Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
September 11, 1996
206 Sandy Hall 3:30 PM

Members Present: E. Brown, J. Cowles, T. Herdman, D. Jones, T. Kennelly, D. Lee, M. McGilliard, A. McNabb, J. Muffo, J. Schetz, R. Schubert, M. Smith, R. Wokutch, M. Uysal, L. Zelazny

Members Absent: C. Finch, J. Johnson, A. Martin, L. Peters, K. Reifsnider, B. Richardson, B. Stephenson

Invited Guests: S. Jubb, L. McCoy, S. Trulove

1. Announcements: Dr. Smith called the meeting to order. Introductions were made. Dr. Smith announced Dr. Janet Johnson would not be able to attend until spring semester.

2. Adoption of Agenda: Dr. Smith stated that some of the agenda items would be led by other individuals. Dr. Wokutch motioned approval; Dr. Cowles seconded. Agenda was approved.

3. Minutes of April 24, 1996: Dr. Brown motioned approval of the minutes; Dr. McGilliard seconded. Minutes were approved as written.

4. Library Report: Ms. Kennelly stated there was no library report.

5. Agricultural Extension Proposal Concerning Intellectual Properties Policy: Dr. Jubb provided the membership with a handout and background explaining the intellectual properties policy on plant germplasm. A resolution was provided by Dr. Brown and the intellectual properties office. The first policy was written in 1991. Dr. Jubb and others have been revising the policy over the past year and a half. He stated the requested policy would be more in line with the current intellectual property policy of the university and allows our plant breeders to share in the benefits of new inventions. In the proposed policy, 50% of the royalty would be the inventors; 40% would be VTIP (Virginia Tech Intellectual Properties) and 10% would be the property of the originating department.

Dr. Jubb stated that the Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station (VAES) wants to return as much as possible to the programs that generate those new varieties so they can assure their longevity. Therefore, VAES would distribute revenue funds to germplasm development programs prior to the 50:40:10 disbursement. Dr. Schetz asked why this issue was different from any other intellectual property issue. Dr. Jubb said that the VAES is unique and that the IPC policy does allow for differing policies on handling intellectual properties as long as the university approves. In response to the question by Dr. Schetz concerning what is unique, Dr. Jubb responded that the breeding programs would die because they cannot generate external funds. Dr. Smith summarized that the difference is VAES research and development is funded by commercial profit and a typical center on campus is driven by grant funding. Dr. Brown stated that funding the production of a new germplasm may be a very different arrangement with regards to intellectual properties compared with other colleges. Dr. Jubb stated that the other difference is that VAES has a public mandate (federal and state) to provide these kinds of products to the people of Virginia, the region and the world. Dr. Brown motioned approval of the resolution 96-97A - policies and procedures for releasing plant germplasm. Dr. Cowles seconded. It was suggested that numbers 2 and 1 be reversed in Dr. Jubb's handout. Dr. Brown accepted the suggestion. Dr. Schetz stated that what the resolution says is strictly correct but very misleading. Dr. Schetz said that the

resolution is a long way from the university's intellectual property policy in general. Dr. Schetz motioned to table the motion pending a clear explanation as to why this particular operation should be separate from every other entity of the university. Dr. McGilliard seconded. After some discussion Dr. Schetz withdrew his motion to table. Dr. Brown motioned to amend the resolution acknowledging the differences between VAES and the development of plant germplasm and intellectual property generation in the remainder of the university. Dr. Jubb offered an amendment to clarify VAES returning a portion of revenue funds to support the future germplasm development. Dr. McNabb stated that most all states with land-grant universities have the same or similar policies. Dr. Smith suggested based on the differences inherent in the organization and structure of VAES germplasm development, VAES maintains control over revenue prior to its distribution. Dr. Schetz suggested the amended version of the resolution reflect a policy at variance with the usual. Dr. Brown suggested an effort be made to attempt to bring these differences together by amending the resolution to reflect the concerns discussed. Dr. Brown motioned an amended resolution to include clarifying statements concerning the unique nature of VAES. Dr. Cowles seconded the motion to accept the amended resolution. Motion passed. Dr. Brown will present the revised resolution at the next meeting.

6. Conflict of Commitment Task Force: Dr. Smith mentioned Dr. Peters' concerns of faculty spending time on activities that are not in the best interests of the university or within the FTE they are assigned. Dr. Peters has appointed a task force chaired by Dr. Merola. Dr. Smith is on the committee and stated that they have not met yet. He said the task force has multi-commission representation. Dr. Brown stated that it is an ad hoc committee which would look at the university guidelines in the light of national efforts focused on academic integrity and scholarship.

7. Center Review Update: Dr. Smith reported for Dr. Reifsnider that the center reviews are on schedule. This year the Center for Gerontology is being deferred because of a new director and the Systems Research Center is also being deferred for one year. The director there will be on sabbatical. The Virginia Center for Coal and Energy Research review committee has been set and the first meeting scheduled. The Virginia Housing Research Center, left over from last year, is actively meeting. The Center for Commercial Space Communications review report will be sent to the membership by mail prior to the next meeting. A charter was passed out for the Center for Human-Computer Interaction. That charter will be discussed next meeting.

8. Vice-Chair Election Announcement: Dr. Smith stated the vice-chair election will be held the first meeting in October. Drs. Schetz and McNabb and Mr. Jones have agreed to be the nominating committee to choose a vice chair.

9. Discussion with Gene Brown: Dr. Brown stated that the ASPIRES program is an indication of what his office intends to do and that is to make the faculty more successful in terms of sponsored research activity. He stated that his office views themselves as facilitators and, in fact, this ASPIRES program is intended to provide some funding to make the faculty more successful in going after extramural support. He mentioned his two

new staff members, Carole Christian and Tom Caruso, who are looking to help our faculty with their contacts with government and industry. A portion of Tom Caruso's salary is paid by the CIT. We are already seeing some very nice payoffs in terms of interactions between our faculty and companies both here and prospective ones. Dr. Brown stated he is also responsible for graduate student recruitment. He stated that he and Dr.

