their work.

We're now in the first review phase of our training programs in bioethics. This will be the first time we have specifically gone out and said, we are willing to support, in this case, both singular, long-term training and short-term training courses, around the issues in bioethics. If you talk to IRB members, or if you look at the data in our study, IRB review is not like an event, it's a process. Things don't come in and they get approved the first time.

They come in, they have the comments, their concerns, they go back, they come in again; they may come in two or three times. A significant number of IRBs never approve things the first time out. Now, maybe that means they're being vigilant, and that's good--don't want to erode that. Maybe it means we need to do more education of the investigators in the first place, so that things could come in and be in better shape when they came in.

We can't do all of that. We can do some of it, we can do more of it, and maybe what we also have to do is ensure that we've provided more opportunities for investigators to learn more of the nuances of what is

involved in the ethical issues of human subjects research. So we have that initiative, and I expect--that has another receipt date. I thought that would take a little time to get established, so I think we'll probably reissue that. I would have liked to see us, and I expect to see us, reissue the RFA for research as well.

So I tried to end with a question: Am I optimistic? Yeah. But, as Jeff would tell you, I'm usually optimistic. This is my lemonade approach. I'm optimistic in that I think we've already learned a lot from some of the streamlining activity-- So I am looking forward to this activity, because I think it blends very nicely into what we're doing on reinvention.

I think there is so much buy-in from the scientific community around these issues that I fully expect that we will get the kind of dialogue that I think is essential. And, given that we are motivated to come back with strategies for improvement, I think there'll be satisfaction at the end.

I guess I have a fantasy--I can just envision what it would be like if we had gone the dollar cost arena--we'd gone that strategy. I've never yet seen any group publish dollar costs associated with anything and not have that lead to a two-year debate about the accuracy of those dollars. I don't want to engage in that debate. I want to say, the community has said these are the areas that could be streamlined, here is how you could lower burden, and I want us to be able to take steps to actually cause that to happen.

One caution: Streamlining happens at multiple levels. If your processes have built up around our regulations, if we change our regulations, or our expectations, that may not be enough. You may have to change too. Now, presumably everybody wants to do this. Umm, yeah. But--this is just foretelling what I think will happen--is that, if you have built up procedures and ways of doing things that are responsive to our regulations, you have to be mindful of the kinds of changes we're proposing, and that the institutions then are willing to make those changes as well.

It's very hard to change behavior--just said--ach! and I'm a behavioral scientist--I believe in behavior change. But I also know how hard it is to cause it to happen. So it has to happen at all levels for people to actually feel that there has been an improvement. And so I think the FDP is absolutely the perfect partner for us in this, but it's only one partner, and you can help us identify others, you can help us network into different types of schools, into different settings.

It's very easy to fall into thinking that there is one type of school, or one type of process, and we'll go streamline that one. One of the things this job teaches you is how variable our community is, and that we have to be mindful of that variability when we make changes in our regulations. So, I welcome you to participate with us in this activity, and I think we're all going to benefit in the end. I don't think it's going to be easy, and it will force us to look beyond just simple questions of, of course we need that, or, of course we don't need that, and actually look at what the benefit is, and look at what could be changed.

So I welcome your comments now, and to working with you for the duration of this project. Thank you.

Dr. Lane's address

I want to thank Barbara Siegel and the FDP Executive Committee for inviting me to join you here today, and for being so flexible on the schedule. The time I was supposed to talk tomorrow is--I've been invited by the Senate, the Commerce Subcommittee, to testify on my confirmation, and I so I think probably it's a good idea for me to go do that. [Laughter.] It puts me in something of a limbo situation. I looked up

"limbo" to make sure I had it roughly right, and what I came up with in my dictionary was, for the definition of "limbo"--there are many definitions--but the one that really seems apt here is "a place on the edge of hell--" [Laughter.] "--as an abode for souls barred from heaven through no fault of their own." [Laughter.] So I don't know about the fault, and I'm not sure quite where the heaven is, but in any case, the idea is, I think that we'll move out of limbo.

So this morning, given that limbo-like state, I'd like to sort of step back a bit, and make some general comments, about how we might think about enhancing our science and engineering and education enterprise to meet the needs of the 21st century. We're coming up on the 21st century pretty fast, and there are all kinds of talks about the Y-2000 problem, or the Y-2K problem. Well, there is the one, of course, that we're concerned about--namely, to make sure all the computers and networks, and all other devices that have electronic clocks in them, function after December 31 '99.

But there's another Y-2000, and if it's not a problem, let's just call it a challenge--a Y-2000 challenge--and that's namely to ensure what I said, namely that we do continue to enhance science technology, research and education in the 21st century. Because we know from past experience that that's what our nation depends so critically on for its own advancement. So, without a doubt, I think these are very exciting, and even, I think, opportunistic times, for science and engineering, and particularly for universities, and for your work. Indeed, without your work, nothing really gets done on the campuses.

And I'm sure people call you every day and tell you that, and walk up and catch you on the street and say, "I've just been wanting to tell you that--" [Laughter.] "--that I just feel so good that you're here on my campus, and taking care--" [Laughter.] It's funny--I used to do that. I don't understand why nobody else does. [Laughter.] It is true, however--you know it's true, and so do many on your campus who do appreciate what you do for them, in this context, but more particularly in the day to day operations of research in academia. So I appreciate that, and I'll say some more about that in a minute. So first a few general thoughts.

Today I'm going to talk a lot about science and engineering and technology, and from a different perspective--stepping back a bit. I've shared these views before, and I wanted to share them a bit with you, because they do reflect what I think is important as we face the 21st century. I'm going to use the word "science" for all of these kinds of things. I think of science as including science and engineering, and certain aspects of technology. I'm going to use science, not so much as a collection of traditional disciplines, or a knowledge base, but simply as a way of knowing about nature, including humans, and human-made devices and methodologies and systems.

So with the release of the President's budget earlier this year, and a little time to digest on science and technology and education in that budget, many out in our community are sort of singing a different tune, like what a difference a day makes, or maybe what a difference a year makes. Or two. Because it wasn't very long ago that many of us--myself included--were talking about the proposed cuts in science and technology as being a risky national experiment, and that's just what it would have been. Some used the term "draconian" to describe those projections. Our concerns were great, and I think they were justified. Now we're somewhat more optimistic, and certainly enthusiastic, at the proposed reversal of that scenario. I think we need to reflect again on what we might have learned from the past.

First, I want to personally thank everybody in the science and technology community who worked to try to reverse those attitudes, who talked with members of the public, and with their elected representatives, about these budget problems. And I want to thank you, as I already have, before, for your involvement in

that effort, because I think these changes that we have seen occur over the last year or so, in attitude, and even outspoken position, on the importance of science in America, would not have occurred without the active involvement of our whole community. That's a message I think we have to recognize, and also ensure that our colleagues recognize.

There has been an increasing awareness of the Congress of the pervasive contributions of research to our national welfare. Senators Graham and Lieberman have introduced a bill to double the federal civilian research budget, over ten years. And Congressman Jim Sensenbrenner, chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Science, clearly identified the challenge for us when he said the following: "As we enter the next millennium, our nation faces many challenges that can be met only by enhancing the country's scientific and technical base." And we also know Speaker Gingrich has been very outspoken within the political process to members of the appropriation committees, and the chairs of those committees, that whatever we do during these tight budget times, we've got to protect science.

In light of all this support, and these good words coming from Capitol Hill, I'm also very pleased to say that President Clinton's proposed R&D budget for the coming fiscal year represents one of the largest dollar increases ever for civilian research and development. In fact, for NSF, it would be the largest dollar increase in our history. The budget request confirms the science community's past achievements. But at the same time it represents an unequivocal vote of confidence for its role, the role of that community, in the future prosperity of the nation.

Now, the budget is working its way through Congress, but its having kind of mixed reception, I would say. In our appropriations hearings, while we heard very positive words about NSF, and about science, we also heard words of caution, and questions like, "What would you do? What would be your priorities if you do not get the increase the President has requested?" And many budget watchers around the town, around the country, are writing quite pessimistic assessments of the situation at the present time, and projections of the budget outcome in this year's appropriations.

Well, let me not speculate on that. Let me just say that we have lots of work ahead of us before these investments proposed by the President meet with Congress' approval. And you can rest assured we're working very hard on it here in town, and we hope all of you out around the country will do the same. And my only advice is to stay tuned, and stay involved.

That brings me to my next point. These proposed record increases represent much more than just a vote of confidence. They also represent an important challenge for all of us. It is clear that we've moved beyond thinking that it will be sufficient to simply expand the science system in replication of itself. The last 50 years of science have yielded a cornucopia of knowledge and innovation.

More money for science, however, does not necessarily mean simply expanding the same system that was driven by post-World War II needs. Some have even questioned the idea of expansion at all; we've heard calls for something that more closely resembles a reorientation, and a reallocation of money, based on future needs. It's been almost a decade since the end of the Cold War, and all the rhetoric that has followed of how things have changed, and how they must change, and how they will change. And as this vision of shifting and movement becomes clearer, we can begin to see the past as one pattern, fairly clearly in focus, and the present and the future as a new pattern, but much less clearly in focus.

In the past, for example, we know that there were decades when technological innovation in the marketplace came primarily via the route of defense supported research. Today, as important as defense

research continues to be, civilian research, carried out in universities, in industry and government, and the private research labs, is more frequently the pathway to eventual commercial application. And that shift has important opportunities, but it also has challenges.

The danger is to think that those extraordinary past achievements dictate that nothing should change in our approach to science in the future. Instead, the influence of the past should give us the confidence and the courage to use this experience boldly for new and even different goals.

In this new time of science, we should heed the astute perspective of scholars such as the late Donald Stokes. In his seminal work, *Pasteur's Quadrant*, Stokes has helped us to understand why the terms "basic research" and "applied research" have perhaps misled us to believe that great science and useful science were mutually exclusive. He documents repeatedly the synergy, not the separation, in research, and he recasts our view of understanding and use as happening simultaneously, and feeding on each other. I believe Stokes' views, and the thoughtful insights of others, will move the larger science community toward greater unanimity, as it attempts to address the increased expectations, and the demands of science today.

The more knowledge we generate, and the more problems we solve, the higher society's expectations will rise--a kind of a feedback of opportunity and challenge. We've heard this voice by the President, by the Congress, and by the electorate. These increased expectations for the work of scientists and engineers are directly related to science's new agenda. We know that, as part of this agenda, excellence in science, engineering and technology will be a wellspring of economic and societal opportunity and progress, as it has always been in the past. This new agenda is also about learning, because nowhere are society's expectations for us as high as they are in education. The recent Carnegie Report on undergraduate teaching at research universities made this all too clear.

We all know that new knowledge is only one of many dividends generated by investments in academic research. Other, more immediate and perhaps more powerful, benefits come through the advanced skills and the training provided to students. Research experiences have become an essential component of a modern education, and this is why NSF has placed such a high priority on the integration of research and education.

Just one month ago we completed our celebration of the National Science and Technology Week. The theme of this year's week was Polar Connections, which aimed to build awareness of the earth's natural laboratories in the arctic and in the antarctic. One highlight of the week was a virtual field trip, where students were able to virtually go to the Project SHBA. SHBA is a floating--actually a frozen--science station in the Arctic Ocean, 300 miles north of Barrow, Alaska. It's built around an ice-breaker that is literally frozen into the pack ice of the Arctic Ocean. Well, you can imagine, the terrain is rather desolate. The only things walking around up there are scientists and polar bears, two species many of us try to keep a safe distance from. [Laughter.] SHBA stands for Surface Heat Budget of the Arctic Ocean, and it's being coordinated by the University of Washington. The goal of the project is to pull together data and information on how the sun and the clouds and the air and the ocean interact and affect the annual melting and refreezing of the Arctic Sea ice. This has major implications for our understanding of global climate change. As *The Washington Post* noted in a recent article, it is taking a very cold look at global warming. For this reason, SHBA qualifies as a frontier research project, by every definition, but it is also much more than that.

Thanks to the web and other marvels of technology, it has also become an excellent example of how we

can open new frontiers to education and learning. Students from elementary school on up can keep tabs on the research, as it develops and unfolds, without having to face subzero temperatures, or the polar bears. This is a topic, I think, that still the public doesn't sufficiently understand. That the way kids get excited about science is by doing it.

You sort of remember when you were little kids you were excited about everything, you were curious about everything, and you didn't make all those distinctions between what was science and what was something else. It was just all a new world, it was all exciting, and the more you could get into it the more you could learn. Somehow, as we move through our system, we forget that, or we lose that kind of same passion, or we advert--we suddenly say, now you're studying science. I mean, maybe that's where we go wrong. The minute the kid discovers, oh, boy, I'm discovering science, I mean--but I don't like science, I like the clouds, and I like the ocean, and I like rocks, and I like to study all these kinds of things. I didn't know it was science.

So there's a communication problem here, there's a problem of definition of words. But more than anything else, there's our getting away from tapping into that very curiosity of young people, that we must not let go away as they work their way through the system. That's also what research is all about. Most researchers--you are researchers, and/or you know researchers very well, and you realize none of us have ever grown up. That's what characterizes who we are and what we do. That somehow is what we must not lose, as we try to make very real efforts to improve the delivery of science and math learning experiences to young people.

