

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
February 8, 2017
130 Burruss Conference Room
3:30pm – 5:00pm

Attendee: Benjamin Corl (Chair), Theresa Mayer, Tammy Trimble (for Myra Blanco), Jennifer Irish (Vice-Chair), Srinath Ekkad, Kurt Zimmerman, Tom Bell, Dipankar Chakravarti, Saied Mostaghimi, Ginny Pannabecker, Nancy Dudek, Randy Heflin (for Sally Morton), Steve Nagle, Kevin McGuire, Jon Green (for Stefan Duma), Samantha Fried, Andrew Neilson, Cheryl Carrico, Bruce Vogelaar, Sandra Muse, recorder (for Scott Klopfer).

Absent: Nathan King and Van Crowder

Guest: Peggy Layne, Ken Miller, Martin Daniel, Scott Midkiff and Dale Pike

- I. Approval of the Agenda – A motion was made and a revised agenda was approved.
- II. Announcements
 - a. Approval of the Minutes of December 14, 2016 – The meeting minutes were approved electronically.
 - b. Reminder of Change for Date of March Meeting – B. Corl reminded the members that the March meeting had been moved up to March 1 due to spring break week.
- III. Unfinished Business
 - a. Report of Ongoing Activities
 - i. University Library Committee – V. Pannabecker reported the library is in the design and development stage to renovate the fourth floor for the innovation/entrepreneurship cluster related to the destination areas for support of collaborative faculty, student and community business initiatives. Materials currently on fourth floor will be moved to the 3rd and 5th floors within the library; chapters or journal will be scanned; and lower use items will be made available in library service center by daily courier. The library is in the process of looking at the need for additional space for increases in student enrollment and faculty. Virginia Tech reviewed a library study where a comparison was made with peer institutions equivalent in type, size and aspirations. In comparison, Virginia Tech was found to have much less space per student and faculty. A digital literacy course is in the works.
 - ii. Update from Faculty Senate – B. Corl reported a presentation was given by the Controller's office to Faculty Senate on taxation on travel funding. The key test is whether a traveler was on university business and the university will benefit. An example is students traveling for their education vs. traveling as representatives of the university. Advice was given on how to decide if your travel is for university business and how giving detail regarding your travel is helpful. A presentation was also given by the Provost on Benchmarking followed by discussion. Time expired before the topic of Destination Areas was discussed.
 - iii. Centers and Institutes Update – S. Ekkad reported a new departmental center in Agricultural and Applied Economics in CALS had been approved

for the Center for Excellence in Global Agricultural Trade to be headed by Jason Grant.

- b. Committee on Research Competitiveness – There was no report given.
- c. Open Access Policy Draft – K. McGuire and G. Pannabecker distributed a working draft which was developed after the Harvard model. Discussion of the draft ensued. There was concern in particular regarding the process for opting out. In addition, procedures were being developed as well as FAQ. An updated draft will be provided for discussion at the March meeting.
- d. Update to Policy 13025 – B. Corl reported that work was continuing on the update draft.
- e. Update to Policy 13005 – T. Mayer provided the background on changes being recommended to Policy 13005. The term “laboratory” is being integrated into the policy to make the connection of laboratories with destination areas. The policy change will give administrative clarification to the governance of laboratories by having oversight by stakeholders as well as OVPRI. There is a need to be flexible with the word “laboratory” as it is used differently by different organizations. The draft revisions of Policy 13005 will be posted on-line with a request for comments before the March 1 meeting. The timeline is considered urgent.
- f. Task Force on Shared Governance Update – A. Neilson reported the task force was tasked with looking at how shared governance might be improved and provide recommendations. The task force determined two options available.
 - a. More change to the governance system
 - b. Keep the current systemIt appeared the current system is fairly solid if done well. The recommendation would include improving transparency. Opportunity for faculty senate comment on all resolutions related to faculty issues will continue. The staff senate, GSA and SGA were not interested in having the review by faculty senate.
- g. Update on Revisions to Faculty Handbook - No Report

IV. New Business

- a. Project Site Migration Discussion – D. Pike and S. Midkiff indicated that we will continue to see a lot of changes in IT in the future with concerns over data sensitivity, requirements by the federal government and added complexity. A sensitive matrix is being developed regarding what systems to use regarding sensitive data. They have found Stanford to have a good model. The landscape complexity may drive development based on level of responsibility taken by the University or faculty member. The University being more restrictive. More flexibility comes with more responsibility. The use of Canvas for project management is not encouraged. Google Suite and Microsoft Office 365 appear to work better particularly for outside collaborations. Scholar will go away and individuals should be transferring their data off of Scholar. Student help has been available for course transfers and can help with project sites also.

V. Adjournment: 4:41pm