LaBerge are working on a strategic plan now. Dr. Brown mentioned the ad hoc committee regarding non-traditional scholarship.

10. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
September 25, 1996
206 Sandy Hall
3:30 PM

Members Present: E. Brown, T. Herdman, D. Jones, T. Kennelly, D. Lee, M. McGilliard, A. McNabb, J. Muffo, K. Reifsnider, B. Richardson, J. Schetz, R. Schubert, M. Smith, R. Wokutch, M. Uysal, L. Zelazny

Members Absent: J. Cowles, C. Finch, J. Johnson, A. Martin, L. Peters, B. Stephenson

Invited Guests: D. Conn, M. Harrington, S. Trulove

1. Announcements: Dr. Smith called the meeting to order. He mentioned that the 1995-96 accomplishments of the Commission on Research were included in the materials sent prior to the meeting. The vice-chair election will be held during the October 9 meeting. Dr. Smith provided copies of the Animal Care Committee adoption policy. He asked the membership to look it over and prepare to discuss it with David Moore at the next meeting. The Animal Care Committee provided a list of potential problems with the policy. The University attorneys do not perceive any problems with the policy.

2. Adoption of Agenda: Dr. Brown motioned approval of the agenda; Dr. Wokutch seconded. Agenda was approved.

3. Minutes of September 11, 1996: Dr. McNabb motioned approval of the minutes; Dr. Zelazny seconded. Minutes were approved as written.

4. Library Report: Ms. Kennelly reported that a serials cut is being discussed in the University Libraries. The same procedures will be followed for this cut as for the last cut to get maximum input from the university community. Due to the lead time necessary with vendors, it is being discussed now. The actual cuts will occur in Spring. Dr. Brown asked, why is there a cut? Ms. Kennelly responded that she assumed it was budget-related and stated that she would find out more about it for a future meeting.

5. University Self-Study Presentation: D. Conn, J. Muffo & A. McNabb: Dr. Conn provided a general introduction. He stated that the self-study is conducted to prepare for reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Dr. Conn mentioned that accreditation is concerned with improving educational quality in the region and certifying that the institution meets the standards. Accreditation is needed to establish eligibility to participate in federal programs. The proposed timeline is to have a report to SACS in December of 1997 and a decision by SACS in December of 1998. Dr. Muffo reported on the institutional effectiveness part of the self-study. He mentioned that institutional effectiveness applies to all courses, programs and support services. It allows an assessment of the degree to which a unit is effective in achieving its mission. There are over 400 criteria to be met. Dr. Muffo stated that once the data is collected, it will be presented to the Commissions/Committees, as well as Associate Deans, to discuss and validate the data. He mentioned that the institutional effectiveness part would give us an opportunity to reassess activities and functions; highlight areas needing improvement; improve administrative efficiencies; and benchmark processes and focus on future endeavors. Dr. Muffo said the commission should receive the data in January 1997. Dr. McNabb went over the strategic component of the self-study. The strategic component is an in-depth analysis of a specific topic, chosen by the university, for use in future planning. The topic will be Transforming Virginia Tech for the

Information Age, which focuses on the use of technology in the learning environment. The topic was selected by President Torgersen following consultation with faculty, staff and other leaders. It supports SCHEV's assessment process. Dr. McNabb is chair of the steering committee. There are four subcommittees focusing on the needs of four learner groups - traditional undergraduate; non-traditional students; graduate students/postdoctoral/researchers; and faculty/staff. Dr. McNabb stated that a report will submitted in the spring of 1997 for review by the University community. Dr. Conn summarized that the self-study would systematize our management process and strengthen our existing initiatives. He asked the membership to recognize their involvement at some point in the process.

6. Review of the Center for Commercial Space Communications: J. Schetz.

Dr. Schetz presented the report of the review committee for the Commercial Space Communications Center. He stated that the Center for Wireless Telecommunications grew from the Commercial Space Communications Center and absorbed it. The committee recommended that the Center for Commercial Space Communications be discontinued as a university interdisciplinary research center but continue to operate under the Center for Wireless Telecommunications. Dr. Brown motioned approval of the report; Dr. Schubert seconded. The membership unanimously accepted the report as written.

7. Charter for the Center for Human-Computer Interaction: M. Smith.

Dr. Smith provided some background on this charter. Dr. Reifsnider motioned acceptance of the charter as written. Dr. Brown seconded. Charter was unanimously accepted.

8. VAES Germplasm Policy - Amended Resolution 96-97A: G. Brown

Dr. Smith reported that the germplasm resolution has been amended. Dr. Brown summarized that the first two paragraphs acknowledge the unique role of VAES. He stated he had spoken with Dr. Schetz as well as Dr. Cannell. The first reading of the resolution will be at University Council on October 7. Dr. Smith stated that Dr. Cannell will be present at University Council to provide background.

9. Discussion with Ken Reifsnider - Associate Provost for Interdisciplinary Programs

Dr. Reifsnider reported on his newly created Office for Interdisciplinary Programs in Research and Graduate Studies. He mentioned several responsibilities that fall into this area. Dr. Reifsnider serves as a liaison to the real estate office. The Radiation Safety Committee reports to this office. Most of the funds directed by his office support the operation of the centers. Funded research totals approximately $148 million at the university and we are about 45th in the U.S. We have $11.5 million in industrial funding and we are 28th in the U.S. We are about 5th in the nation in percent of industrial funding. We are in the top ten in number of patents. There are 27 interdisciplinary research centers that report to the university level. There are nearly 100 centers at the university. Dr. Reifsnider stated that he works with Dr. Brown and his staff in pursuing funding for interdisciplinary programs. He mentioned he would like to improve the organization of the infrastructure. He stated we have remarkably little infrastructure to support research and centers. Dr. Reifsnider went over some of the centers' statistics and origins. Dr. Brown mentioned a DOE center in Morgantown (METC) has indicated spinning off their contracting activities. It would involve Virginia Tech, University of Cincinnati and the University of South Carolina. Dr. Brown announced that there would be a workshop on October 1 at 4:00PM at the CEC to discuss the ASPIREs program.

10. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM.at the next meeting.

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
October 9, 1996
206 Sandy Hall
3:30 PM

Members Present: E. Brown, T. Herdman, D. Jones, D. Lee, A. McNabb, J. Muffo, K. Reifsnider, B. Richardson, J. Schetz, R. Schubert, M. Smith, M. Uysal, R. Wokutch

Members Absent: J. Cowles, C. Finch, J. Johnson, T. Kennelly, A. Martin, M. McGilliard, L. Peters, W. Stephenson, L. Zelazny

Invited Guests: E. Hitchingham, P. Metz, D. Moore

1. Announcements:

Dr. Smith called the meeting to order. He introduced the invited guests. Dr. Smith announced the first reading of the germplasm resolution was presented to University Council and the second reading will be at the end of the month. Dr. Brown announced that the expertise database is being released in stages. He mentioned that 95 faculty attended the ASPIREs workshop and that 60 proposals are being sent from Engineering.

2. Adoption of Agenda:

Mr. Lee motioned approval of the agenda; Dr. Wokutch seconded. Agenda was approved.

3. Minutes of September 25, 1996:

After discovering several errors in the minutes, Dr. Smith proposed that the minutes be accepted after making the noted changes and additions. The membership was asked to approve or disapprove electronically the amended minutes. The minutes were accepted on that basis.

4. Library Serials: Dean Hitchingham and Paul Metz

Dean Hitchingham informed the membership that the library may be working with the faculty during the spring semester to prepare for a materials purchasing power cut of up to one million dollars. She stated that the serials would likely be the greatest part of the cut. Dean Hitchingham said serials represent the largest part of the overall cost of library materials, and they anticipate a 15% price increase next year from many of the publishers. She then went on to provide background on the library budget, giving detail as to where funds were spent. Dean Hitchingham said in response to her question why not cut something else in the library other than materials, the library already runs at a very lean ratio for spending that is not materials related. She also mentioned the internet. It has useful information, but it does not provide free access to the refereed and edited sources that are the basis of faculty research,publication, and graduate work. Dean Hitchingham said that if we want to have the same purchasing power in 1997-98 that we saw a year ago, we would need to see an increase of $1 million in the operating base to meet materials costs estimated at $6.2 million. She stated the library staff will support the ability of faculty and graduate students to order, with an estimated 24 hour turnaround time, faxed copies of the canceled publications available in the CARL system. The CARL system will also offer a mechanism for receiving e-mail listings of the table of contents of up to 50 journals selected by the faculty or graduate student. For journals not in the CARL system they will use the fastest commercial or academic document delivery service for getting the articles. Dean Hitchingham stated they will monitor the document delivery process to identify canceled publications which are requested frequently. She said that costs of the process will be supported by setting aside funding from the current materials allocation or by taking some part of any new allocation that is still not large enough to prevent cancellations. Dean Hitchingham said

they will need to know by December what kind of anticipated support they can count on for next year. Dr. Metz provided additional background information on the budget shortfall. He also detailed the cancellation process. Dean Hitchingham suggested the commission organize a response to the shortfall. Dr. Metz stated they are trying to stay in the top 50 of research institutions. Dr. Smith suggested the membership go back to their respective departments and colleges and get their feedback. He offered to draft a letter supporting the library. At the close of the meeting Dr. Richardson stated his alarm at the library situation. He mentioned it is under-publicized. Dr. Smith mentioned a letter written to President Torgersen expressing the overall collective concern from the membership. Dr. Brown mentioned some support from the Graduate Student Assembly would possibly be helpful.

5. Animal Adoption Policy: David Moore and Mark Smith

Dr. Smith provided two handouts and introduced Dr. Moore. Dr. Moore provided background on the topic. He said in 1985 the University Animal Care Committee had a policy which said that animals that were used in teaching and research could not be adopted. It was determined that the committee did not have the authority to say there was a policy when in fact there was no policy. The committee felt there needed to be a policy so a group was formed within the committee to draft a policy. Four members of the committee felt so strongly about having a policy that they were pushing for it but they also said the committee should not be the ones to sign off on the policy for a variety of concerns. At that time Dr. Peters was asked to be the signatory for the policy and he in turn asked there be a joint working group between the Commission on Research and the Animal Care Committee.

Dr. Schetz asked why don't they just vote 12 to 4? Dr. Moore responded there are another 8-9 people who don't voice any opposition and in essence go along with those individuals. There are three individuals that are in favor of adoption and vote in favor whenever possible. The committee has gone on record saying they will not write the policy. Dr. Smith asked what action the membership would like to take on the policy. Dr. Schetz responded that the group should be charged to develop a policy, not necessarily the policy presented. He stated that they seem to be the appropriate group to draft the policy. Dr. Schetz said that if they refuse to do it, then they should be replaced on the committee. Dr. Moore relayed that the 4 individuals have stated that if the administration is not happy with our stand on this then they can replace us. Dr. McNabb said that if they are charged with writing a policy and say that there should be a policy; but they refuse to draft it, resignation would be appropriate. Dr. Smith said as a first step he would go back and talk with Dr. Peters and ask Dr. Peters to encourage the committee to formulate a policy. Dr. Schetz made a motion to state the position that the Commission on Research feels it is imperative that there be a policy on animal adoption without saying what that policy is. Dr. Reifsnider seconded the motion. The motion carried.

