FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP

Redefining the Government & University Research Partnership

FDP Phase VII Membership Types

Membership Committee Members

Akin, Lisa	**Eads, Michael**	**Morehead-Farmer, Jennifer**
Texas A&M Engineering Exp. Sta.	Northern Illinois University	Regenstrief Institute – Out of town
Alford, Terry	**Hedberg, Gina**	**Murphy, Debra**
Arizona State University	University of Southern Alabama	Arizona State University
Anderson, Susan	**Hermann, Jeanne**	**Spragens, Melissa**
College of Charleston	U of Tenn. Health Science Center	U of Massachusetts Medical School
Arias, Lynette	**Kissmann, Katherine**	**Sutter, Larry**
University of Washington	Texas A&M University	Michigan Tech University – will step out
Billinger, Kristi	**Koszalka, Maria**	**Swaney, Courtney**
Texas A&M University	National Science Foundation	University of Texas, Austin
Brightwell, Webb	**Kusiak, Michael**	**Thatcher, Julie**
Harvard University	University of California – Out of town	Institute for Systems Biology
Brown, Glory	**Marvin, Vicki**	**David Wright**
Florida A&M University	Texas A&M University	FDP
Carney-Nunes, Charisse	**Mercer, Jean**	
NSF	U of Tennessee, Knoxville	

Problem Background

- FDP Membership has grown since 1986
  - 120 research institutions Phase V
  - 144 research institutions Phase VI
    - 207 research institutions based on Clearinghouse profiles
    - 23 classified by FDP as Emerging Research Institutions
- Federal funding for FDP Activities decreased in Phase VI
- FDP operational and meeting costs have increased
- Increase in registration fees is not enough to cover funding gap
- The FDP Membership Committee charged to make recommendations regarding membership structure for Phase VII

Considerations

- FDP supports continued operational costs, i.e. Clearinghouse maintenance
- FDP supports and values having perspectives from a diverse group of member institution types
- FDP's need and desire to have equitable sharing of costs across all members

Evaluation Process

- The Membership Committee formed a working group headed by Michael Kusiak (University of California System) and Lynette Arias (University of Washington)
- Existing institutional members were categorized using Clearinghouse data, Carnegie classification, and R&D expenditure data
- Equity imbalance revealed when institutions were reviewed by number of clearinghouse profiles and dues paid
- Working group proposed several new methods to bring dues structure to a more equitable level

Overall Recommendation

- Simplify institutional membership application
- Rather than flat fee - develop dues tier structure to reflect research ‘size’ of institutions
- Maintain and enhance diversity of institution member types

Specific Recommendations

- Each institution with a unique DUNS # will be treated as one FDP member
- The FDP Finance Committee will develop a classification system to assess dues based on tiers
- The continued engagement of a diversity of institutions will be reflected in the FDP membership and fee structure

What does this mean to you?

- Each institution will have their own official representatives (Admin. Faculty, and Technical)
- Each institution's official administrative representative will vote in the Administrative Co-Chair election
- Each organization's official faculty representative will vote in the Faculty Co-Chair election

What does this mean to you?

- FDP will continue its commitment to Minority Serving Institutions and Emerging Research Institutions and this commitment will be reflected in the new tier-based dues structure
- The FDP Finance Committee will complete their final implementation details
- Phase VII solicitation will be announced in January 2020