So before I close, let me share a few insights from a report that released last month by the National Science Board. It's findings relate directly to all of these increased expectations and responsibilities that I'm talking about. The report is entitled "Industry Trends in Research Support, and Links to Public Research," and it examines the evolving nature of the university-industry tie.

First, it found that industry has restored funding of its own research laboratories, which represents a turnaround from the cutbacks that began in the late 1980s. It didn't just put the money back into the laboratories, the same way they had been twenty years ago. It's quite a different kind of resource for research and development activities in industry, but the point is, they funnelled the money back in again, and that's an important consideration.

Second, the report found a continuing increase, albeit from a relatively small base, for industry funding of academic research, and you're seeing that in your own institutions. Not only with that come opportunities, but also challenges that you deal with on a day by day basis. Most significant was that the Board took a close look at the findings first released last summer on the linkage between patents and publicly supported research activities. And to quote from the report, "The growing incidence of patent citations to research papers indicates increasing importance of publicly funded research to U.S. industry, particularly in such areas as biotechnology and pharmaceuticals."

Findings like these raise a number of questions that relate directly to FDP and our gathering here today. We now have a wealth of data and analysis that speaks to the importance to our nation of these different kinds of connections, and the linkages and partnerships. That's now clear, I think, beyond any doubt. But it's also clear that the growth in both the number and the complexity of these connections affects our research system, as a whole, but we're not sure precisely how.

There are some indications that it worsens existing stresses on the system; others suggest the

opposite--namely, that it strengthens the system, and helps to position it for the 21st century, and probably there are examples of both, and it depends on the time and the situations. Maybe the only thing you can say with certainty, in general, about the future of our research enterprise, is that expectations and responsibilities are both increasing at record rates. While this does not make your work any easier, it does make it all the more important. I know, for example, that these continuously evolving partnerships, and other signs of the times, can create their share of administrative headaches.

So just when we think that we have a grip on terms like conflicts and cost sharing, some new wrinkle appears, and we feel like we're back at square one. For this reason, when we think about the post-Cold War agenda for science, I know that one key to our success as a community rests with all of us here today.

The Federal Demonstration Partnership has already strengthened and streamlined our research system in countless ways. Your work has given our research enterprise the agility and the facility needed to rise to the challenge of the still evolving agenda. So I want to commend all of you again, for all the innovations and the efficiencies you've brought to the research process. The advances in electronic research administration are especially encouraging and impressive. Much more needs to be done, so let me also challenge you to continue working creatively and thoughtfully, and aggressively. That's the only way for us to meet the ever increasing expectations and responsibilities being placed on us.

And I've said to many of you outside when we were talking before the session here this afternoon that if it were not for this organization, I would be very pessimistic about our ability in the federal government to get at some of these important issues that you have laid out for us. If you had to invent this organization right now, as impressive as you all are, I have a feeling it would take a while to get the organization together to reach some consensus on what are the important issues to move forward on. So we're extremely indebted to all of you, particularly, who were founders of this organization, but all of you who spend your time and effort in behalf of these very important problems.

So with the existence of FDP, and with the work you're doing, I'm optimistic we're going to make some progress. We won't get all the tough ones done right away, and we may not get some of the tough ones done for a long time. I mean, it may still be depending on our children and grandchildren to solve some of these problems of the partnership between the federal government and the university. But let's not let that be too many of the particularly important ones. Let's try to get hold of some of

the biggies early on, as well as the little ones, and see if we can't have some successes together. Not assume there is anything that can't be done here, just to try to move forward. I think with a few successes we'll get the attention of the folks who perhaps initially are skeptical about our ability to get at these issues, and make them champions of the whole process.

So in closing, all of you should know that you certainly have my thanks, certainly my appreciation, and my continuing support for your efforts. We know that an exciting and formidable time lies ahead for all of us. We have both national optimism and support for our task in moving America to a post-Cold War agenda in science, engineering and technology. And together I think we can forge--indeed, we are forging--a new agenda for science that will help lead our nation into the 21st century.

Faculty Panel

MR. WALSH: Well, I'd like welcome everyone on the Committee of the Whole to the second panel discussion this morning, and to recognize the previous panelists for setting a very, very high standard. Our intent here is to discuss stresses on faculty, and this morning's summary will be a reflection of two very instructive and wide ranging discussions yesterday afternoon, and an attempt to synthesize in bites something that we all felt yesterday, I think, is a really inextricably linked set of issues. Particularly, I'd like to draw the committee's attention back to Dr. Lane's remarks yesterday, where he talked about the integration of teaching and research. And I think the these yesterday in our discussion was that faculty recognize that these things are simply not separable, or auditable in a bite-sized way, and many of the stresses that come up are based on the assumption that that's possible. So the panelists today will each have four to five minutes to summarize their own thoughts, and to inject anything else that came out of yesterday's discussion, weave it in, and then we'll turn it open for discussion. We have Bill Olbricht from Cornell, who will discuss graduate students, and some of the stresses related to that. Susan Braunhut, from the University of Massachusetts in Lowell, who will talk about electronic research administration--some pros and cons, the difficulty with the learning curve. James Taylor, from the University of Wisconsin at Madison, who will talk about stability, and the stability of funding, and the stresses that projecting this and maintaining the staff bring to faculty life. And then Carol Liedtke and Bob Decker--Carol from Case Western and Bob from Northwestern--will discuss effort reporting and cost sharing, and they will go as a team, I believe. So, starting from my right, Bill?

MR. OLBRICHT: My name is Bill Olbricht, and I'm in chemical engineering at Cornell, and I spoke up yesterday about something that affects myself, and my colleagues, I know, and so here I am. After you've been at the university a while, in the role of a faculty member, you realize that you're really an entrepreneur within the university. And one of the big challenges as being an entrepreneur is really to meet the payroll, and that's supporting, to a large extent, graduate students. For many faculty members in their research laboratories the support of graduate students is the single biggest item that they face, and it's one that they face on a very timely basis. Some of the stresses that that puts on faculty members grow out of the complications, by the fact that various agencies view graduate students in a very different way, and the role of graduate students in carrying out the research activities has never been really defined quite precisely. Everyone seems to have a different view of what graduate students do--faculty members, even our university administrators, and the sponsoring agencies. Some of the agencies, for example, as you're well aware, put limits on graduate student support. They place limits on the reimbursement of graduate student tuition. And one comment that was made yesterday at our meeting is that even within an agency, an agency may view graduate students differently, depending upon whether they are supported as a research assistant on a grant, or they're on a fellowship, or maybe consider a trainee. And the frustration to faculty is that these different rules that apply to different kinds of sponsorship are ironic, because, in many cases, those students are doing exactly the same activities within the laboratory, and contributing exactly the same things to a sponsored project. Even university administrators are unclear on this point, as you're well aware. I was recently sent a survey, and one of the questions was, are graduate students at your institution employees of the university or not? And when I got back the results of the survey, in about half the cases they were and in about half the cases they weren't, in different universities. It's kind of easy to see why we have this problem of the view of graduate students, and one thing that I constantly point out to my colleagues is the view of first year graduate students. First year graduate students, new on campus, spend most of their time taking classes. Now, you might say they're learning the skills that they'll later apply professionally, or perhaps you might view them as meeting the

curriculum requirements for their own degree objectives. A third view might be that they're receiving training, or developing the tools that are necessary for them later to carry out that sponsored research. And the answer is, probably they're doing all three of these things, and I think you see here the connection between research and education is perhaps as intimate as it gets on the university campus. The problem comes when some agencies, and maybe their auditors, try to carve out that educational part of the training, and say that that part should be borne only by the university. The university, on the other hand, is saying often they are bearing a substantial fraction of the cost of the graduate students. Maybe they pay that first year, for example. And there they view that that contribution is setting up the students to work on sponsored projects. Maybe the graduate students serve as TAs during their training; most do, and during that semester or two, the university is bearing the cost of that graduate student, even though, probably 50 percent or more of their time, the graduate student is working on a sponsored project. Isn't that a form of cost sharing? And these kinds of debates are really frustrating to the faculty, because they try to make an artificial distinction between graduate education and research. On our campus, we've been trying to train our upper level administrators, especially the ones who deal with the public, to think of research and graduate education as one long word, and not to make the distinction. It's kind of gratifying when they finally get it. They say, research and graduate education about half the time, and graduate education and research about the other half of the time. And so then we know they've really got the idea. What are the consequences of this kind of murky view of graduate students and their role in the sponsored research enterprise? Well, there's little recognition, or little explicit recognition, given that when grants are cut, or delayed even, that a payroll still has to be met. If it comes down to an equipment purchase, or even supplies, those sorts of things can be stretched out, but the graduate students are not going to be turned out when grants are delayed or cut. It's a huge problem for a department. I know in my department, since a substantial fraction of our discretionary funds is used to support graduate students in this situation. Worse yet, I think it forces faculty to become very conservative budgeteers, and it thwarts innovation, and it makes them averse to taking risks in their own proposals. It leads them to come to a conclusion that if agencies, and our administrations themselves, don't explicitly recognize the investment faculty make in training graduate students, then why should the faculty make that investment. This is a source of stress, because faculty are faced with balancing the training of graduate students with the need to produce timely results in the grants and contracts. This is especially difficult when people are trying to encourage interdisciplinary projects, where graduate students are going to have to take extra time to learn fields that they're not that familiar with. The faculty are trying to build proposals that are scientifically sound and technically relevant, and make good training ground for graduate students to learn how to do research, because that's their job. And we need the agencies' support in this overall enterprise. The alternatives that faculty will take if they don't get that support is to do things like turn more to postdocs for their work. Their postdocs are more productive early on, they don't have that induction time to get going, and at some universities, like my own, they're not that much more expensive than graduate students. I think maybe the longest-range impact of this inability--or lack of a definite role of graduate students, a view of it in sponsored research--is that we fail to convey that role to the public, and train the public to understand what role graduate students play. And this shows up in the way that legislators treat graduate students, and now we have the taxation of graduate students' stipends. And there is a repeated proposal that comes up every few years to tax the tuition portion of what graduate students receive. Not only would this be a disaster, fiscally, for a university like mine, and probably many others, but also it sends exactly the wrong message to the public, and to future graduate students, about this connection between research and graduate education.

MR. WALSH: Thank you, Bill. We will go through the panelists, because I felt if we opened these

topics for discussion we would get about a third of the way into the group. So please remember your questions. Susan?

MS. BRAUNHUT: I wanted to mention that the topics that we picked here today were really things that the faculty at large that met in the caucus--these are issues that resonated through the group. So we tried to focus on them. And my remarks are actually not all my own so much as to serve as a conduit for other faculty members who commented on these particular issues. So I wanted to address the stresses that faculty are experiencing with regard to electronic submission and administrations. Now, we wanted to emphasize that some of these are obviously short-term, and that they will be resolved as the technology gets better, and as we all get accustomed to the method of submission and administration, but that others are long-term. One of the first issues that was raised was concerning security, and that although passwords are being implemented, et cetera, the computer-wise and savvy among us are warning us that in fact to communicate an application over open airways is really not secure. And so the fact that we are sending original ideas--not only can the proposals be tampered with, but also people have access to original ideas that until activation are really--haven't been disclosed, and are not really protected. The second major concern that we had was the quality of the submission, that once you push the send button, that in fact, because of the nonuniversality of platforms, the product coming out at the other end will be of lesser quality than what you would have control over if you were submitting a hard copy from our grants administration offices. And there's an enormous concern about the quality of the submission that will retain us competitive with people who have better equipment for electronic submission. So, concerns about nonuniversal platforms, the fact that original figures that need to be printed out at a distant site, at NSF or NIH, will be of lesser quality than will serve the purpose of the grant. This brings up the next issue, and I think this is really in keeping with the mandate of FDP. By having representatives from large and small universities, we have a raised awareness that electronic submission will start again to separate the haves and have-nots. People who have more sophisticated digitizing equipment accessible to them will have a better presentation when grants are submitted electronically. So this is a big concern, that there will not be a level playing field. There's a lot of stress associated with the loss of control of the product, and how do we maintain our competitiveness. There was a suggestion made that perhaps grants administration offices should consider having a specialist who would be centralized within a university, just as we have contract people, or people who deal specifically with budgets. But maybe there should be an idea of centralizing superior digitizing equipment, and a specialist who could aid the principal investigators, so that the product that goes out is very uniform, and of the most competitive and best quality that we can generate. The last thing I wanted to mention is, those faculty among us who have been participating in fast-lane mentioned that the burden of preparation has shifted to the PI. By having templates on web sites that we then go and fill in, and really generate a final form, that it has been taking people up to twice the time for the preparation. And so, although on the reviewer's side we hear people who were receiving the grants to review had a very--they approached it first with trepidation, and then had a very positive response to it--those people who are submitting proposals are finding that the time commitment is roughly double. So these are some of the things--part of it is a learning curve, in terms of learning how to enter the data. But even more than that, it's generating a final form document for some of the--from the templates. So some of it will go away as we learn to use the forms and enter the data, but some of it really is shifting the burden of preparation to the PI.

