MINUTES
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
March 1, 2017
130 Burruss Conference Room
3:30pm – 5:00pm

Attendee: Benjamin Corl (Chair), Martin Daniel (for Theresa Mayer), Myra Blanco, Leigh-Anne Krometis (for Jennifer Irish (Vice-Chair)), Tom Bell, Dipankar Chakavarti, Saied Mostaghimi, Ginny Pannabecker, Nancy Dudek, Sally Morton, Steve Nagle, Jon Green (for Stefan Duma), Samantha Fried, Mike Sorice (for Kevin McGuire), Cheryl Carrico, Kurt Zimmerman, Scott Klopfer, Sandra Muse, recorder

Absent: Nathan King, Van Crowder, Srinath Ekkad, Andrew Neilson, Bruce Vogelaar

Guest: Peggy Layne, Ken Miller, Julie Speer

I.   Approval of the Agenda – A motion was made and the agenda was approved.

II.   Announcements
   a.   Approval of the Minutes of February 8, 2017 – The meeting minutes were approved electronically.
   b.   Election to fill COR Research Faculty Seats – S. Muse reported two of the three seats held by research faculty will expire this year. A call for nominations to fill the seats will be sent out shortly and an election will be held for terms to begin July 1.
   c.   Vice-Chair for FY2017-18 – B. Corl requested commission members give thought to serving as vice-chair for FY2017-18. In the past, the vice-chair would assume the chair position the following year. New members joining next year to the Commission can also be considered.

III.   Unfinished Business
   a.   Report of Ongoing Activities
      i.   University Library Committee – V. Pannabecker reported the library committee will be looking at the information received in their peer review survey and how they might share the information with the Commission and others.
      ii.   Update from Faculty Senate – B. Corl reported the faculty senate discussed the Ombudsman resolution. There were two other items that the senators felt strongly about. One concern was over the benchmarking and metrics development going on as part of the new budget model. A number of senators advocated for a task force from the Faculty Senate to monitor the development of the metrics and then the utilization and implementation. Concerns were raised over the term of scholarship not being the same for everyone. The second item was the new EFAR and Elements systems and their application in departments and colleges. It was reported that a number of things were not functioning as they thought they should and were looking at having them addressed. Sally Morton, dean of COS expressed she would welcome faculty senate input regarding the metrics. As dean, she had worked with chairs and faculty to have a very open and transparent discussion of the metrics at a departmental level.
      iii.   Centers and Institutes Update – No Report
      iv.   Committee on Research Competitiveness – No Report

b. Open Access Policy Draft – Julie Speer, chair of the Open Access Policy working group gave an official update and presentation. Speer cited Peter Suber as defining open access as digital literature online which is free of charge and most copyright and licensing restrictions. Two ways to participate are through green access (depositing in an open access depository) and gold access (making research freely available through scholarly peer review journals). Speer noted that faculty should care about open access because there are papers that show there is a citation advantage which increases the visibility of your scholarship, increases readership, shows the impact of your work, and at the academic level, the opportunity to reclaim the ownership of scholarship. At the national level it is also about providing content rights and access (providing public access) that tax payers pay for through federal grants. At the global and national level, it is supporting the development and transmission of new ideas, which impacts in positive ways the local environments and communities that supports knowledge sharing and demonstrates research impact. Speer cited a number of institutions including peer institutions which have open access policies. A reminder was made of Virginia Tech already having an open access repository. Almost 60,000 items are already available. The draft policy previously made available to COR has not changed. It has been reviewed by Legal Counsel to insure there is no conflict with the University IP policy. Information regarding implementation and procedures are also included. Virginia Tech's language has largely consisted of language implemented by Harvard University and is found in many of our peer institutions' policies.

c. Update to Policy 13025 – B. Corl reported this is the policy about Investigators, Co-Investigators and Lead Investigators being removed from a funded project. Many funding agencies and institutions have different means for identifying the person leading the project. To clarify, changes considered were to add to the policy "or Equivalent" and a clarification in the purpose statement. There are also some administrative changes to titles. These are not believed to be substantive changes to the policy at this time. If no questions or changes recommended by the Commission, the draft will next go to Dr. Mayer for review. The committee suggested moving forward with no suggested changes.

d. Update to Policy 13005 – No Report

e. Task Force on Shared Governance Update – No Report

f. Update on Revisions to Faculty Handbook - M. Daniel reported the faculty handbook is updated annually. Currently there are a series of edits to bring the handbook into alignment with some of our current practices. The edited version is out with a subgroup of members from COR. The individuals were asked to return feedback by March 7. Once comments are back, the edited version will be brought back to the COR and voted on.

IV. New Business
   a. Creation of Ombuds Office – Charter and Resolution – B. Corl provided a copy of the draft charter and resolution in advance. Faculty Senate has voted in support. Some discussion ensued commenting that one centralize place to go would be best. A vote was taken and approved to show support to the resolution going forward.

V. Adjournment: 4:35