6. Interdisciplinary Research Center Policies and Procedures - Possible Revisions: Ken Reifsnider

Dr. Reifsnider stated that the policy document was last approved in 1991 so there may be a perfunctory need to update the titles and offices. He mentioned he plans to ask the center directors to look through the document as well. He went through all the sections. Dr. Reifsnider stated he may offer some additions on the Project Administration section. He mentioned the reauthorization/termination section needs to be clarified somewhat. He asked the membership to look it over and offer suggestions at the next meeting. Dr. Schetz suggested that definitions of centers, institutes, labs would be helpful.

7. Election - Vice Chair: Mark Smith

Dr. McNabb nominated Dr. Schubert to be vice chair. Dr. Schubert was elected unanimously. It was announced that Dr. Schubert will likely be

on leave next year.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 PM.

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
October 23, 1996
206 Sandy Hall
3:30 PM

Members Present: E. Brown, J. Cowles, C. Finch, T. Herdman, D. Jones, T. Kennelly, D. Lee, M. McGilliard, A. McNabb, J. Muffo, K. Reifsnider, B. Richardson, R. Schubert, M. Smith, L. Zelazny

Members Absent: J. Johnson, A. Martin, L. Peters, J. Schetz, B. Stephenson, M. Uysal, R. Wokutch

Invited Guests: P. Hyer

1. Announcements: Dr. Smith announced the germplasm resolution was accepted and passed second reading at University Council. He announced that there were 142 proposals for the ASPIREs program.

2. Adoption of Agenda: Dr. Zelazny motioned approval of agenda; it was seconded. Agenda was approved.

3. Minutes of October 9, 1996: Dr. Herdman motioned approval of minutes; Dr. Cowles seconded. Minutes were approved.

4. Review of Commission on Faculty Affairs Severe Sanctions Policy: Dr. Pat Hyer introduced the severe sanctions policy to the membership for their input on how it will affect the research and administrative faculty. She stated the policy is needed to have a bridge between a letter in the file and dismissal for cause. She said there is a wide gap and that needs to be remedied. Dr. Hyer mentioned not all the possible sanctions were defined in the policy. She went over all the sections in the policy and stated that in the deans meeting a request was made to add a phrase in the section beginning "Recommendation of a severe sanction..." In the sentence beginning "Upon such recommendation.....and provost to discuss the facts - add the phrase -and supporting documentation.... Dr. Hyer suggested it would go in the Research Faculty Handbook along with the sections describing removal for just cause. Mr. Jones asked why the policy could not be written with more specific guidelines. Dr. Smith asked about a peer review committee. Dr. Hyer responded that a severe sanction could conceivably be charged without going through a peer review committee. Dr. Reifsnider mentioned his concern with privacy issues. Dr. Richardson stated his concern over faculty morale with some of the language that is written into the policy. Dr. McNabb suggested that the wording "document allegations or violations" be added. Dr. Hyer stated she needs to add to the policy, at the request of the CFA, how to convey that the policy will not be invoked for some trivial reason. Dr. Richardson mentioned the possibility of using the severe sanctions policy as a tool of threat. Dr. McGilliard stated he would want a severe sanction to be covered in either the Faculty Senate Ethics Committee, by the Scholarly Misconduct Policy, the Sexual Harassment Policy, Internal Audit or Post Tenure Review. Dr. Brown stated that there is a certain amount of protection for the individual faculty member in the proceedings of the existing disciplinary pathways that would be missing if charges were brought through the current draft of the severe sanctions policy. Dr. Hyer stated our ethics policy is very narrowly drawn. She suggested another possibility might be to require a departmental personnel committee to review the evidence and support the department head's recommendation before it gets forwarded. Dr. Reifsnider stated any specifics that can be added would help to make the process more clear. Dr. Reifsnider suggested adding a statement like "under normal conditions these will be heard from the previous five avenues and only in exceptional circumstances will the severe sanctions policy be considered".

Dr. Smith summarized that the commission's concern is the mechanism for peer review when one of the five disciplinary pathways is not implemented. In such cases, perhaps the personnel committee or P&T committee would be appropriate. He stated that wording to that effect may be helpful. Dr. McGilliard stated that perhaps those five disciplinary pathways (EEO/AA, Ethical Misconduct, Post Tenure Review, Scholarly Misconduct, or Internal Audit) may not be quite enough. However, far fewer cases may be outside these areas compared with potential abuses which may result from a department head unilaterally applying a severe sanction. Albeit peer review is possible at the grievance stage of the process, it seems to be at a relatively late point in the application of the severe sanctions policy.

5. Revisions to Center Review Policy: Dr. Reifsnider mentioned the correction in the terminology referring to the Associate Provost for Research and updating it to read the Associate Provost for Interdisciplinary Studies. The terminology referring to the Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies was changed to the Commission on Research. Dr. Reifsnider mentioned a change in the last paragraph of the Funding section. In a previous version there is mention of a small operating budget being a normal allocation to a center. That has been removed since it is not a normal allocation to a center. Under the Review and Evaluation section, the second paragraph has been changed. It now reads: The review committee will nominally consist of three faculty, a department head, an associate dean for research, and a member of the Commission on Research. Dr. Reifsnider motioned acceptance of the changes; Dr. Brown seconded. Dr. McNabb stated a concern she had on the overhead sharing. She mentioned it may open it up to renegotiation. Dr. Reifsnider suggested modifying the wording to read -- "there may be some agreement that a portion of the returned overhead on center projects". Dr. McNabb suggested that under the governance section the question, 'Will it have an "advisory board"? be taken out. Dr. Reifsnider agreed. Dr. McNabb had a third suggestion in relation to the reauthorization section. She stated that a request for re-authorization in the same manner and format as for initial establishment has not been done in the past. Dr. Reifsnider responded that SCHEV requires a reauthorization policy. After much discussion it was decided that it was an issue of wording. The sentence should now read: "If reauthorization is recommended by the review committee, it must include a request for reauthorization in the same manner and format as for initial establishment". The motion to accept the report with the changes made passed unanimously.