MR. WALSH: Thank you, Susan. James?

MR. TAYLOR: Before I begin talking about some of the stability of funding for research, I'd like to reiterate some of the statements that I made in San Antonio, when I have worked with industrial

contracts, versus grants from the agencies that are represented by FDP. I can certainly see the stress that FDP has eliminated from my life in trying to prepare a grant. But John asked us to talk about some of the remaining stresses that we have, and one of the stresses that's coming from the area of the physical sciences--this is a different area than perhaps from the biological sciences--is the precipitous drop in funding from Department of Defense. There are a number of engineering faculty that are in serious difficulties on our campuses because of this rapid drop in funding. For 1998 to '99, the blue book that we have in the packet of the material that we have shows a drop in DoD funding for federal science and technology of 9.7 percent. And as long as you leave it in percentage figures, it doesn't look too bad, but that particular budget is three times that of NSF. So that would correspond to about a 27 percent drop in an NSF budget, if that same percentage were applied. The NIH budget seems to be twice that, so that would correspond to somewhere in the neighborhood of a 4.5 percent drop in NIH. If the budgets were to be phased, or planned, universities would find some way of redirecting their effort. But when you assemble a group of very highly trained, technical people to support a center, or to support a particular mission, and over a period of a year or so you have to disband that group, or find some other way of finding funding, this causes major stress. It also means that some of the products that would come out of this concerted effort will no longer be there. The standard that we need for producing better documents is coming out of some of the microelectronics research that will no longer be done. Some of the microwave communication facilities that we presently have is coming out of some of the research in the physical sciences dealing with ways of making those devices. So this funding cut that's appearing in the Department of Defense will have a major impact, not only on our consumer electronics, but also on our health areas as well, because some of the developments in imaging, and everything else, are coming from some of the instrumentation work that is supported by the Department of Defense. I think this is a major stress area. I'm not so sure how FDP can influence it, except to continue to inform the public of some of the things that are causing stress in our lives as we attempt to do the research that originally was mandated as a way of providing competitiveness for our U.S. industry.

MR. WALSH: Thanks. Now, Carol and Bob, I presume that each of you would speak, but that you've divided it amongst yourselves.

MS. LIEDTKE: Okay. I'm going to start out. As you've just heard, not are there a number of stresses on the PIs, but the FDP has played a critical role of reducing stresses to us. So when new ones pop up, they're immediately recognized. The faculty tend to be individuals who will immediately bring to their administrators' attentions certain issues that are of extreme importance. And one of them is effort reporting. Effort reporting has come into being through A-21, and there are a number of important consequences of the effort reporting that have resulted in a cycle of activity. To begin with, the effort reporting itself is to be based on the percent of the professional time of the faculty that is dealt on a research topic. Now, this is the definition we hear from the NIH, but it may not be the definition other agencies are using. It is this type of reporting, based on professional time, that is done, rather than reporting on a forty-hour week. Most faculty will admit to you that they actually spend more time on the research projects than is indicated in effort reporting, particularly in terms of the number of hours that are spent on it. But part of the cycle of activity that we're starting to notice is that there's an impact on the salary support. The NIH has a cap of \$125,000 a year for salary. Also there are investigators, particularly those in clinical research, who have multiple salary sources, and how does one factor in the effort reporting for this type of an individual. Because of the lack of a definition of efforts, there are difficulties in determining how we keep track, how do we keep records, and this has become a particularly important issue, causing stress for both university administrators and faculty, as some agencies are now auditing the

effort reporting. The consequences for that may be a readjustment, or a renegotiation, of the percent effort that is declared on a particular research project. So what we have tried to identify in our sessions is the key things that the FDP can do to recognize the stress, and to work with faculty and administrators in relieving it. What we have come up with is that there's a real need for principles of effort reporting--a definition that is accepted by all agencies, and certain principles that are uniform, upon which administrators and faculty can then look and determine how its effort is recorded, what record keeping is necessary, and how audits will be done. What particular elements of the audits will be done, and how will this be applied in the future. Okay, I'll hand it over to Robert now.

MR. DECKER: I think it's quite clear that effort reporting, and the salary attributed to effort reporting on a grant, is an important issue that needs to be resolved in a number of different concerns. But accompanying this are the issues related to cost sharing, that many different agencies are adopting, or have adopted over the past. And I think all of the faculty members of our panel were quite pleased with the cost sharing arrangements that have developed over the past several decades with respect to purchasing major pieces of equipment, and it's quite clear that universities are pleased, and willing to become partners with the federal government to maintain our research infrastructure. But over the past several years, the issue of voluntary cost sharing has become more and more important, and has become more and more problematic. The issue becomes one that was raised earlier, of the haves and the have-nots. For an example, would a large program, that has significant cost sharing, be looked at from an advantageous point of view by an agency, if one university was willing to cost share at the 40 to 50 percent level, while a potentially competing university could only cost share at a 25 or a 30 percent level? The issue becomes, if the peer review for those two programs was identical, or at least almost indistinguishable, would favoritism be shown? And I think the issue that the faculty committee raised is to address the issue of cost sharing across agencies, to try to come up with some principles--again, principles like the principles that we're trying to define for time and effort--that would allow us to define exactly what cost sharing means, and whether it's important that the issue of cost sharing in fact be different from one agency to another. I think universities are perfectly willing to partner with the federal government, obviously. We can't carry out our research without an effective partnership. But we need to know what the rules are, and we need to establish what the relationship between cost sharing and the university is. This is a particularly stressful situation, and maybe anecdotally I can give you an example. In addition to being a faculty member, I'm an associate dean for research, and we just responded to an RFA for a magnetic resonance machine to do animal research. Now, I'm on that RFA, but I'm also the associate dean of research, who has to commit matching funds to get that piece of equipment. It puts me in a very compromising situation, needless to say. But in this particular instance it wasn't difficult for me to make the decision. [Laughter.] Furthermore, the institution I'm at has the resources to do that. But I think that there are major concerns, once again, that we need to be concerned about what the rules are, and we need to ensure that research programs in which cost sharing is an issue be separated from the peer review itself. We would very much like to have the proposals ranked and funded on peer review, and separate the cost sharing issues after we've done the peer review. That's the only way, at least we view, that this could be a fair process. And I think this is an issue that FDP is ideally suited to address, because we can discuss on a one-to-one basis with our agency partners exactly how we can implement this process. Thank you.

MR. WALSH: Well, thank each of you for those presentations. And just before we open the floor for discussion, I would mention two more things. First, I think the FDP could also be instrumental in convincing the agencies, Congress and the public at large that the very existence of research universities

is a massive form of cost sharing. And to try to ascertain who paid for what is a formidable task. And second, those of you who noticed that most of our panelists, including myself, are senior researchers, well established--some of us more senior than others. We did not yesterday get to the specific stresses on young faculty, who are just passing beyond graduate students and entering the profession, and I think that's an issue and an area where FDP, over the next year, should focus some of its attention. And we're dealing with these issues from a perspective of, as Bill said, maintaining an organization, and we do have to pay particular attention to the young people who are entering the profession, and who have additional stresses, just based on the notion of, is there a place for me in this?

Return to the [Calendar of Events](#) page or to the [FDP Home Page](#)

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).

FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP
Meeting of the Steering Committee
September 25, 1998
Lecture Room
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Morning Session: 9:00 a.m.

Welcome: FDP Executive Chair Barbara Siegel

Chair Barbara Siegel welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the other members of the executive committee: Constance Atwell, Susan Braunhut, Karl Erb, Anne-Marie Mazza, and Charles Paoletti. She then called Steering Committee academic/research institutions and asked members to introduce themselves. She also recognized the presence of federal colleagues, affiliate organizations, friends, and guests, noting that FDP is an open organization.

Institution Reports: Gerald Stuck

Stuck reported that 60 of 65 reports had been submitted using the new, improved electronic format. Siegel indicated that because the reports are a requirement of FDP membership, Bob Hardy and Beth Israel, co-chairs of the Membership Committee, will be following up on those institutions who have not submitted them.

In a viewgraph presentation (Attachment 1), Stuck summarized the report format content that includes demographics of the institution, FDP involvement on committees/ workgroups, efforts at institutionalizing FDP on site, major concerns, suggestions about working groups, re-engineering efforts, status of ERA and business processes efforts, and FTE's that support the research administration function. The top concern is standardization of terms and conditions, closely followed by issues related to cost-sharing. The top suggestion for a future demonstration is (1) the relationship among cost-sharing, time and effort reporting, and indirect costs, followed by (2) a suggestion to continue to focus on the ERA working group efforts regarding consistent policies and procedures at federal agencies and institutions, and (3) the faculty/graduate student issue on the integration of research and education. A fourth suggestion is to address faculty needs for quality and sufficient administrative and fiscal services. Stuck is preparing a written summary report to be distributed to members at the December meeting. Russell Lea proposed that it also go to GUIRR and the House Science Committee, and others urged sending it to a larger audience (scientific groups, friends, etc.) as well. Chair Siegel agreed and noted the continuing efforts to work with the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) on a joint convocation involving FDP and the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) Committee on Science that would be geared toward university presidents and vp's for research. Regarding the full institution reports, Siegel also said that members would be queried via the listserv as to whether they

wanted their institution report posted on the web.

Member discussion focused on ERA: Paoletti

Concern that the feds are not appearing to have a "common" face re ERA; Braunhut: feds need to understand that cost is a barrier to university re-engineering; Lea/Norris/Datko: cost not the barrier - it's that faculty are not pushing ERA use; Wasserman: faculty waiting to see if it will bring standardization and simplification; Norris: confusion about which ERA "system" will win is causing institutions to sit back and wait; Braunhut: faculty concerned with ERA allowing truly quality applications that fairly represent the quality of work, and concern that they won't have administrative help to fill in the blanks and this will increase their workload not lessen it. Walsh: In a transient phase from "old" faculty to "new" faculty who are electronically literate and we must invest in the new faculty. Wray: the ERA costs are an institutional commitment and we need to convince our administration that it's cost-effective. Showman (EPA): the feds must commit to ERA to convince smaller organizations to invest in re-engineering. Siegel: Concluded that ERA systems tend to require more people and higher level individuals than paper processing, so no cost-savings during the interim.

A Conversation with Woody Jackson, Deputy Controller of the Office of Financial Management of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget:

Chair Siegel introduced Mr. Jackson as a person who is well-known to FDP and who was especially active during FDP's Phase II. Mr. Jackson in turn introduced his OMB Associate Gil Tran who will be OMB's representative to the FDP.

Mr. Jackson outlined four principal points:

1. Merger of OMB cost principle circulars. Mr. Jackson stated his determination to merge the various existing OMB cost principle circulars. "If we're going to allow costs to a state government to carry out a grant, why wouldn't we allow that same cost to a university or to a non-profit organization?" Mr. Jackson indicated that in his view the circulars are now quite symmetrical with regard to allowable costs. While he recognized there are pros and cons to such a merger, he hopes by spring that OMB will have a model. Gil Tran has been assigned responsibility for this project.

Perhaps anticipating audience questions, Mr. Jackson also indicated that there will be some anomalies, such as the A-21 administrative cost cap. He stated "That cap has never particularly bothered me," and pointed to the political issues that would arise should OMB seek to remove it. However, he went on to state "I never want to see facilities costs capped...If we cap your ability to recover things like the cost of facilities...it stands to reason that your inability to recover...is going to directly affect your propensity to construct facilities needed to carry out important research."

2. OMB intends to review current grant administrative requirements in circular A-110, with a view towards massive simplification. He would like "to see whether we could deal with things more conceptually than procedurally." He called for a possible demonstration aimed at eliminating all or most of the procedural requirements in the existing circular, to test whether this would work and meet an audit test. In his view, reducing administrative burdens in this way (while retaining the A-21 cap) could free up funds for other purposes. "We need to look forward toward a cost-beneficial administration system as

opposed to a very prescriptive administration system....but we have to test what it is we want to do before we ...codify it."

3. The Glenn bill. While originally targeted to state and local government formula programs, Mr. Jackson indicated OMB's view was that it should cover all organizations covered by the 1996 Single Audit Act Amendments. OMB has worked extensively with the Senate Committee staff to rewrite the bill accordingly. The bill would provide a statutory basis for grant management reforms, especially with regard to moving into an electronic environment. Mr. Jackson indicated the bill could serve as a vehicle to bring all Federal agencies to the table to deal with the complex issues with regard to electronic grant submission. It would provide 18 months to solve these problems. (Note: the bill subsequently was -not-passed by Congress).

