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Researchers doing science, not administration

• Association of federal agencies, academic and nonprofit research institutions, and research policy organizations that work together in a collaborative initiative to streamline the administration of federally sponsored research

• Improving the productivity of research without compromising its stewardship

• A unique forum for individuals from universities and nonprofits to work collaboratively with federal agency officials to improve the national research enterprise
Phase VI: 2014-2020
Phase V: 2008-2014
Phase IV: 2002-2008
Phase III: 1996-2002
Phase II: 1988 Federal Demonstration Partnership
Phase I: 1986 Florida Demonstration Project
Pre-FDP: 1985 Hearing and Report by GUIRR
Where and When

• Meet three (3) times a year: September, January, May
  • Some times Sunday – Tuesday... Sometimes Wednesday – Friday
  • Always in Washington DC

• Future Dates:

  2020: Jan 8-10, May 20-22, Sept 9-11 *Marriott Wardman Park*
• 154 institutional recipients of federal funds
  - Includes 38 new members (Phase VI)
  - Includes 26 Emerging Research Institutions
  - Each university has 3 formal, institutional representatives: Administrator, ERA/Technical and faculty reps.
    - **VCU: Sue Robb (Admin), John Leonard (Faculty), open (ERA/Technical)**

• 10 Federal Agencies
  - NSF, NIH, ONR, USDA, AFOSR, ARO, AMRMC, NASA, EPA and DHS
## Federal Agency Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Agency</th>
<th>Administrative Representative</th>
<th>Program Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR)</td>
<td>Marion Faulhaber <a href="mailto:marion.faulhaber@us.af.mil">marion.faulhaber@us.af.mil</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Research Office (ARO)</td>
<td>Kevin Bassler <a href="mailto:kevin.j.bassler.civ@mail.mil">kevin.j.bassler.civ@mail.mil</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture (USDA)</td>
<td>Robert Magill <a href="mailto:Robert.magill@usda.gov">Robert.magill@usda.gov</a></td>
<td>Margo Holland <a href="mailto:mholland@nifa.usda.gov">mholland@nifa.usda.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security (DHS)</td>
<td>Heidi Custer <a href="mailto:Heidi.Custer@HQ.DHS.GOV">Heidi.Custer@HQ.DHS.GOV</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
<td>Alex raver <a href="mailto:Raver.Alexandra@epa.gov">Raver.Alexandra@epa.gov</a></td>
<td>Darrell Winner <a href="mailto:winner.darrell@epa.gov">winner.darrell@epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Aeronautics &amp; Space Administration (NASA)</td>
<td>Antanese Crank <a href="mailto:antanese.n.crank@nasa.gov">antanese.n.crank@nasa.gov</a></td>
<td>Linda Sparke <a href="mailto:linda.s.sparke@nasa.gov">linda.s.sparke@nasa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health (NIH)</td>
<td>Michelle Bulls <a href="mailto:michelle.bulls@nih.gov">michelle.bulls@nih.gov</a></td>
<td>Laura Moen <a href="mailto:moenl@mail.nih.gov">moenl@mail.nih.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation (NSF)</td>
<td>Charisse Carney-Nunes <a href="mailto:CCARNEY@NSF.GOV">CCARNEY@NSF.GOV</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Naval Research (ONR)</td>
<td>Debbie Rafi <a href="mailto:debbie.rafi@navy.mil">debbie.rafi@navy.mil</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Medical Research and Material Command (AMRMC)</td>
<td>Carolyn Keeseman <a href="mailto:carolyn.r.keeseman.civ@mail.mil">carolyn.r.keeseman.civ@mail.mil</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional representatives are expected to:

• Attend FDP meetings on a regular basis
• Participate on committees
• Suggest activities
• Serve as advocates for their institutional colleagues

Expenses for attendance are borne by the institutions
How it all works

• Information exchange: At regular meetings, university faculty and administrators talk face-to-face with decision-makers from government agencies that sponsor and regulate research. (FDP -> UIDP)

• Common and best practices identified and shared.

• Demonstrations - testing new ways of doing things in the real world before fully implementing across all universities.
How it all works

- **Demonstration** - Test new ways of doing things in the real world before putting them into effect.

- **Pilot Project** - an exploratory activity that furthers the FDP’s mission to streamline administration.

- **Initiative** - an exploratory activity that furthers the FDP’s mission to streamline the administration.

- **Study** - to provide specific information.
History of Success

• Expanded Authorities
• FDP Subaward Agreement
• Standard Government-wide Terms and Conditions
• Faculty Workload/Administrative Burden Survey
• FDP Clearinghouse for FCOI (now Expanded Clearinghouse)
• FDP as key sounding board for Research Business Models Subcommittee of the Committee on Science, grants.gov, research.gov, etc.
• Congressional Testimony on Administrative Burdens
Current Activities

- Expanded clearinghouse for sub-award information
- Rolling out the third Faculty Workload Survey
- (FACT) Faculty-Admin Engagement
- Uniform Guidance issues
- IRB Wizard
- Current issues (e.g., Foreign Influence)
Faculty Committee

• Serves as the forum for faculty representatives to discuss and develop faculty input on all FDP activities and FDP administration.