6. Library Budget: Other Perspectives: Dr. Smith mentioned to the membership to think about alternatives to access information besides buying a hard copy journal. He stated perhaps electronic access should be utilized more frequently. He reported that Dr. Eaton has mentioned there have been discussions concerning the possibility of a consortia of university libraries to share costs associated with acquisition of information from serials. This was mentioned as an example of how to address the rising, unchecked costs of serials charged by various publishers. Dr. Smith stated it would be on the agenda next time.

7. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 5:00PM.

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
November 13, 1996
206 Sandy Hall
3:30 PM

Members Present: J. Cowles, C. Finch, D. Jones, D. Lee, M. McGilliard, A. McNabb, J. Schetz, R. Schubert, M.Smith, M. Uysal, L. Zelazny

Members Absent: E. Brown, T. Herdman, J. Johnson, T. Kennelly, A. Martin, J. Muffo, L. Peters, K. Reifsnider, B. Richardson, B. Stephenson, R. Wokutch

Invited Guest: J. Eaton

1. Announcements: The meeting started with a discussion on the animal care policy and the discussions that occurred at University Council. Dr. Smith stated that perhaps the December COR meeting will be canceled.

2. Adoption of Agenda: Dr. A. McNabb motioned approval of the agenda; Dr. Zelazny seconded. Agenda was approved as written.

3. Minutes of October 23, 1996: Dr. Zelazny motioned approval of the minutes; Dr. Cowles seconded. The minutes were approved as written.

4. Electronic Dissertation Thesis: Dr. Eaton stated that the Library, Computing Center, and Research and Graduate Studies (particularly Dr. Peters) have been very supportive of the electronic dissertation thesis project. He went over a list of sponsors and their roles in the project. Dr. Eaton said N. C. State has a pilot project and will probably be submitting theses/dissertations this spring. He stated the purpose of the project is to use computer based technology to improve both the content and availability of theses/dissertations. Dr. Eaton said we want students to be more creative in their scholarship; we want to give them access to some of the tools that are out there (multimedia tools, ability to produce color graphics in their documents, ability to put video and audio in their documents; knowledge to be more widely available; and we want students to become electronic publishers. Dr. Eaton mentioned benefits: 1) elimination of the hard copy will save students money without a significant increase of effort; 2) save shelf space in the Library; 3) fit into the electronic library of the future; 4) make access to theses/dissertations less expensive. Dr. Eaton said he plans to have implementation in the spring of 1997. To date over 60 proposals have been submitted electronically. Dr. Schetz and Dr. Smith mentioned the potential problem of plagiarism. Dr. Eaton responded he did not think it would be a major problem, but he was not prepared to say it would not happen. He stated there would be a workshop in January to train the students. He went through the procedure the students will follow in submitting their theses/dissertations. Dr. Eaton asked the membership to spread the word around campus.

5. Library Budget: Other Perspectives: Dr. Smith stated that Dr. Richardson had written him and stated that comments made at the last COR meeting were in line with what he was thinking (not necessarily a hard copy but maintaining access). Ms. Kennelly wrote as well and was more concerned about maintaining the budget. She had a different perspective based on her position. She was encouraging a more forceful response from the Commission. Dr. Peters had mentioned at a pre-COR meeting that external factors affect the budget, especially the cost of serials. Dr. Schetz said the Commission should make a statement that the Library is a high priority. He also mentioned the Library is very important to the research mission of

the University. Dr. McNabb said the Commission needs to be careful of the type of message we send. She said we need to be more informed before we make any type of statement. Dr. Schetz stated he believes it is obvious that the Library is not very high on the priority list of allocations of money. The budget is not being increased. Dr. Smith mentioned we are slipping in ranking. The library personnel salaries are low. Dr. McNabb responded that we are slipping across the board, not just the Library. She commented that the Library may be in the same situation with regards to budget as other areas. Hopefully, the Library is not being unfairly prioritized when it comes to funding. Dr. Smith asked if there are alternatives that may not cost as much. He stated that information access may be the pivotal issue. Dr. Smith offered to get more information on the budgeting of the Library. Dr. McNabb suggested that perhaps Dr. Meszaros could come and address the Commission on this topic. Dr. Smith stated that he would find out more information and draft a position letter for the Commission's review at the next meeting. He said he plans to have an action item on the agenda concerning this issue for the first January meeting.

6. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4:55PM.

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
January 22, 1997
206 Sandy Hall
3:30 PM

Members Present: E. Brown, J. Cowles, T. Herdman, D. Jones, D. Lee, A. McNabb, J. Muffo, L. Peters, J. Schetz, R. Schubert, M. Smith, M. Uysal, R. Wokutch, L. Zelazny

Members Absent: C. Finch, J. Johnson, T. Kennelly, A. Martin, M. McGilliard, K. Reifsnider, B. Richardson, W. Stephenson

Invited Guests: L. McCoy, D. Moore, P. Scanlon

1. Announcements: Dr. Smith provided the membership with copies of the minutes of the task force to draft an animal disposal policy. He also provided copies of correspondence between E. Blythe and L. Matheson on the University Libraries possible shortfall as well as a response draft from the COR to Mr. Blythe.