4. Cost sharing and full cost demonstration. Mr. Jackson strongly believes we should attempt to fully cost all grant activities. He indicated that some newer techniques such as "activity-based costing" (advocated by San Diego State) might be tried. Under this concept every function or activity is charged for all the costs that benefitted that activity. "If a researcher has spent time on a grant that was not charged to that grant, you've understated the cost of that research, and there's no record of it." With regard to distinctions between persons who are paid a salary to work on sponsored research and persons working on sponsored research activities for education purposes, Mr. Jackson indicated that education functions may be dramatically overstated by salaries not being charged to the particular grant or contract sponsored research. He stated that "A grant should be charged for the benefit it receives, notwithstanding the means by which an individual is paid for standing at the bench." He felt that universities are poorly served by present accounting practices, because they have no idea what they're actually contributing to the cost of sponsored research. "I would challenge somebody to come forward and show mea record that shows how much subsidizing is going on...we don't have a clue what full cost is right now. We do not know the full cost of carrying out research on Federally-sponsored agreements today." Mr. Jackson stated his belief that from a managerial point of view, the universities need to be able to demonstrate the extent to which they have shared in the cost of sponsored research.

Mr. Jackson felt that this subject would lend itself to "a great little demonstration project....Take some pilots and say who's got a good....up-to-date accounting system, who's got the capacity to do this, and let's see if we can't experiment....with regard to ways to fully cost out Federal grants and contracts." Mr. Jackson suggested that for these purposes people be brought in who develop cost accounting techniques for enterprises outside the government environment, including some from academia. In the discussion that followed, Mr. Jackson's last point received the most attention. Julie Norris indicated the biggest problem with cost sharing is voluntary effort beyond that which is documented in the proposal, where the audit agencies tell universities that it must be captured and moved into the (organized) research base for purposes of F&A rate calculation, which results in lowering the F&A reimbursement. Mr. Jackson indicated he felt that was a separate argument, but that any full cost demonstration would have to deal with it. "Full costing should not carry with it a penalty." Jack Kamerer raised as another issue "how much tuition money is going to fully offset the research costs and when you start taking faculty effort that's paid out of the academic side of the house that gets transferred over to research, it's not always clearly understood in the state legislature the importance of research as it relates to the academic enterprise." Mr. Jackson indicated that the political ramifications would have to be dealt with in any full costing demonstration. Susan Braunhut stated that from a faculty perspective, "When any person walks through the door at my laboratory, I'm educating them in how to conduct research and the way I do it is through my funded research project. So that every effort on the part of an undergraduate or graduate

student or a postdoc is aimed at one of the grants that I have currently ongoing and all their effort is assigned to a project with a specific aim." She suggested exploring other ways to track student effort such as disclosures on patent applications or papers submitted in progress reports. Mr. Jackson indicated that if the grant benefitted directly from the student's effort and energy, then it should be charged to the grant. "If you were producing automobiles and you were using people who were involved in an educational endeavor to help design the automobile or construct the automobile, then their efforts, albeit they individually benefitted, would be charged to the cost of that automobile. That doesn't mean the individual didn't benefit. That's what an education is all about." Mr. Jackson went on to state "If you carry out a demonstration effort here, these things are going to come out and we have to work through one at a time. They just put them in individual buckets and you have to work out a solution and you get the researchers involved. This is not a demonstration carried on by accountants. We've got to have the academic people sitting at the table, because you're affected by whatever we come up with in terms of cost determination here...what people do, they look at this thing horizontally. They don't look at education vertically...maybe we have to, because of the way the model is developed, but we talk about things in terms of the way the accountants had it set up...we are forced to put things in certain buckets...from an accounting point of view, if it's in the education bucket, it would imply that those people that are in that bucket are teaching and the people who are in the R&D bucket are not teaching. Well, that's a contradiction in terms, from what I'm hearing."

In closing, Mr. Jackson indicated that he was responding to concerns from the university community, rather than higher-level management at OMB. He expressed belief that a way to deal with these concerns may be through a demonstration, and he believed it could be designed in a way that would not engender great risk to universities.

Faculty Committee Report: Susan Braunhut

Braunhut reported that between now and the December meeting, the Faculty Committee will be working on five things: (1) developing a faculty mission statement that will focus on (a) active participation and (b) serving as a conduit to the faculty at large in their institutions; (2) shifting the committee's workload from on site to on-line via the FDP listserv, (3) forming faculty interest groups on various topics of cost-sharing, electronic submission, effort reporting, and education and research, (4) polling faculty about identifying preferable times during the year that are best for FDP meetings, taking into account teaching activities, the end of the fiscal year and scientific society major meetings, and (5) developing incentives for faculty to come to FDP meetings and developing FDP materials, including a slide show, for use by faculty as a conduit to the faculty at large. Braunhut then reviewed the "profile" of a successful FDP faculty rep (diverse activities, service as a reviewer and submitter of proposals, some interest in policy, service as a dean.)

ERA Activities: Gerald Stuck

Stuck took brief note of the Glenn bill, noting that FDP's and federal agencies concern is that the issue is standardizing the data, not the forms. Stuck then presented an update of Federal agency ERA activities to develop a "proof of concept," by initially connecting NSF, NIH, and ONR systems. Issue areas include security (authenticating people in a common way, i.e., digital signatures), organizational profiles, professional profiles, and creating a secure internet on the backend where agencies can exchange database information. Funding is assured through GSA, NSF, NIH, and ONR. Timing includes beginning

development in October; they are requesting a high level domain: "fedcommons.gov." Stuck stressed that the working group views this as developing "behind the scenes" infrastructure to merge disparate grants agencies across the government. Stuck emphasized that FDP is clearly going to be used as a test vehicle to see how this works, there is high level involvement and focus, and there is commitment to supporting the 194 transaction set and some web interfaces for those who can't use the 194.

Afternoon Session

ERA Coordinator Position: Chair Barbara Siegel

Siegel announced that Jerry Stuck would be completing his one-year assignment as FDP ERA Coordinator and returning to NSF, where he would continue to participate actively in ERA coordination activities, especially federal coordination activities, through the end of the calendar year. After that he will continue to be strongly involved in the ERA working group and also serve as a liaison for FDP to the various Federal working groups. Siegel invited nominations regarding Stuck's successor, and then thanked him "for all the wonderful things you've done for us." (Applause.)

Finance Committee Report: Mareda Weiss

Mareda Weiss, Chair, summarized the views of the Committee with regard to establishing a fund reserve for the FDP, and moved that the plan be adopted. A two-year, two-tiered registration fee would go into effect for the upcoming December meeting of the whole. Member institutions, affiliates and nonmembers would pay the fee (per person) at both Steering Committee and Committee of the Whole meetings while Federal agencies would pay only at the Committee of the Whole meetings. MIT has agreed to maintain the account; the Executive Committee will approve expenditures. The fee is \$25 per member, and \$50 per nonmember. On a show of hands Chair Barbara Siegel declared the motion passed and thanked Weiss for her work and Julie Norris and MIT for taking on the role of treasurer.

Agency and University Updates:

Office of Naval Research

Ann Stuart introduced new associates Marty Morris, June Hawley (Seattle office), and Cheryl Ball (San Diego office). She then reported that ONR has eliminated its foreign travel approval requirement.

EPA

John Showman introduced Mildred Lee who will become more active in FDP as he will become somewhat less involved. He then reported that EPA is mandated to eliminate by July 2000 a large backlog of grants closeouts (some just a formality) and asked for cooperation from those who will be receiving notices. He then noted that EPA has begun oversight visits of recipient organizations, not for audit purposes but to see how grant programs are managed. The agency conducted five such visits this past summer.

USDA

Melanie Krizmanich noted that the Agricultural Research Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998, which authorizes many grant programs, was signed in June, and they are working with grantees to interpret the language and determine how to meet the requirements of the language. Issues include one related to their agricultural telecommunications program, and another one related to the special grants program reduction in awards from five years to three years. The latter issue, as well as a new requirement of an annual submission of a SAFETY-269 for those awards that require cost-sharing, will require USDA modifications in their agency-specific terms and conditions, and Krizmanich invited feedback on the language, and Siegel in turn invited her to post this on the FDP listserve.

Bob MacDonald, USDA, then talked about: (1) indirect cost rates, (2) the Fund for Rural America, and (3) the new \$120 million grants program in the context of then current information about the 1999 appropriations bills. The indirect cost rates are uncertain until the appropriations bills are passed and he invited calls to the agency regarding current information. He then reported that the Fund for Rural America, authorized under the 1996 Farm Bill, may not be funded in 1999, the \$120M grants fund for research/education/extension may not be funded, and the national research initiative grants program may not be funded as well, and he invited members to get updates on their website. He reported that USDA will be automatically emailing proposal acknowledgements as proposals are entered into the system as well as piloting an email award notice this year. In addition, plans are moving forward on a web-based reporting system for competitive grants. He noted also that USDA is very supportive of the "federal commons" concept and is actively participating.

NASA

Siegel introduced Sylvia Kraemer and her associate Steven Miley. Kraemer reported that the 2-year old NASA grants process action team has made persuasive recommendations regarding greatly streamlining their processes and eliminating redundant paperwork. Kraemer hopes soon for a report on the success of implementing these changes.

NIH

Diana Jaeger introduced her associates George Stone, Carol Alderson, Karen Tiplady, Carol Tippery, Paul Markovitz, Chris Lambert, Ann Russo and Mary Armstead. She then reported on five items: (1) NIH will have two regional seminars: in the spring at the University of Florida, and in July at the University of Wisconsin. (2) There is now a link from the FDP website to register for the NIH commons. (3) Revised application kits will be available shortly and go into effect in February. (4) A new NIH grants policy statement for grants not subject to FDP terms and conditions will go into effect October 1. While it won't carry new terms and conditions, it is geared specifically to NIH. (5) NIH has received approval from Dr. Varmus to proceed with modular grants with a target date of June.

Member discussion: Jaeger clarified that institutional email points of contact for purposes of award notices are identified by a list at a central office and not from a proposal face sheet and until the "federal commons" is fine-tuned, institutions must directly notify the central NIH office of any changes. She also noted that awards are posted weekly on their website.

NSF

Jean Feldman reported that NSF Director Rita Colwell has signed off on Important Notice #123, working

toward a paperless proposal process - and it is available on the web. (See Attachment 2.) Feldman then summarized the notice which is NSF's vision of the process that goes all the way from program announcement to award closeout. Importantly, the notice includes a much requested timetable for implementation - a lot of which occurs by October 2000.

NSF has also issued a new grant proposal guide, 99-2, effective October 1 (with a flexible transition period). In addition, NSF has developed new grant general conditions for non-FDP participating institutions and announced that NSF did intend to revise its agency-specific requirements for FDP. Feldman said the draft had been put in today's meeting packet for participants and she already had feedback regarding participants concerns. Feldman then addressed several of the concerns (e.g., specific project reporting, acknowledgement of NSF support on web pages) and urged that members track the new grant conditions on the website, as many have to do with required electronic submission of information. She said she would send out a revised draft to all in anticipation of quick feedback for the October 1 implementation. She announced two NSF regional meeting in FY99: in the spring in California, and on October 13-15 in Kansas (an EPSCOR state as well).

Jerry Glaser asked that everyone encourage their PI's to work through their sponsored research offices to notify NSF well in advance of any potential Y2K problems that could arise, and said a Dear Colleague letter to that effect has recently been sent to both these entities. Glaser also emphasized the importance of the NSF website as the advance source of all information on NSF grants.

Member discussion: Siegel raised practical concerns about cumbersome electronic submission of pre-proposals by faculty and the hope that when official concurrence was not required, administrative offices could be relieved of some of this burden. Feldman responded that NSF is working hard at the senior level on development of pre-proposal guidelines to clarify this. Norris again sought assurance that NSF's Fastlane will be not become a separate entity incompatible with other electronic systems that other institutions have invested in, and Feldman's and Hardy's response is that it will be transparent: (the program official will) "not even know whether it came in via EDI or Fastlane."

Feldman then introduced her NSF colleagues: Tom Weber (NSF program rep), Joanna Rom, Jerry Glaser, Carolyn Miller, Bob Hardy, and Joe Kull.

In closing the NSF presentation, Siegel encouraged faculty members present to alert their faculty colleagues back on campus to take the NSF notice seriously and begin testing the system and working with their NSF counterparts in advance of the deadlines.

Committee Reports

Establishment of a Standing Committee on Terms and Conditions: Chair Siegel

Siegel announced that the FDP Executive Committee, upon recommendation of Ann Stuart and Chuck Paoletti, has re-activated the Terms and Conditions Working Group as a full FDP Standing Committee on Terms and Conditions, and now will include institutional as well as federal members. The working group has been in existence from the beginning of FDP - to try to develop a standardized set of terms and conditions for awards from Federal agencies to recipients. The Committee will undertake a detailed review of the FDP terms and conditions to ensure that each article is a model implementation of OMB Circular 110, and hope that the set will become standardized across all Federal agencies.

Sarah Wasserman will be the institutional co-chair, however, the Federal co-chair has not yet been identified. Other institutional members include: Beth Israel, Mary Schmiedel, Vonda Durrer, Donna Ham, and Erica Magrum. NOAA has volunteered to send a representative, and Gil Tran may be solicited from OMB. The new Committee expects to report back at the next Steering Committee in March 1999.

FDP Membership Committee: Bob Hardy

Bob Hardy listed the five institutions whose reports have not been received: UCLA, University of Central Florida, Texas A&M Research Foundation, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, and the University of North Texas. Because submitting these reports is a condition of membership, Hardy urged institutions to keep current on these matters and also update contacts points on the FDP website.

