FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP
Redefining the Government & University Research Partnership

Online Web Form Section Name	Session Info
Session Name	FACT – May 10, 2018
Point of Contact	Mark Haselkorn/Dave Reed

Working Group Activities/Outcomes/Progress to Date	• Developed a charter
	• Executive Committee endorsement
	• Initiated website
	• Established Communication and Marketing Subgroup
	• Expanded membership
	• Initiated two pilot projects to better understand the Faculty & Administrator collaboration
	   o Quantitative assessment of research administration with the FACT partner institutions
	   o Qualitative assessment of research administration with the FACT partner institutions

Agenda/Discussion Points for this Meeting	Focused on update on the progress of the Quantitative and Qualitative Working Groups
Key Decisions Pending	Finalize quantitative metrics and gather qualitative interviews at nine participating institutions.
Participation	Open to pairs of faculty/administrator. Contact Mark Haselkorn/Dave Reed
Moving Forward Key Risks/Issues Identified	Still gathering preliminary data. No obstacles to report to date.
Opportunities/ Volunteer	• Understand diversity of existing structures and strategies for Faculty-Administration research collaborations • Identify best practices and opportunities for improvement of institutional structures and strategies for Faculty-Administration research collaborations • Gain understanding of institutional definitions of research enterprise success • Establish conditions for, and examples of, Faculty-Administration collaboration successes • Establish examples of frequent challenges to Faculty-Administration collaboration
Meeting Summary	See FACT webpage, http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_184146 For detailed sessions notes

INTRODUCTION

- Began meeting @ 3:50 PM.

- An overview of past activities was presented.

- Current FACT activities are focusing on gathering information about the general characteristics of a university research enterprise. The intent is to gather quantitative as well as qualitative data from nine (9) participating FACT partner institutions.

- Future FACT activities will be determined after the general characteristics of the university research enterprise have been examined.

QUANTITAIVE ANALYSIS

- The quantitative team is gathering data to understand demographics, expenditures, staffing (by cost pool), and other characteristics for which hard data can be obtained.

- The quantitative team still needs more data; there are gaps in types of data across the board, or specific data from some FACT partner institutions.

- <u>CHALLENGE</u>: Find the correct person at each institution to access the needed data.

- Note on quant data shown in slides: SPA code is central expenditure; DA is department level expenditures.

- The quantitative team is developing metrics to examine data for different institutions. Some clear differences are seen in the preliminary data but the significance of those differences remains to be determined after all data has been gathered.

- <u>NEXT STEPS</u>: 1) Develop further metrics, 2) further analyze data, 3) harmonize data gathering and analysis with data from the Faculty Workload Survey.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

- The qualitative team is gathering feedback from faculty and administrators at FACT partner institutions. A script (i.e., standard questions) has been developed and piloted on 7 individuals. Preliminary information was obtained. Adjustments to the script will be made to account for individuals serving as both faculty and administrators. Once finalized the script will be used to gather qualitative information regarding the research enterprise of FACT partner institutions.

- The script has questions broadly in the groups: Mission, Policies, and Procedures.

- It was noted that this is not a survey, rather a "semi-structured interview" and we will follow where the interviews take us.

- <u>NEXT STEPS</u>: 1) Expand the script to capture the dual-role individuals, a specific early feedback was on the need for better software solutions, requiring questions to help describe the type of software needed in general.

- <u>ACTION ITEM</u>: Post the script on web site for review by others in audience.

DISCUSSION

- *The following topics or points were raised by audience members as part of the open discussion.*

- When FDP was first established, it had a dual focus. The first was to examine and improve the federal agency – institution relationship and improve processes. The second was for institutions to examine internal contributions to research administrative burden. The second focus has been lost over time but FACT is rekindling that discussion. FACT is clearly on the right track and the efforts of the group should continue on that track.

- Institutions need to migrate to more shared equipment and spaces. This should be a focus of FACT as shared resources require cooperation between faculty and administration. Shared resources lead to more innovation and collaboration, and a vibrant work environment.

- Procedures for establishing core facilities are common in research universities.

- Uniform Guidance addresses shared equipment.

- At APLU and FASEB, shared resources are a focus. What makes them successful? Staffing? Is just equipment enough? There are many questions about best practices for core facilities.

- Core facilities can be archaic and die slowly. What was once a very important need (i.e. equipment) can become an insignificant need as research needs change. Techniques that were once expensive and required centralization can become inexpensive, negating the need for centralization. Core facilities need to adapt. Another important consideration is how do central facilities integrate with education? Central facilities can provide a barrier to access by students. Central facilities need to be well thought through.

- Rotating faculty through administrative positions can help communicating to faculty the "challenges" of administration, and vice versa.

- A focus for FACT needs to be understanding how we communicate on our campuses.

- Faculty ask administrators "Why?" when it comes to internal policies and procedures. Administrators say "Because there is a rule." Administrators need to know (from the Federal agencies) why there is a rule so they can explain the motivation to faculty. Just saying there is a rule is not adequate.

- If the administrator cannot explain "Why" they may not really know what the Federal agency seeks by setting a policy and therefore they may not be meeting the desires of the Federal agency through the policies and procedures within the institution.

- Post Award financial management is the low hanging fruit for where FACT should focus. Issues there are central to all research. Focus there for any pilot.

- One possible reason why there are issues with post-award is because often post-award is not under the VPR but is under finance. Administrators in finance are typically not as aware of faculty needs. Administrative structures where post award is not under the VPR may correlate with post-award problems.

- How we measure success in the research enterprise varies and needs to be better understood.

- Research with companies (i.e., private entities, non-profit funders) brings special challenges. Should these relationships be discussed as part of FACT? Important that faculty and administrators understand each other's goals. Recommended to include General Counsel.

- Comment brought up about space utilization. Could be discussed for feasibility in Quantitative Group.