2. Adoption of Agenda: Mr. Lee motioned approval; Dr. Zelazny seconded. Agenda was approved as written.

3. Minutes of November 13, 1996: Mr. Lee motioned approval; Dr. McNabb seconded. Minutes were approved as written.

4. Animal Disposition Policy Report: Dr. Smith provided some background on this issue. The members of the task appointed by Len Peters to formulate a policy were: Joe Cowles, Delbert Jones, Klaus Elgert, David Moore, Pat Scanlon (chair), Forrest Thye, and Frank Gwazdauskas. Dr. Scanlon stated the University is required to have an animal care committee according to federal law. He said that the committee generally approves everything before the fact (all research proposals and all teaching protocols). Dr. Scanlon said that people have been concerned about the adoption of animals from the university. Some of the concerns are: 1) care of the animal after it is adopted; 2) liability; and 3) potential appearance of impropriety. Dr. Scanlon stated the task force had met twice and had reviewed two different drafts of resolutions plus a policy type document. Dr. Scanlon went over the resolution approved by the task force . Dr. Moore asked that the task force be commended for developing this document in two short meetings. Dr. Cowles said that the committee had worked together very well. In response to a question from Dr. McNabb, Dr. Scanlon stated the policy gives the University an end point in the sale of animals. After a question by Dr. McNabb on the section: AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that disposal of laboratory rodents, lagomorphs and reptiles is excluded from any type of sale or donation, ..... the wording or donation was removed. Mr. McCoy suggested that the policy be modified by taking out the word property in two places where it appears. He mentioned that this would fall under the branch of the surplus property rules. Omitting this word will allow the University to not be restricted in following surplus property rules. Dr. Moore stated that the intention of this resolution was to provide the groundwork. There would be an additional administrative policy that would provide more direction to the colleges. Dr. Peters asked if the presumption is that once University Council acts on the resolution, if positive, an administrative policy would be developed by the research office to address details. Dr. Moore responded yes. Dr. Peters proposed that his office would work with Mr. McCoy's office (University Controller) and Kay Heidbreder in establishing an administrative policy. Dr. Peters would bring that policy back to COR at least for information purposes. Dr. Schetz motioned approval of the document with the changes; Mr. Lee

seconded. Motion approved unanimously. Dr. Smith stated he would edit the resolution as needed and review it with Pat Hyer prior to presentation before University Council. The edited version of the resolution would be reviewed by Dr. Scanlon, representing the task force.

5. Library Budget Response: Dr. Smith stated that the issue has been determined to be less ominous. He said he had a call from Ms. Kennelly and that she and Dr. Hitchingham asked that COR wait and see how everything works out with budgeting in reference to a serials cut. Dr. Smith stated that his response draft to potential cuts acknowledges that the COR's concerns are similar to those of the University Library Committee. He also said that the memo also acknowledges that it is difficult to maintain budgets with publishers basically charging a very high amount for these serials. Dr. Schetz asked where the reallocation would come from and what the effect will be on other activities. Ms. Kennelly told Dr. Smith that they did not yet know where the reallocations would come from nor the possible ramifications. He stated that there seems to be less concern about a massive cut compared with attitudes in the fall. Dr. Muffo stated he did not have a problem with the memo but suggested that we keep an eye on the situation. Dr. Peters stated that universities have looked at short-term remedies by cutting serials without looking at the long-term implications. Dr. Schetz asked what other resources will be impacted as a result of decreased serial cuts. He suggested that a sentence be added to Dr. Smith's memo asking what other resources will be impacted. Dr. Muffo asked that a question be asked about long-term planning. Dr. Smith stated that he would revise the memo based on additional feedback from COR members and send it out electronically to all members if substantial differnces are recommended. It was agreed that copies would be sent to all the individuals copied previously by others.

6. ORAU Call for Reviewers: Dr. Brown mentioned ORAU has a proposal deadline of February 14 (University deadline is February 10). The proposals are to be 3 pages with an award of $5,000 and equal level cost-sharing. Two proposals will be sent forward. Dr. Smith asked for volunteers. Drs. Schetz, Herdman, and Uysal volunteered.

7. Waste Policy Institute Board Appointment: Dr. Peters stated that the Waste Policy Institute board has a representative serving from Faculty Senate and a representative serving from the Commission on Research. The nominating committee endorsed Dr. Smith to serve as a representative to the Waste Policy Institute board. Dr. Brown nominated Dr. Smith. Mr. Lee seconded. Dr. Smith was elected unanimously.

8. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM.

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
March 12, 1997
206 Sandy Hall
3:30 PM

Members Present: E. Brown, J. Cowles, C. Finch, T. Kennelly, A. McNabb, J. Muffo, K. Reifsnider, J. Schetz, M. Smith, M. Uysal, L. Zelazny

Members Absent: T. Herdman, J. Johnson, D. Jones, A. Martin, M. McGilliard, L. Peters, B. Richardson, R. Schubert, B. Stephenson, R. Wokutch, A. Wright

1. Minutes of January 22, 1997: The minutes were approved electronically and forwarded to University Council prior to the meeting.

2. Housing Research Center Review Report: Dr. Reifsnider presented the report of the review committee to the membership. The legislative charge to the center is to serve as an interdisciplinary study, research, and information resource on housing for the Commonwealth. Dr. Reifsnider stated that the bulk of the review is very positive and the activities in the center have a national and international stature. He mentioned that some of the functions listed on the executive summary are not happening, particularly the interaction among faculty and students, and the transfer of information. It was recommended that a University advisory board be established. The board should meet at least three times per year and the charge to the board was listed in thirteen items to be addressed. Dr. Reifsnider provided an overview of some of the items. He stated that the committee recommends continuation of the center and that the report includes several significant accomplishments. Dr. Reifsnider made a motion for acceptance of the report. Dr. Brown seconded. Dr. Smith asked if there was a statement in the report recommending continuation of the center. He suggested that a written statement on the continuation of the center be added following the statement on creation of a University advisory board. Dr. Reifsnider agreed. Ms. Kennelly asked, in reference to the funding section, if the director will have less time to devote to the center. Dr. Reifsnider responded that the director is taking on more teaching responsibilities. The committee did recommend that the director spend more of his time on center activities. Dr. McNabb commented that the faculty associated with the center could improve their "visibility" by greater collegial interaction and interdisciplinary collaboration. Dr. Reifsnider agreed. He stated that the recommendation is for an interactive board which desires to be involved in the center, and not an administrative board. Dr. Brown asked Dr. Reifsnider if he thought that the actions proposed would alleviate these difficulties about insufficient interaction among the faculty and various other units around campus. Dr. Reifsnider responded with a guarded yes. He stated the board will have to sit down and carefully ask that question. Dr. Reifsnider said that there is much strength in this area, but he would like to see more people involved. Dr. McNabb asked if there could be a possibility of conflict of interest for the members on the board. Dr. Reifsnider responded yes, and that this issue will have to be monitored. He stated the board should be broad-based to ensure unbiased activity. Dr. Smith called for the vote on the review report with the addition of the added sentence on continuation of the center. The report was accepted unanimously.