Executive Committee Meeting with OSTP Associate Director for Science, Artie Bienenstock, and Norwood (Woody) Jackson, OMB: Chuck Paoletti

By way of background on the meeting, Chuck Paoletti announced that in August the FDP PRD working group delivered their draft report to the PRD Task Force of the NSTC Committee on Science (COS). The report comprises three parts: (1) recommendations for a set of guiding principles for the university-government research partnership, as compared with operating guidelines driven by A-110, cost principles and agency precedence, (2) operating guidelines that should form the basis for A-110, A-21, etc., and (3) recommendations for follow-up studies of specific parts of A-110, A-21 or other policies. The expectation is that the COS, under Bienenstock's leadership, will review the draft and then engage the universities and Federal agencies in dialog to come to agreement on the principles. Paoletti indicated he thought that COS Task Force members would be receptive to the draft as many had already provided input to the draft.

The meeting with Bienenstock was to elicit his thinking on the matter and move forward on a timetable for COS approval of the draft and scheduling of institutional/agency dialog. Siegel noted that while Bienenstock's OSTP associate Sybil Francis, made it clear that such a dialog was expected, the draft had first to be approved by the COS and that date is uncertain, but it likely will not happen at least until early 1999. FDP staff will continue to follow up with Francis.

Faculty Committee: Susan Braunhut

Braunhut reported on today's lunch meeting of the Committee. She noted (1) that Federal agency program reps are a large incentive for faculty to attend FDP meetings, and encouraged them to come and also serve on FDP working groups as they are familiar with faculty concerns, (2) Woody Jackson's remarks today on cost-sharing are going to elicit a passionate response from faculty, and (3) concern about post-docs without a funding record being in a catch-22 situation -- being overlooked as potential P.I.'s in favor of others who come into a position well-funded.

Working Group Reports

Integrated Performance Standards: Jean Feldman

Feldman reported that the working group plans to state its mission and change its name to the "Business

Rules and Performance Standards" working group. She then noted that NSF has been working on standardizing its program announcements and also providing electronically with each announcement a list of business rules associated with a particular announcement. NSF expects to have this fully in use by January of 1999.

Electronic Notification of Awards Working Group: Russell Lea

Lea noted that the working group included ONR working with five universities on the concept. Technical progress is being made regarding scanned facsimile signatures, and by October 1 the group will begin providing test awards on a collaborative working website to the five universities. MIT has already successfully downloaded several into their system. Testing will also go forward with other institutions' electronic systems in November. Lea hopes to present test results at the December Orlando meeting and perhaps open up the system to others who are interested.

EARS Working Group: Nancy Wray

Wray reported that the group has not been successful at raising funds from agencies to support the initiatives of the working group and that they plan to abandon these efforts in favor of restructuring the group. The new structure will have three subcommittees: (1) the EARS electronic communication committee (co-chaired by Wray and Kathy Larrett), (2) the EARS business rules committee (co-chaired by Mary Ellen Sheridan, George Stone, and Carolyn Miller), and (3) the EARS technology committee (now co-chaired by Erin Lindsay and Ken Forstmeier). In addition, there will be a steering committee comprising representatives from the subcommittees. Details will be posted on the working group listserv, and an update provided at the December Orlando meeting.

Other Items of Business: Chair Siegel

Steering Committee Rotation

Bob Hardy announced that the University of West Florida will switch with the University of Maryland to serve in years five and six (2001 and 2002).

Agency Program/Faculty Representatives

Hardy also urged agencies to name a program representative, institutions to name faculty representatives, and for all to regularly update the FDP website.

Establishment of a Publications Task Force

Siegel announced the formation of the task force as a third component of the Communications Committee. In addition to the website and listserv components of the Committee, the publications task force would not only develop FDP descriptive materials for internal use, but for distribution to external groups as well. Siegel invited those interested in serving on the new task force to get in touch with her.

Return to the [Calendar of Events](#) page or to the [FDP Home Page](#)

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).

This page was last updated on 12/08/98

FDP - Steering Committee and Committee of the Whole

December 1998 Meeting: Orlando, FL

Welcome

FDP Executive Chair Barbara Siegel (Executive Director, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Northwestern University)

Chair Barbara Siegel opened the meeting by introducing members of the FDP Executive Committee: Constance Atwell, Susan Braunhut, Anne-Marie Mazza, and Charles Paoletti. Karl Erb was unable to attend the meeting. Siegel noted that 10 years ago, the FDP (then called the Florida Demonstration Project) had its kickoff meeting in Orlando, coinciding with the first space shuttle launch after the Challenger disaster. She then warmly thanked all of the Florida institutional organizers for this week's meeting: Barbara Pifel and Linda Gallegos, UCF; Cathy Thurman and Doug Backman, FIU; Sandra Goldstein and Rusty Okoniewski, UF; and Dave Slusher, UNF. She called attention to the attractive FDP logo created by the organizers, suggesting it could be adopted as the official logo.

Welcoming Address:

"Personal Reflections on FDP: Past, Present and Future"

Dr. Thomas Walsh, Professor of Physics and Electrical Engineering, and Director, Office of Sponsored Research, University of Florida

Barbara Pifel, UCF, introduced Dr. Walsh. Dr. Walsh reviewed the history and influence of the FDP as it affected Florida universities from 1985 to the present, based on his personal observations and experience as the University of Florida leader in the early Florida Demonstration Project, and he reflected on the current focus of FDP as well. He described the features, aspirations, apprehensions, and results of each FDP phase. In FDP I ("the bold and naive years") the organization of FDP was similar to "pick-up basketball," and the meetings were randomly opportunistic. With support of then Senator Lawton Chiles, the Florida Universities simply sought a "clean review," and "immunity from prosecution" to run demonstration projects that would ease up on burdensome regulations restricting research programs, and that would result in permanent authority. They wanted to create enthusiasm for further federal initiatives and influence the state comptroller to ease up. They were apprehensive about getting retroactive audit disallowances (can we trust the feds?), loss of control (can we trust the faculty?), and job security (will we be needed if we succeed?). FDP I didn't budge the state comptroller, but it did strengthened the bonds among the Florida universities. FDP II (the "dark ages") featured development of a detailed structure of procedures. Meetings were well defined and well-attended. FDP II aspired to (1) numerous successful and bold demonstrations, (2) sweeping removal of "bureaucratic accretion," (3) extension to all federal agencies, (4) removal of "agency specific" exceptions, and (5) extension to contracts as well as grants. Apprehensions were few or none. The results, even though there were no new improvements, produced a

well organized FDP, and the Florida state comptroller began to lighten up, even as the universities created nonprofit foundations to conduct their research programs as a way to side-step the restrictions. FDP III (the "electronic renaissance") features (1) rediscovery of FDP as a model of reinvention, (2) "bonded" institutions/administrators eager to do something after the "dark ages," (3) strengthened faculty representation, (4) abundant new technology: net access, cheap computing, spiffy software, and (5) an emphasis shift to pre-award, electronic submission of proposals compared to the earlier focus on the post-award, pay-out end of the cycle. FDP aspires to (1) continuing removal of regulations that add little to accountability while draining human resources of the partnership, (2) agreeing on electronic methods for proposal submission and award acceptance, and (3) refining existing electronic methods for payment and closeout. Apprehensions abound: (1) Might the institutional workload to submit proposals increase while agencies' workload decreases? (2) Will there be disjointed electronic methods of submission among the agencies? Keeping the small v. large institution playing field level, and assuring quality presentation of electronic proposals are big faculty concerns. Walsh, however, believes there is optimism on both sides of the partnership: "If you get the procedures right, the technology will provide faster and better evaluation proposals and placement of the award. Also, it is hoped that the reduced administrative legwork will be rewarded with increased funding for the research that we all support."

University Perspectives on Federal Electronic Commerce Initiatives Panel

Agencies: Jerry Stuck, NSF (Moderator); Jean Feldman, NSF; Diana Jaeger, NIH; Brad Stanford, ONR

Universities: Denise Clark, Cornell; Russ Lea, North Carolina State; John Wood, Northwestern

Jerry Stuck, moderator, opened the Panel session by noting that the impetus for the discussion arose out of continuing apprehensions and concerns, as voiced in the September 1998 Steering Committee Meeting and the 1998 FDP institutional reports, about what the federal agencies were doing with respect to ERA activities. The three university panelists were invited to summarize their concerns.

John Wood, Northwestern University, identified NU's strategy for software and people re-engineering for ERA as (1) "aggressive wait-and-see," (2) "pluck the low-hanging fruit first," and (3) "ready, aim, fire," and always in that order. He explained that NU, knowing that ERA changes will occur, has gradually invested in an internal university feedback loop among computer specialists and those who develop the university's ERA business rules. For example, common understanding of data administration concepts across schools, departments, and individual researchers is emerging. Dialog has also ensued about centralized v. decentralized computer systems. To "pick the low-hanging fruit," NU's sponsored research department strategy is to "aggressively prepare themselves both in terms of how we do research administration, as well as to understand the significant structures that must be in place before the investments are to be made in large amounts of software." "For example, standardization of work stations and the software to run them." In this way, research administration at NU can be ready for integration into the larger NU centrally-managed system and external ERA activities.

Denise Clark, Cornell University, noted that Cornell has taken a different approach and is a little farther along in the process, having been working with a vendor for two and a half years. Clark stressed several lessons learned: (1) that before data definitions are established it is necessary to examine in advance not

only university definitions but government and vendor definitions as well, (2) that a data access policy is necessary (who sees what screens and when), noting that the access policy will be driven by computer system software default if a pro-active access policy is not there first; (3) it is important to define "output requirements" up front; and (4) it is important to realize that a huge time and effort is required for the project--both in working and training. Clark closed by posing to the audience a significant dilemma that is ongoing: how to derive "functionality" from a vendor-developed system in an environment of rapid and constantly changing federal initiatives and rules. "What are our options when technology keeps changing and federal initiatives keep changing and we're in the midst of developing our system?"

Russ Lea, North Carolina State, used a [slide presentation](#) (Appendix A, 7 pp.) to emphasize that institutions must recognize that no matter what electronic systems they put in place to do a better job internally, i.e., to lower costs, reduce risks, improve people value, they will still need a "bi-directional relationship" (to external sponsors). Institutions also need to know that there's a different motivating factor for institutions than for federal agencies, e.g., uniform standards, speeding up the review process, etc. Rather than worrying too much about what information values flow from universities across the boundary to the agencies, he argues for institutions' designing reciprocal systems whereby institutions are prepared to capture feedback from agencies and put it in their databases. In order for the Federal Commons to be successful he calls for a focused collaborative effort that will take (1) joint leadership (at the highest levels of government and institutions) and development of a national master plan to include strong neutral technical leadership and a timetable, (2) implementation of current standards (a mutually binding consensus, perhaps a memorandum of agreement) and changing them only after successful implementation of the pilot demonstrations so that universities won't be at risk regarding software purchase and development, and (3) start some pilots now - incentives being to reduce the PI's work on the institutional side, and streamline processes and move toward federal reporting on the agency side. Steps to take after Master Plan development include: (1) publish more agency commitments to ERA-with timetables as NSF has done, (2) confirm standards-FDP needs to sign a declaration of standards and establish a "adherence" committee to monitor agency compliance, (3) implement pilots immediately at demonstration sites, and (4) measure the outcomes.

Moderator (and ECC member) Stuck spoke to assure Lea that the Federal Commons group is spending a lot of time working on figuring out a way to connect all the federal agencies "behind the scenes," and in the process they are addressing some of Lea's issues, including standards. He said it would be useful to involve the institutions as much as possible even though some federal agency work will still necessarily be done in closed door sessions as the Federal Commons is developed.

Jean Feldman, NSF, reiterated the absolute importance of data standards and said that agencies had come a long way in this regard, and that details were being worked out with regard to institutional representation in this area. But she noted the importance of putting a system in place for making adjustments to the standards.

Brad Stanford, ONR, concluded that up to now it was important for the agencies to first get coordinated, but in FDP III it is appropriate to have some formal link and actual participation by FDP members in the workings of the ECC.

Diana Jaeger, NIH, added that electronic grants administration has now become a broader federal initiative involving non-research granting agencies, such as FEMA, and so the ECC committee is getting tugged in a variety of ways in order to keep research administration and ERA activities moving at a

steady pace within the process.

Steve Miley of NASA offered a response to Clark's concern about "how can you put a system in place that can still address changes," by describing a NASA pilot demonstration wherein NASA took a "tools-based approach" and put a proposal announcement on its website and received 60 out of 66 responses electronically. "You use a tool and the tool changes over time and you just use whatever the most recent tool is available."

Ken Forstmeier, Penn State, responded that his University system was not compatible and it was costly and difficult to change internal ERA systems to respond to the NASA announcement.

George Stone, NIH, commented on the distinction between changing data standards as compared to transmission standards. He endorsed institutional flexibility in ERA data standards and at the same time defended the notion that the Federal Commons should not close anyone out by insisting on a single transmission standard. Julie Norris, MIT, summarized her views: "...what can the universities do to help the federal government recognize the need to make this standard some way across the agencies so that we don't have to be experts in every single federal agency and every single type of submission that any particular installation or center decides they want to use for a particular submission?"