• The Committee meetings are used to share information from other operational and programmatic committees.

• Opportunity for faculty to incubate and develop new activity proposals.

• As needed, the Faculty Committee develops surveys of faculty at member institutions to garner necessary information to direct proposed activities.
2018 FWS Purpose

Re-assess and update estimates of federally-funded researchers’ administrative workload, following 2012 and 2005 surveys.

Provide empirical input toward a better understanding of focus areas for

- streamlining research administrative workload,
- making federally-funded research processes more efficient, and
- allowing greater focus on the science of the research.
Comparison of FWS Response Rates

A series of 3 surveys of Principal Investigators (PIs) on federally-funded projects which asked about time taken away from research by administrative and related requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period Assessed</th>
<th>FDP Organizations</th>
<th>PIs Invited</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY2004-2005</td>
<td>74% (73 of 99)</td>
<td>23,325</td>
<td>6,081</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2010-2011</td>
<td>83% (99 of 119)</td>
<td>53,428</td>
<td>12,816</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY2016-2017</td>
<td>72% (111 of 154)</td>
<td>56,869</td>
<td>11,167</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VCU faculty workload

45%
• At VCU, federally funded investigators spent 44.6% of their research time on administrative and related requirements and NOT on direct research.

• This value (44.6%) is comparable to other ML category respondents (46.6%) and the overall survey respondents (44.3%)

• The overall value (44.3%) is up from both the 2002 survey (42.3%) and the 2012 survey (42.3%)
VCU faculty workload
Overall burden over time

Time Taken Away from Research

Total Time Taken from Active Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Fourteen Institution Categories Adopted for Reporting FDP Institution Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Institution Category Legend</th>
<th># Institutions</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>VHR Private Very High Research Expenditures (&gt; $900M)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>VHR Private High Research Expenditures ($500-899M)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>VHR Private Medium Research Expenditures ($300-499M)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>VHR Private Low Research Expenditures ($100-299M)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV</td>
<td>VHR Public with Medical School Very High Research Expenditures (&gt; $900M)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>VHR Public with Medical School High Research Expenditures ($500-899M)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>VHR Public No Medical School High Research Expenditures ($500-899M)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>VHR Public with Medical School Medium Research Expenditures ($300-499M)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ML</strong></td>
<td><strong>VHR Public with Medical School Low Research Expenditures ($100-299M)</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>1014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>VHR Public No Medical School Low Research Expenditures ($100-299M)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Medical School/Center or Medical Research Institute</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>HR Low Research Expenditures ($100-299M)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>HR Sub $100M Research Expenditures ($60-99M)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Emerging Research Institute (&lt; $60M Research Expenditures)</td>
<td><strong>12+</strong></td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Peer comparison

![Graph showing Mean % Time Away from Research for different institutions. The graph compares Overall Mean and Category Mean. Institutions ML01 to ML12 are listed.]
Time Taken Away from Research

Pre-award and Post-award Time From Research

- Pre-award Proposal Prep
- Pre-award Admin
- Post-award Admin
- Post-award Report Prep

2012 vs 2018
VCU faculty workload
Peer time away by task group

![Bar chart showing mean % time away from research by task group for Category ML and Institution ML04.](chartimage)
• 92 PIs responded to 2017 survey. Majority had 12-month appointments, 2/3 were tenured.

• About half are Biological and Biomedical Sciences

• Appointments average 48% research, 19% instruction, 17% service.

• 64% male, 80% white, average age 54

• 75% of time funded by federal sources, NIH most prevalent.

• 75% basic or applied, 70% involved animal or human subjects
VCU faculty workload
Research climate

Figure 15. Percentage who agreed with statements regarding priorities on research for Category ML and Institution ML04. Each bar combines the percent of ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’ responses.
Figure 16. Percentage who agreed with statements regarding the impact of research-related administrative workload for Category ML and Institution ML04. Each bar combines the percent of ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’ responses.
Figure 17. Percentage who agreed with statements regarding institution effectiveness in alleviating research-related administrative workload for Category ML and Institution ML04. Each bar combines the percent of ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’ responses.
VCU faculty workload
Research climate

My Institution...

...has a culture of trust in researchers.

...ensures that researchers have an active voice on issues affecting research.

...avoids overreactions based on audit or legal concerns.

...regularly explores ways to reduce administrative burden on researchers.

Figure 18. Percentage who agreed with statements regarding the institution’s research culture for Category ML and Institution ML04. Each bar combines the percent of ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’ responses.
VCU faculty workload
So what? What next?

- Is 45% representative? Does it feel “right”
  - Is it too high or too low?
  - What is a good number / target?
  - Does this matter?

- What can we expect if we implement change?

- Where do we focus our attention and investment?
  - Centrally? Or locally in the colleges, schools and departments?
  - Do we / how do we engage more faculty?
  - Do we / how do we make changes without setting false expectations?

- What next?