3. Self Study Review: Dr. Smith introduced the topic and stated that he felt the responses were appropriate and well documented for the must statements related to the University's research mission. He stated that the Commission's charge is to confirm that the responses to the statements

are appropriate and accurate. He opened the floor for discussion on each statement. Dr. McNabb stated that on the first item the statement beginning - "The proposal process ensures...." should be addressed first and the description of the process should follow. Further, item 70 does not address contract agreements where publication is delayed. If that was not addressed explicitly, there may be a perception that we do not allow delays. She stated that it would be appropriate to say there are examples where publication is delayed but these contracts are only accepted after the system approves their reasonable nature. Dr. McNabb mentioned that the response to this must statement implies that there are never any blocks on publication, even temporarily. She said she did not think this was accurate. Dr. Reifsnider said that it is routine for industry to ask for a one year delay to assess the impact of the results. In statement 71-72, Dr. McNabb questioned the statement - "accordingly all faculty are expected to become involved in research activities". She said that is not an accurate expectation that faculty who are classified as instructors, or all tenure-track faculty actively participate in research. Dr. Reifsnider suggested that the word "all" be omitted. At this point Dr. Smith summarized the changes. In statement 68-69, it is appropriate to switch paragraphs. The second paragraph beginning with "The proposal..." would be the first paragraph. The second paragraph would begin with "The proposal submission...". The extra period in the last sentence will be removed. In statement 70, a statement will be recommended relating to delayed publication or publication with contractual stipulations. In statement 71-72, we are recommending deletion of "all"and just have "Accordingly, faculty...". Dr. McNabb mentioned statement 77-78. The second to last sentence provides only one of many examples of how overhead money that comes back to the University can be used. She felt it was not appropriate to cite limited examples if not required. Several editorial suggestions were made. Dr. Smith summarized the Commission's recommendation concerning the sentence relevant to the use of returned overhead: "This money is used to support the research mission of the University". Dr. Schetz stated his disagreement with the statement concerning the contribution of overhead return to the University's operating budget: "The $8 million is less than 3% of our E&G budget". Dr. Schetz stated that there is an underlying bigger issue with respect to reliance on these funds especially at the department level. He summarized that the answer to the must statement is misleading and does not accurately reflect what actually happens in many departments. Dr. Muffo stated that for some colleges, it is a non-issue, and for other units, it is less of an issue. However, there are units which definitely rely on overhead return for operating dollars. Dr. Brown stated that the must statement is directed to the institution and not individual departments and colleges. Dr. McNabb stated that she did not think it was appropriate to address this particular issue as part of the self study. She stated that Dr. Schetz's concern in addressing this area is important and should be reviewed internally. After much discussion on this point, it was decided that use of returned overhead dollars would need to be addressed, but not necessarily in the forum of the self study. With respect to this matter, Dr. Smith stated he would present the concerns of the Commission to Dr. Peters.

4. Indirect Cost Revenue Distribution: Dr. Reifsnider presented the indirect cost revenue distribution plan to the membership. He stated that we have had agreements over time with the Centers who report to the Research Division Office of Interdisciplinary Programs. These are similar in many regards but also different. He stated that he is hoping to normalize the process and to have some uniform guidelines in place next year. This will improve the planning process. Dr. Reifsnider said that this plan is a close clone to what has been in use. He stated it is still a draft and that he welcomes comments. He is hoping to get it in final form by September. Dr. Mike Vorster helped Dr. Reifsnider create the plan. The departmental allocation of the research indirect cost return follows the fraction of the denominator. He said they tried to make these absolutely transparent. The guidelines will apply to individual contracts and grants. The Research Division and individual Colleges end up with a

suggested amount of 5%. Dr. Reifsnider explained the current overhead distribution. He stated that the administrative unit is responsible for cost over-runs. Dr. Reifsnider explained some examples of the proposed plan. Dr. Smith asked about the approval process. Dr. Reifsnider responded that it is a normalization scheme. He plans to see everyone affected by this plan and then send out a memo confirming the plan. Dr. Reifsnider stated he has been amazed at the positive reaction he has received thus far. He said that this is being welcomed as at least a normalization of what we do so that there are no special cases. Dr. Reifsnider reminded the membership that this plan is preliminary.

5. Nominating Committee for COR Chair: Dr. Smith announced that the nominating committee for the chair for next year consists of Drs. Cowles, Schetz and Smith. He said a slate of nominees will be presented at the first meeting in April.

6. Announcements: Dr. Brown announced that two applications were chosen to send to the ORAU competition: one from the College of Engineering and the other from the College of Human Resources and Education. He announced the limited submission program from the Packard Foundation which awards $100,000 per faculty. Two will go out on behalf of the University. The competition will close in about 6 weeks. Dr. Brown plans to ask for assistance in the review process from Commission members.

7. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM.

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
April 9, 1997
206 Sandy Hall
3:30 PM

Members Present: E. Brown, C. Finch, T. Herdman, J. Johnson, T. Kennelly, M. McGilliard, A. McNabb, L. Peters, K. Reifsnider, J. Schetz, R. Schubert, M. Smith, M. Uysal, L. Zelazny

Members Absent: J. Cowles, D. Jones, D. Lee, A. Martin, J. Muffo, B. Richardson, B. Stephenson, R. Wokutch

Invited Guests: S. Burlingame

1. Announcements: Dr. Smith stated that the review report on the Virginia Coal and Energy Research Center may be the only item for the April 23 meeting. At the close of the meeting Dr. Brown thanked Dr. Smith for his service as chair.