John Walsh, Dartmouth College, pointed out that so long as standards are "optional" that's great, but when the word "require" and a timetable are announced, e.g., NSF's Fastlane, then everything changes-requests that FDP get a commitment from other agencies regarding transmission requirements. Feldman's response was that while NSF wants to lay out a time frame for FastLane, it is doing so in the context of full support of the Federal Commons and so they think of it as "electronic submission," not FastLane per se. Mareda Weiss, University of Wisconsin, raised concerns about PI's, simply shifting electronic proposal submission onto administrators. Jaeger responded that it is getting more difficult to challenge the agencies - there are at least 33 federal agencies - up from 11 - now involved in the ECC activity - and that it is hard to challenge the state and local systems. Another speaker vigorously endorsed data standards as the place to begin to stabilize in order to take money out of the ECC process and put it back into research. David Slusher, University of North Florida, spoke to the disparities that are arising between the larger institutions with money and staff and smaller institutions who have little of either. Lea responded that with acceptance of a data standard that vendors will quickly become service bureaus and in essence level the playing field. He noted that larger institutions, the early implementors, simply had already "plucked the low hanging fruit" to satisfy faculty and administrative committees. Carol Bluestein, InfoEd International, a vendor, cautioned that changes to data standards affecting multiple agencies at the federal level are very expensive and have a tremendous ripple effect-even adding a couple of items can cost thousands of dollars. Another speaker noted that sometimes federal agencies simply add data elements of existing standards without notifying anyone and this needs addressing. Ken Hardy, Florida International University, called attention to the impact on faculty-fewer people to help with proposal preparation, changing word processing software requirements, and forms inaccessibility outside the agencies. Geoff Grant, Stanford University, observed that FDP members fall into two general groups: those that are ready to roll out the systems they've been developing and those who are still taking a "wait and see" attitude, but that he views the situation worse than a year ago; that standards and milestones are important and a renewed explicit commitment, including a funding commitment, to developing standards is required.

Stuck offered a few final words: he advised FDP members of the benefits of coming to these meetings to

dialog and get feedback, and said he felt that creation of the ERA Standing Committee will be the best way to address formalizing rigorous adherence to commitment of standards. He added that it is not just the data standards, but how each agency can implement the same data standards particularly when they try to do the same thing using different data elements within each standard.

Panel Discussion: Cost-Sharing/Cost-Shifting/Effort Reporting

Robert Hardy, NSF (Moderator); Carol Liedtke, Case-Western Reserve; Julie Norris, MIT; Gil Tran, OMB

Hardy introduced the panel and noted that (1) he would first present the overall government, and then the NSF perspective, on these issues; (2) Gil Tran would present the OMB perspective ; (3) Carol Liedtke would discuss issues from a university and university faculty member perspective ; and (4) Julie Norris would offer suggestions for follow-up demonstrations and other FDP activities in this area.

Hardy set the stage by noting the genesis for the panel stemmed from Woody Jackson's comments at the September 1998 FDP meeting (see summary minutes on FDP website, click on p. 1, "What's New") that touched on the difficulties of full costing grant-supported university research and education and challenged FDP to conduct a follow-up demonstration. Jackson also had talked about the difficulty in distinguishing between research and education for purposes of effort reporting and allocation of faculty time, and he also talked about voluntary cost-sharing--typically faculty contributions to federally-supported research that are neither paid for by the agency nor put forward as cost-sharing in proposals, and the effect this has had on F&A reimbursement.

Hardy identified two university concerns: (1) the issue of the government's pushing off the costs of research onto universities, and the related issues having to do with facilities and administrative cost reimbursement, and (2) the notion that agencies might be conducting a kind of "silent auction" among institutions with regard to cost-sharing--as compared to awards on the merits. Hardy described a study of NSF cost-sharing practices conducted by Dr. Irwin Feller, Penn State University, under contract to NSF. The study found that there is some evidence, both statistical and anecdotal, for these concerns. Hardy noted that NSF, as a decentralized organization, believes that a review and clear policy statement of its policies and practices is in order, for both institutions and as guidance to NSF program managers.

Tran's remarks centered on three issues related to cost-sharing: (1) the definition of cost sharing; (2) integrating cost-sharing into an indirect cost proposal, and (3) how to balance accountability and research performance in dealing with cost-sharing. He noted the issue has increased in importance over time (1) because of the A-21 revisions of 1991, "that all research and development activities had to have a common face." and (2) because cost-accounting standards now require greater auditor scrutiny on whether institutions have satisfied the effort that was committed on the project, and (3) a recent major cost disallowance regarding voluntary cost-sharing. Tran noted that OMB circulars need a "definite" definition of cost-sharing, and he described his views of both mandatory and voluntary cost-sharing: "for computing overhead rates, cost-sharing (mandatory or voluntary) is tied with the identification and classification of space. Mandatory cost-sharing is expressed in the award notice or cost limitations imposed by OMB Circulars and legislation. Voluntary cost-sharing is a commitment made by the PI on research proposals (it becomes mandatory cost-sharing when the project is awarded) and intentional

contributions to further the research projects beyond the stated goals at the university's or other non-federal source) funding. Turning to effort reporting, Tran noted that reporting on mandatory cost-sharing is straightforward, but reporting on voluntary cost sharing is not straightforward--and he then described some options that a demonstration or pilot program could examine to both remove regulations that add little to accountability while allowing more flexibility to improve the performance of research.

Liedtke noted that while the cost-sharing issue is largely invisible to the faculty, it is having a huge impact. For example, mandatory-cost sharing to the faculty member primarily means seeking internal cost-sharing--and if agencies increase the number of that kind of grant, it will only mean more competition and frustration among faculty for scarce matching institutional funds in order to submit a proposal. With regard to voluntary cost-sharing, Liedtke described in detail problems associated with two kinds of voluntary cost-sharing: (1) planned cost-sharing for multi-project grants or single-project grants, when budget limits prevent requesting full salary for all key personnel, and therefore whether the remaining per cent should be considered cost sharing by the department or an individual's other research grant--and the difficulty of keeping track, and (2) unplanned voluntary cost-sharing, for example because of agency budget cuts, or uncompensated service on government peer review panels that agencies do not recognize as a legitimate research-related activity. Decisions about how and where to assign unplanned voluntary cost-sharing can lead to disagreements within departments as well as reduce the institution's indirect cost rate.

Norris underscored that cost-sharing/cost-shifting/effort reporting has become, in addition to the electronic processing issue, the most serious issue facing the FDP. She summed the issue: "Are we really talking about cost-sharing or effort reporting or both? How does the whole issue of cost-sharing or effort reporting impact upon the research output, because that's really where we need to focus our efforts; we have to ensure that no matter what we do structurally, organizationally, administratively, or in terms of regulations and policies, that we in no way negatively impact the research output of faculty. And in fact, what we need to do is find a way to enhance that research output." She underscored concerns about constantly "raising the bar" on cost-sharing, where current cost-sharing becomes the "floor" in the next year's cycle--constantly pushing cost-sharing up and foreclosing some institutions. She noted that a definition of what constitutes cost-sharing is needed--"when is it cost-sharing, and when is it a cost of research, and when is it both?"

She outlined possible goals for a demonstration: (1) demonstrate that the research output is not lessened when one does not have to report in detail the cost-sharing; particularly voluntary cost-sharing; (2) finding ways to quantify what are the current reimbursed and non-reimbursed costs to a project on an institution-wide level (what is the cost that an institution bears in the effort reporting side of the house that gets moved into the base and what is that impact upon an institution's F&A rate?). The demonstration would comprise a meaningful sample of institutions/agencies that keep/don't keep such records, and there would be a commitment of no audit exposure to institutions--a "hold-harmless" across the board. (3) The demonstration would analyze what kind of contribution university faculty already make to the federal research effort, which has never been quantified in terms of service on peer review panels, service on site visit teams, or doing "by mail" peer review--to show the government they are already getting a tremendous amount of volunteer effort.

Norris strongly reiterated Liedtke's concerns about the impact of voluntary cost-sharing on indirect cost rates, noting that as a result of auditing MIT recently had to move millions of dollars into its research

base to compensate for voluntary cost-sharing, and that reduced its indirect cost recovery by a significant amount.

Audience discussion included questions about the relationship of allowing unallowed direct costs to be cost-sharing; unanticipated voluntary cost-sharing. Randy Jacobson, ONR, remarked that they evaluate cost-sharing as high, medium or low, but beyond mandatory cost-sharing, "you never do a quantitative analysis of cost-sharing in the review process," to which several others responded to the effect that there is a credibility gap. For example reviewer scores have been altered when cost-sharing via percentages of salaries are not deemed to be sufficient. Geoff Grant, Stanford, called for simplifying the process by separately budgeting and accounting for voluntary research; Norris agreed and indicated that redefining categories of organized research, departmental research, and university research could solve the problem so long as the end result does not negatively impact faculty research.

The transcript of the Cost-Sharing/Cost-Shifting/Effort Reporting Panel Discussion comprises Appendix B (37 pp.).

At the close of the discussion Chair Siegel asked the cost-sharing panel as well as the earlier ERA panel to summarize the issues coming out of the panel discussions.

Afternoon Address: "Perspectives on the FDP of a P.I.-Administrator"

Dr. George Newkome, Vice President for Research, University of South Florida

Dr. Thomas Walsh, the morning speaker, introduced Dr. Newkome by highlighting his career. Newkome came to Florida in 1986 as vice president for research; he is distinguished service professor, and in 1991 was awarded outstanding chemist of Florida.

Newkome's remarks focused on the efforts of the early Florida Demonstration Project to overcome the cumbersome and inflexible State bureaucratic system--micromanagement of P.I. resources, budget limitations, requirements for prior approvals and rebudgeting. He wondered at the tremendous expansion of the FDP over 10 years--positive in that the federal-university partnership has endured, and negative in that greatly increased regulation is the major legislative driving force. He lauded FDP's structure as being driven by need and not the other way around and recounted its accomplishments. He insisted that FDP must continue to take strong stands against needless regulations to achieve cost-savings to both federal and institutional partners. In closing, he congratulated the FDP on strengthening faculty participation to bring depth to its overall mission.

University Update

Kathy Delahoy, Colorado State University

Delahoy described Colorado State's development of an internal plan for greater coordination and uniformity of processing grants and sponsored agreements among the offices of research and technology, university advancement, and the CSU research foundation. The PASS System (Proposal Approval and Support System), located on the University's website (preview it on

www.research.colostate.edu/preaward/era/pass.ppt) is intended to provide advance notice to the University by people who are working on proposals so that the University can pro-actively support their efforts. The system effectively helps with smoothing out the proposal submission work load, provides a clearance process, and allows the sponsored research office to distribute relevant guidelines to the P.I. early on. Faculty access the system with ID/PIN numbers, and entering proposal data is menu-driven. Among other features, the program links to agency forms and then allows the information to be entered directly into the University's Proposal Budget Sheet (PBS)--saving the P.I. up to 50% in time. PASS is report-generating "friendly." It has enabled sponsored research to increase proposals by identifying unmet proposal opportunities in advance, and then encouraging certain P.I.'s to submit proposals. It has facilitated internal linkages for preparing multidisciplinary proposals and has allowed less active liberal arts departments to learn of and join in proposals. With PASS, university approval is accomplished in three days.

Legislation to Amend OMB Circular A-110 for the distribution of data through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)

Tony DeCrappeo, Council of Government Relations (COGR), and Gil Tran, OMB

DeCrappeo first presented an overview of the issue, deriving his remarks from a recent COGR white paper on the subject (Appendix C, 4 pp.)(See also FDP website: www.dml.georgetown.edu/fdp--click on Fed. Regs. and Reference Materials). Essentially, this year, a 2-sentence provision was put into the Omnibus Spending Bill that states that data produced under awards funded by the federal government under grants, it specifically says grants, must be made available under the procedures of FOIA. Concerns immediately arose about premature release of data, confidentiality issues regarding medical research involving human subjects, copyright, etc., and COGR and the AAU (Association of American Universities) sent a joint letter dated December 4, 1998, to OMB with suggestions for crafting the A-110 amendments. (Appendix D, 2 pp.) (See also the AAU home page: www.tulane.edu/~aau: click on "policy issue documents;" click on section on "disclosure of research data.") (NAS President Bruce Albert also sent a letter dated January 26, 1999. (Appendix E, 4 pp.) (See also the NAS home page www.nas.edu--"top-news archives.") Congressman Porter (R-Ill.) and Cong. Brown (D-CA) have also written to OMB along the same lines. The COGR/AAU focus is on mitigating the impacts, rather than overcoming the legislation.

Audience Discussion: Carol Liedtke, Case-Western, indicated that faculty should take the lead in encouraging university support to defeat the legislation. DeCrappeo noted most scientific societies are sending letters of opposition; but he also noted that a lot of case law for protecting/exempting this kind of data has already been developed around FOIA.

He also noted that Senate floor discussion (Sen. Lott) on the issue was "directed at getting data that developed regulations: EPA, the Endangered Species Act, things like that, where research was done and regulations changed, and industries were affected, they wanted that data to at least be made available." He said the COGR letter encouraged OMB to make sure that all FOIA costs are recoverable from the requester, not just copying costs, but the time and effort to fulfill the request, and also referred OMB to use existing NSF/NIH data access policies as guidance.

Tran said data access is one of OMB's major concerns with the legislation, but he believes that the issue

of data integrity is an even more serious problem. "Once a third party has access to your data, they want the agency to set up a process where a third party can question the result of the research." This is of concern to high level OMB officials--not just the results of the data but the tests you have done to support those data. In recommending A-110 changes regarding data access, OMB plans to meet with agencies to define what data are FOIA-eligible or will still be exempt from FOIA; but that will not address data integrity.

Audience discussion included concerns about who is the "owner" of the data (the university or the researcher) that could add layers of complication. Jack Puzak, EPA, noted that EPA bases new regulations only on current scientific literature. He then described the continuing battle for access to, and the challenge to the integrity of, raw data underlying EPA's regulations on airborne particulate matter. Russ Lea raised concerns about potential conflict of A-110 with confidentiality agreements with corporate or other providers of raw data. Tran noted that under the new regs, universities will have to evaluate FOIA requests against the nine FOIA exemptions, especially those for confidentiality, personal records, and national security. Decrappeo noted that FOIA exemptions are not mandatory and that agencies can still release data under FOIA if they choose to. Siegel concluded the discussion by noting that OMB expects to release its proposed revision in about six weeks. (Note: The proposed revision was posted in the Federal Register on February 4, 1999, Vol. 64, No. 23, pp. 5684-5685: "OMB Circular A-110, "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations.")(Appendix F, 3 pp.)

Another participant spoke forcefully against repealing the new legislation, and asked everyone to think carefully about the implications. He noted that "all the really fundamental advances in science have been made with completely open channels of data," for example the recent discovery of Bose-Einstein Condensate, where data was shared among many, many investigators on merely a name basis with no secrecy, no trying to hide anything. He also asked everyone to consider what might have happened if the data on smoking and health had been made available to the public rather than kept a secret.

NIH Regulatory Burden Study Update

Diana Jaeger, NIH

Jaeger said that the study arose during the FY98 budget cycle. The House Committee on Appropriations requested that NIH conduct a study of the burdens on institutions that result from complying with federal regulations in five areas: (1) human subjects, (2) animal welfare, (3) conflict of interest, (4) misconduct in science, and (5) hazardous waste. COGR's suggestion to establish volunteer working groups to study these areas and minimize burdens was adopted, and NIH also engaged a contractor to help. The groups have met and NIH is targeting the House's April 1999 appropriations hearings for the report release that will highlight "best practices." She also noted that the FDP could be asked to develop and test some of the proposed solutions.

CFDA (Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance) Numbers

Samuela Evans, University of California System

Evans raised concerns about the lack of many agencies to provide CFDA numbers on awards, and some institutions are being threatened by state auditors with a material weakness in this area if they can't identify CFDA numbers, even though the federal awards did not come with CFDA numbers--a "catch-22.". Gil Tran, OMB, responded that OMB knows this is a serious issue and will work with agencies to correct the situation, and he invited FDP members to alert him of agencies who are not providing CFDA numbers. In the meantime OMB has established a link from its home page to the CFDA listing.

OMB Circular A-21 Update

Gil Tran, OMB

Tran reported that OMB would likely put out before the end of 1998 a working draft on a standard format for preparing an F&A proposal. (2/23/99 note: OMB now expects to post the draft for comment in the Federal Register later in the spring.)

Agency Updates

USDA

Melanie Krizmanich reiterated much of the information contained in her FDP agency update at the September 1998 Steering Committee meeting: The Agricultural Research Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998 which re-authorizes many grant programs, was signed in June, and they are working with grantees to interpret the language and determine how to meet the requirements of the language. Issues include one related to their agricultural telecommunications program and another one related to the special grants program reduction in awards from five years to three years. The latter issue will require USDA modifications in their agency-specific terms and conditions. She said that Section 212 now requires that USDA, before awarding special research grants, must have assurance from institutions that they have done a peer merit review on the proposal submitted. She also said that the language would be as general as possible, e.g., the institution's normal routing and approval process might meet the criteria.

EPA

Jack Puzak indicated that EPA now offers email notification announcements to its website-total or by categories. Sign up via the website. Announcements are active at least 90 days. The website will also list an announcement schedule beginning each fiscal year that will include a flashing light at the top of the page for unanticipated announcements.

Office of Naval Research

Ann Stuart first introduced ONR's new FDP program representative, Randy Jacobson, and then she announced that ONR has named a chief information officer at the department level (their highest level). Tim Moran will head this department. ONR has also named two Process Improvement Teams (PIT's) who work on grant process reforms to better describe, for example, reporting requirements/non-requirements for symposium grants. The second PIT is working on grant closeout processes in order to close out a backlog of 11,000 grants-in closing out grants, ONR will decouple

A-133 audit results as well as payment of final vouchers, from closeouts under A-110 regulations. ONR has also eliminated the dates from its incremental funding paragraphs because the information gained bore little relationship to grantee spending patterns.

Financial Management Service, U.S. Department of the Treasury

Carolyn Austin-Diggs relayed two items regarding payments: (1) A final rule regarding federal agency disbursements came out in September 1998, saying that all federal payments are to be made electronically by January of 1999; however there will be some latitude because the rule just came out. The rule also has some waivers for payments that cannot be paid electronically, for example to individuals with hardship cases, for one-time non-recurrent payments, and if it's non-cost-effective for the government. Details are on their website: www.fms.treas.gov. (2) The FMS recently reviewed the number of cash draw-down systems that institutions must access in order to receive federal funds FMS counsel recommended: (a) a moratorium on development of new cash draw-down systems, (b) by January 1999 civilian agencies are to designate either a treasury or an HHS system. DOD will still use its system, and (c) agencies who have a unique population of recipients can use that system, but must also use the Treasury or HHS system and institutions can decide which to choose. Customer advisory boards/meetings with users will be developed. The systems should be in place by October 2000. She reported that four of six FDP agencies have so far designated either a Treasury or HHS system.

NIH

Mary Armistead announced changes as a result of SBA rules, effective January 1, 1999.

The first (most painful) is the addition of a mandatory evaluation. For all contracts over \$500K involving R&D, NIH is required to assess the extent of small disadvantaged business participation in contract (only) proposals. Noting this will deeply affect institutions, NIH is forming an implementation work group and hopes to have more information for FDP at its March 1999 meeting.

Diana Jaeger also announced that the modular grant announcement would appear in the NIH guide on December 15-off the grant page from the NIH home page. There will also be an email set up: modulargrants@nih.gov, as well as an FAQ. In response to a question, she replied that beginning with FY99 moneys, the NIH salary cap is now tied to federal executive pay level III and no longer associated with a specific dollar amount. Institutions are still encouraged to reflect institutional base salary even though very high salaries can over inflate the budget. She suggested showing base salaries in one column, but doing calculations based on the cap, noting that medical school faculties have problems here. She also noted that NIH has a Y2K information webpage.

NASA

Steve Miley acknowledged the criticism that NASA received on its pilot program announcement demonstration and invited email comments at smiley@mail.hq.nasa.gov.

He said that NASA has consolidated all its program research announcements on its website-click on "research." He also reported that NASA's Office of the Inspector General, concerned about the lack of timely institutional compliance with financial transaction reports to NASA regarding grants and cooperative agreements, is urging increased diligence as compared to creating more strict enforcement.

NSF

Jean Feldman announced that NSF on March 10-11, 1999, will co-host a regional grants conference with Cal Tech, UCLA and USC in Los Angeles, that will feature a full day of hands-on training. Details will be posted on the NSF website.

Faculty Panel: Coupling and Decoupling of Education and Research: Implications for Faculty and Students

Susan Braunhut, U. Mass./Lowell, Moderator (the "black box" of academic research.)

John Hildebrand, University of Arizona (undergraduate education)

Robin Leach, U. of Texas Health Science Center/San Antonio (graduate education)

Bob Decker, Northwestern University (medical education)

Steve Dahms, San Diego State University (future of graduates in the life sciences)

Susan Braunhut noted that FDP is already implementing new aspects of faculty participation by holding the first of future faculty breakout lunches to be a regular feature of the first day of FDP meetings-she encouraged continuing faculty participation and also invited agency representatives to join the group to talk about funding issues. She also praised the introduction of mixed FDP working groups that now include faculty representation, especially for example, on the cost-sharing/effort reporting panel. After she introduced the faculty panel (see above) she opened the panel with a [viewgraph presentation on "the black box of academic research."](#) (See Appendix G, 13 pp.)

John Hildebrand then spoke on the contributions of undergraduates and also some of the dilemmas he has faced with the role of undergraduates in laboratories-a model that represents a large fraction of laboratories supervised by faculty. He first explained his job and his research funding at the university, and he also confessed at being puzzled and perplexed during many FDP meetings--trying to learn the jargon or technicalities of the FDP. He outlined the allocation of hours in his work week--out of a total of 60-70 hours on the job in the university each week, he devotes about 30-35 in teaching, mentoring and training, service to the institution and profession, and administration as a unit director. He devotes the rest of his time to scholarly work, research, writing of grant proposals and manuscripts, reviewing of same, etc. Because most of his time for his scientific work is above and beyond the 40-hour work week, and because he resents the notion that the institution or the funding agencies have a "right to" or "claim on" his personal time, he said he might refer to himself in grant proposals not as a P.I., but as a "community volunteer." He spoke of the importance of undergraduates in research-intensive institutions. Large numbers of undergraduates serve as "for-credit" workers, student volunteers helping us gain experience, and paid undergraduate laboratory technicians whose funding comes from grants. In each of these cases, a student typically devotes 10-20 hours/week to work in the lab. The involvement of undergraduates is important because it (a) prepares the "scientists of tomorrow" for the next stages of their education and training, (b) offers students experience in doing "real science" as opposed to prescribed lab exercises in courses, (c) enriches the education of all students who get involved in research, and (d) significantly benefits our funded research projects both by bringing in fresh talent and by providing very low-cost effort for the advancement of the research.

Robin Leach, who has done graduate teaching for nine years, spoke on how complicated it is to try to integrate teaching and research components, and she offered a few examples:

She explained that in her institution, the state does not pay for the graduates the whole time they are there, and also that faculty who are training graduate students have to have grant funds--and that means that most graduate education ultimately comes from federal agencies. Students usually begin with about a year and a half of course work and then move to the laboratory for three to five years on a grant of some sort. Their research effort is charged to the grant, but what they are doing is also teaching-relevant as they are observing teaching/mentoring. Leach has problems "dissecting what part is teaching in my job and what part is research," e.g., when she helps students prepare publications, is that teaching or research? The student is doing dissertation work, but "it's on my research, so it's clearly research-relevant and it comes out of my lab so it counts toward my NIH output, and yet, if I wrote it myself, it wouldn't take nearly as much time as when I have these students writing their 25th draft of a publication to try to get them to actually write in scientific terms and actually use scientific language as appropriate." Her major point is that it is impossible to try to split hairs on effort reporting. Leach also noted that laboratory technicians who are paid 100% on her grants are actually teaching her graduate students new technological skills she does not have time to devote herself to. Not to report the technicians efforts as 100% research effort on her grant, however, would be hopelessly complicated--could not be done.

Bob Decker discussed the uncompensated contribution of medical students and residents from the perspective of spending his time 75% as a researcher and 25% as a faculty member; however the time he spends over and above a normal work week is considerable.

(Appendix H, 6 pp.)

Finally, Steve Dahms discussed where newly trained life scientists are going to end up in the new millennium--what will they do and what are the prospects for their future. (Appendix I, 5 pp.)

Braunhut concluded that the panel presentations make several points: (1) that medical and academic research cannot be accounted for in traditional ways, (2) that the value of outcome may have a latency that cannot be deeply assessed; (3) that voluntary cost-sharing should not have a negative impact on indirect costs and they represent different aspects of research activities, (4) the value of voluntary contributions to our research endeavors, and (5) there are serious concerns on the part of the faculty about the future of the science workforce.

Audience discussion. One member noted that a very active group at Texas A&M is working hard to promote the idea that research and education are coupled--for example: "We don't do research. We use a research laboratory as an environment to provide an apprenticeship to learn the art and practice of...Every time we say the word "research," it's followed in the sentence as close as we can to the word "education." Somehow these ideas have got to come back together because there's a huge disconnect and it's doing us a great disservice." Another noted that in many instances students teach themselves. Carlos Vargas, Kent State, noted that "research is a mechanism to accomplish education...instruction in the classroom, the use of new technologies, and research are all means of educating students, which is what universities do;" however, he has concerns that legislators and the public need to understand that research is not just a "hobby" of the faculty.

Announcement

Chair Siegel

Siegel announced that two FDP affiliates are celebrating anniversaries--NCURA its 40th and COGR its 50th--and that the FDP Executive Committee has accepted NCURA's invitation to partner with them on their ERA conference to be held in August 1999. The conference will be co-chaired by Jerry Stuck, NSF, and Andy Rudczynski from Rutgers.

Institution Reports:

Jerry Stuck

Stuck highlighted in his handout the same information he had provided to the FDP Steering Committee meeting last September 1998. (See the FDP Website--home page under "What's New.") Stuck noted that work is already in progress to address standardization of terms and conditions, cost-sharing and effort reporting, and the federal role in ERA. He noted that about 60% of institutional strategies regarding reengineering are "aggressive wait-and-see" and "plucking the low-hanging fruit." ERA activities are categorized and he noted that the challenges are in proposal submission and pre-award activities. The major federal barriers are commitment to standards and compatibility of systems with multiple agencies. The 65 institutional reports are all in the Lotus Notes database at NSF and will be published for a download server on the web.

Chair Siegel later asked for a few volunteers to help her carefully read through the individual reports.

ERA Activities

Jerry Stuck, NSF, and George Stone, NIH

Siegel announced that the Executive Committee had reinstated the FDP ERA working group as a standing committee--an umbrella group that will oversee all FDP ERA-related activities. The ERA Standing Committee will serve as a clearinghouse on information related to the "Federal Commons" and will serve as a liaison to the federal Electronic Commerce Committee (ECC) that is developing the Commons, with an eye to establishing a formal relationship between the FDP and the ECC.

Siegel also announced that the Executive Committee had successfully negotiated with NSF for Jerry Stuck's continued active participation in FDP activities, and in that regard the Executive Committee has named him federal co-chair of the ERA Standing Committee. (Ed. Note: In January 1999 Denise Clark, Cornell University, was named as the second co-chair.)

Stuck used a series of viewgraphs to articulate the purpose and progress of the "Federal Commons" is to work together to promote a common face in the whole ERA process by demonstrating that "we can develop flexible alternatives to meet a variety of institutional requirements." He talked about the Commons being used as a testbed to resolve technical and security issues in connecting and sharing agency databases, and said that progress is being made. Stone said 40 FDP schools comprising 178 account holders have registered since July to use the NIH Commons pilot demonstration as a way to analyze or get information about proposal applications and their status.

Next FDP Meeting Dates/Locations

Chair Siegel

Siegel announced the 1999 FDP meeting schedule: March 26, June 14-15, and September 24 in Washington, D.C., and December 2-3, in California. A show-of-hands approved of holding the meeting in December rather in January 2000. In the meantime the FDP Membership Committee will review the timing, number and length of FDP meetings and make a recommendation at the March meeting.

Reports of Working Groups

Working Group on Working Groups

Siegel announced the Executive Committee established a "working group on FDP working groups" to define procedures for the groups. The working group members (Nancy Wray, Russ Lea, Joyce Freedman, Pam Whitlock, Cathy Thurman, Denise Clark, and Jim Taylor) will provide their first report at the March 1999 FDP Steering Committee meeting.

Electronic Awards

Brad Stanford reported: (1) that ONR has successfully tested both the EDI and EDF provisions of awards with their volunteer institutions, and (2) announced plans to extend the test to other schools beginning January 1999 and he is confident this will be the mode for future awards, and (3) ONR, NIH, NSF and other agencies will design a joint demonstration project for the EDI electronic award with the purpose of presenting a full-fledged demonstration for approval by the FDP Steering Group in March 1999.

EARS Committee (Electronic Routing and Approval Systems)

Business Rules Subcommittee:

Co-Chairs: George Stone, NIH; Carolyn Miller, NSF, and Mary Ellen Sheridan, U. of Chicago

Technology Subcommittee:

Ken Forstmeier, Penn State; Amin Plaested, Dartmouth; and Ron Splittgerber, Colorado State

Communications Subcommittee:

Nancy Wray, Dartmouth, and Kathy Larmett, NCURA.

Siegel noted that the EARS Committee is a joint task effort between FDP and NCURA and that the FDP hopes to capitalize on the partnership in additional ways, including the ERA NCURA conference in August as previously noted.

Business Rules. George Stone, NIH, noted that the group's focus was to take on the "business process" and translate the process for the technical software re-engineering process which requires thinking not in terms of socially-derived titles such as "dean," but rule-based involvement. The working group has begun defining specific rules that would become the basis upon which the data dictionary for routing would be defined. The group hopes to have by the end of January data that will show to what extent there is a common basis for routing at various organizations, but even if there are a thousand ways to do routing, the software design will have to accommodate that or it won't work.

Technology Subcommittee. Ken Forstmeier, said the focus will be on producing within the next 9 months a compendium of systems and an evaluation of their capabilities-looking at both institutionally-developed and commercial products. The 17 member subcommittee will work both with the business rules group (regarding what methods to evaluate) and the communications group (to help them interact with the research community).

Communications Subcommittee. Nancy Wray, Dartmouth, and Kathy Larmett, NCURA, said the subcommittee's charge is to coordinate with the other two subcommittees and develop a survey instrument to identify, collect (from institutions and vendors) and disseminate the information on the different EARS systems that are available. They will develop a draft web page to post the information by mid-February 1999, and report to the FDP meeting in March.

Communications Committee:

Siegel reported there are now two subcommittees comprising the Communications Committee: Publications: Elaine Simmonds, Jill Mortali, Jim Smith, Lawrie Robertson, Erin Lindsay, Steve Dahms, and Anne-Marie Mazza; and Website Development: John Pezzullo, Ann Wilks-Penrod, Jo Ann Treat, Tim Reuter, Diane Gilliland, and Bill Huth.

Publications. Jim Smith reported the group is focusing on preparing several publications for the faculty and public over the next six to eight weeks.

Website Development. John Pezzullo noted that Communications working group now comprises the publications subcommittee and the website subcommittee. The website group has 8 or 9 persons who will contribute ideas to the improvement of the FDP website. The first is to replace the ungainly URL and Pezzullo asked that the FDP authorize registration of either FDEMO.ORG or FEDDEMO.ORG (FDP.ORG is unavailable) at a cost of about \$100 for two years. The group also discussed the need for upgrades, revisions, additions, structure and organization of the site, which has grown in an ad hoc way over the last two years. Paper copies of the website have been provided to the subgroup members and the group will communicate electronically over the next few months as they review the material. Pezzullo asked FDP members to help with the process by updating individual, institution and committee/workgroup information. On a related matter, he asked those replying to the main FDP listserv not to hit the reply button unless they intended their response to be broadcast back to all members of the listserv. (Ed. Note: FDP's new website address as of 3/26/99 is www.fdp3.org.)

Integrated Performance Standards (formerly Business Rules)

Siegel announced that Erin Lindsay, Cal Tech, will co-chair this group with Jean Feldman.

Jean Feldman said the focus and emphasis of the group is different from the EARS business rules: it is associated with the program announcement and solicitation process, and they will look at ways to improve the process by developing a uniform format for communicating agency business rules and performance standards, e.g., in the areas of general information, eligibility, proposal preparation, etc. She noted that "special requirements hidden in these documents are driving everyone crazy" and that this information needs to be up front. The group's mission statement will be re-written and posted on the FDP website, and a group listserv will be initiated. The group intends to keep in close contact with the cost-sharing and EARS workgroups as well as faculty members and vendors.

Terms and Conditions Standing Committee

Siegel noted that the importance of the work on terms and conditions had given it a new status: standing committee. Ann Stuart, agency co-chair, thanked the FDP executive committee for their support in this regard. Sarah Wasserman, institutional co-chair, said the Committee's focus is to create a model implementation of FDP terms and conditions and A-110 and in some cases A-21--so that it will look a whole lot more like A-110 with its numbers and sub-numbers. Two to four committee members will work on each of eight parts of a matrix of A-110, A-21, and FDP terms and conditions using the most liberal interpretations of the terms and conditions. The matrix will be cleaned up by Jane Youngers, who is their clean-up, integrative "guru." The group will also develop a standard form for "agency specifics" as well. The group has scheduled itself to meet during the COGR meeting in February and make a final report to the FDP March 1999 meeting.

Effort Reporting

Robert Hardy said that following the cost-sharing/effort reporting panel session, the "effort reporting-plus" workgroup engaged in a lively discussion during its afternoon meeting. He reported two emerging themes: (1) accounting for donated faculty effort to federally supported research and here the general feeling is that this is a subject that must be addressed on public policy grounds and that the FDP seems to be the best organization to address it, and so the group plans to try to develop that theme and come up with some way to address it on behalf of FDP, and (2) the general area of effort reporting and ways that this might be addressed in a university context-with the idea of developing a demonstration model along the lines of the equipment screening model used in a previous FDP demonstration. Hardy and Norris will take the lead on these efforts and try to develop them further with the effort reporting group. In this regard, he asked those who are interested to get in touch with him or Julie by email (rhardy@nsf.gov or jnorris@mit.edu). Julie Norris emphasized that the group had agreed that the work was not going to be easy and it is a risky activity, but one that FDP can't afford not to address. She noted one suggestion that instead of doing an institution-wide analysis, there could be merit in having institutions identify a small group of faculty (4-6) and then doing detailed, intensive interviews with these faculty on the issues of donating time, cost-sharing, and related issues. The disadvantage is that you might "pre-select" and skew the results; the advantage is that if it were opened to the entire institution and everyone was "held-harmless" it would be a tougher sell to the government. The demonstration proposal should show "this is a reasonable way to approach this," and could include peer review and panels. The group was reminded that in some institutions even collecting that kind of information could be very dangerous because of the impact about whether or not you're really taking time away from research effort or from institutional effort. The group will have to decide whether to or not to include a costing model. She noted that she and Hardy agreed that the critical element in the demonstration is that participating institutions be held harmless.

Contracts

Sarah Wasserman reported that at yesterday's working group meeting Mary Armistead, NIH, reviewed the FARS and outlined five different categories of optional clauses. The group will send NIH's model to agencies and FDP members with the intent to develop a user-friendly FAR roadmap/guide that can be put up on the web. The contracts group also has A-133 input on contracts for the institution guidelines on grants. Concerns include mandatory drug-related certifications. The group is also examining an NIH standard "just-in-time" subcontract plan as a model for other agencies. She said that pre-award audit concerns have subsided; however, several speakers strongly indicated that pre-award audits were actually increasing for contracts, primarily those of DOD and NASA, and urged keeping the issue on the agenda

(yes).

Institutional Profiles

Diana Jaeger reported that the group's work mission to identify a standard base of elements that are static about an institution is complete. The final report has been provided the FDP Executive Committee and will go on the FDP website after it is approved. When the elements are incorporated into the Federal Commons, any feedback will come back to the ERA Standing Committee.

Adjournment

Appendices

Appendix A. Lea, Russ, "Re-Energizing Electronic Commerce," slide A-1 Presentation, FDP Steering/Committee of the Whole Meeting, December 3, 1998. (summary minutes, p. 3)

Appendix B. FDP Panel on Cost-Sharing/Cost-Shifting/Effort Reporting, A-8 transcript of panel session, FDP Steering/Committee of the Whole Meeting, December 3, 1998. (summary minutes, p. 8)

Appendix C. Council on Government Relations, "Legislation to Amend A-57 OMB Circular A-110: Distribution of Data Under FOIA," 1988. (summary minutes, p. 9)

Appendix D. Letter dated Dec. 4, 1998, to The Honorable Jacob Lew, A-61 Director, OMB, signed by Nils Hasselmo, President, Association of American Universities; and Milton Goldberg, President, Council on Governmental Relations, regarding OMB Circular A-110/FOIA (summary minutes, p. 9)

Appendix E. Letter dated Jan. 26, 1999, to The Honorable Jacob Lew, A-63 Director, OMB, signed by Bruce Alberts, President, National Academy of Sciences, regarding OMB Circular A-110/FOIA (summary minutes, p. 9)

Appendix F. Proposed Revision to OMB Circular A-110: "Uniform A-67 Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations," Federal Register: February 4, 1999, (Volume 64, Number 23), pp. 5684-5685. (summary minutes, p. 10)

Appendix G. Braunhut, Susan, Transcript of remarks and viewgraphs A-70 for the FDP Faculty Panel on Coupling and Decoupling of Education and Research: Implications for Faculty and Students, FDP Steering/Committee of the Whole Meeting, December 4, 1999. (summary minutes, p. 13)

Appendix H. Decker, Robert, Transcript of remarks for the FDP Faculty A-83 Panel on Coupling and Decoupling of Education and Research: Implications for Faculty and Students, FDP Steering/Committee of the Whole Meeting, December 4, 1998. (summary minutes, p. 14)

Appendix I. Dahms, Stephen, Presentation of remarks for the FDP A-89 Faculty Panel on Coupling and Decoupling of Education and Research: Implications for Faculty and Students, FDP Steering/Committee of the Whole Meeting, December 4, 1999. (summary minutes, p. 14)

Appendix J. Braunhut, Susan, "Faculty Panel Issues Document," Summary A-94 of Faculty Panel, FDP Steering/Committee of the Whole Meeting, December 4, 1998. (summary minutes, p. 15)

Return to the [Steering Committee](#) page or to the [FDP Home Page](#)

This Website is maintained at [Georgetown University](#).