2. Minutes of March 12, 1997: The minutes were approved electronically and forwarded to University Council prior to the meeting.

3. COR Policy Formulation: Dr. Smith introduced this agenda item by stating it is in response to a written memo from a faculty member. COR members received copies of the memorandum. It was suggested that the pertinent issue before COR is related to: when does the COR formulate policy or revise policy? The COR agreed that a COR member representing his/her constituency, University administration, or a University committee can request that COR consider policy formulation or policy revision. The COR discussed these pathways and concurred that they were appropriate. Examples from this current year included a policy to revise the way revenue is distributed with respect to agricultural extension germ plasm development, and the animal disposal policy. These issues and subsequent policies were initiated by faculty through the Intellectual Properties Committee, and University administration through the Animal Care Committee, respectively. COR members also discussed its role with respect to grievances related to research activities. Guidelines already exist in faculty and research faculty handbooks with respect to disciplinary actions secondary to research activity improprieties. After much discussion, it was confirmed that COR is not a component of University grievance procedural pathways. However, COR members agreed that their may be instances when a grievance review committee recommends to COR that a particular policy be reviewed or, perhaps formulated, to address an issue related to research which emanated from the grievance process.

4. Research Overhead and Operating Funds: Dr. Smith introduced this topic based on the concern of COR members that some departments on campus may over-rely on returned overhead for operating dollars. This concern was in response to COR answers to the University self-study. Most COR members agreed that, on a University-wide basis, there is not an over-reliance on overhead. However, Dr. Schetz responded that the specific question was answered in a way that seemed to make this question/answer a non-issue, when in fact, it may be a problem in certain departments. Dr. Peters stated that he and Mr. Hurd answered that question of the self study. He said that the University generates about 10-12M$ in overhead a year: 30% of that is not accessible to departments, nor anyone, and 70% (or 8M$) is accessible. Even that 8M$ does not get built into departmental operating budgets. Dr. Peters and Mr. Hurd then asked what is the worst case scenario. He stated that they basically took 8M$ and divided it by a half

a billion (total University operating budget). Dr. Peters said they did not know how to answer that question any more specifically, recognizing there is high variability between departments with respect to the reliance on returned overhead dollars. Dr. Reifsnider stated there are a number of questions as well as opportunities to be addressed. With the discussion of opportunities, some barriers may also exist. He mentioned the different environments within departments and colleges at Virginia Tech being a concern. Dr. Reifsnider also mentioned the changing times and the varying manner in which overhead is distributed. Dr. Smith stated the reason for this topic being on the agenda was to determine: 1) if departments are relying on overhead too much ?,and, 2) should something be done about it? Dr. Reifsnider said perhaps we could use these moneys in a better way. He asked should COR look at how this money is used and how it might be used? Dr. Reifsnider suggested that we ask the Provost's Office to look into the situation. After some discussion between Drs. Reifsnider, Brown, Herdman and McNabb, Dr. Smith suggested that it might be appropriate to ask the department heads to reveal what percentage of returned overhead is used for operating dollars; some examples of what the money is used for; and are they satisfied with the current system. Dr. Peters responded with a series of questions: Is the issue a problem? He asked if the current system is providing the proper incentive to the PI? How is the PI rewarded and how uniform is it across the University? Is it creating problems that we don't anticipate and what are the positive and negative ramifications? Dr. Reifsnider stated that it is important that this not be an administrative activity aimed at manipulating a process that really isn't intended to be controlled. Dr. Schetz said that current policy dictates these funds be used for research-related activities. However, members noted anecdotal sources indicating this is not always the case. Dr. Reifsnider asked Dr. Schetz his opinion on questioning department heads on this issue. He responded he would react with disdain. He told Dr. Reifsnider he liked his opening comments about opportunities. Dr. McNabb mentioned the ASPIRES program as an example of the use of money from many pools (like overhead) that provides general incentive to all. However there is always tension between overhead going back to those who generate it and programs that foster grant activity in general. She mentioned there is much anxiety concerning where the overhead funds are placed (departments versus University-wide programs). Dr. Reifsnider stated that he would like to see the funds go to the investigators so that they can be motivated to increase their research budgets. Dr. McNabb mentioned the faculty who don't have a grant at the moment (especially new assistant professors) may really need the funds to acquire data/equipment to successfully compete for grants. There is also an issue of how do we share resources for the collective good in addition to making sure that we properly foster those faculty who usually have a grant, but require extra help when a shortfall occurs. She stated a balance must be achieved. Dr. Peters asked are we at the right balance? He noted we need funds for central initiatives, for college initiatives, for departmental initiatives, and some for the principal investigator. Dr. Schetz stated that he thought, with some adjustment of the system, we could probably provide a greater incentive for the PI than now exists on the average. Dr. Johnson mentioned that we should at least study it. She said we need a baseline; need some basic information on what occurs across the University. Dr. Reifsnider asked if it would make faculty angry or upset. Dr. McNabb responded it would create apprehension just by asking the questions. It would take much thought about designing the questionnaire and how you interpret the different results/constituencies to get meaningful information. Dr. Peters mentioned the composition of the committee would be critical in making sure it is done as well as possible. Dr. Brown mentioned that in addition to the apprehension, there would also be expectations. Dr. Smith stated that he thinks COR members should consider this issue further before recommending the process be reviewed. Dr. Reifsnider volunteered to bring something in print to the next meeting.

5. GSA Poster Judges: Dr. Smith asked for volunteers to judge at the annual GSA Poster Session on April 28. Drs. Brown, Schetz and Uysal

volunteered.

6. Election of 1997-98 COR Chair: Dr. Smith announced that the nominating committee asked Dr. Herdman if he would agree to be nominated. Dr. Reifsnider motioned that the nominations be closed; Dr. McNabb seconded. Dr. Herdman was unanimously elected as chair.

7. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM.