

MINUTES
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

April 12, 2017
130 Burruss Conference Room
3:30pm – 5:00pm

Attendee: Benjamin Corl (Chair), Theresa Mayer, Jennifer Irish (Vice-Chair), Tom Bell, Dipankar Chakavarti, Saied Mostaghimi, Andrew Neilson, Jonathan Petters (for Ginny Pannabecker), Steve Nagle, Bruce Vogelaar, Stefan Duma, Samantha Fried, Kurt Zimmerman, Amer Fayad (for Van Crowder), Martin Daniel (for Srinath Ekkad), Barbara Lockee, Sandra Muse (for Scott Klopfer) and recorder

Absent: Nathan King, Myra Blanco, Nancy Dudek, Sally Morton, Kevin McGuire, Cheryl Carrico

Guest: Peggy Layne, Ken Miller

- I. Approval of the Agenda – A motion was made and the agenda was approved.
 - II. Announcements
 - a. Approval of the Minutes of March 1, 2017 – The meeting minutes were approved electronically.
 - b. Final Meeting of FY2016-17 on May 10, 2017 – B. Corl reminded the members of the last COR meeting of the fiscal year is May 10, 2017.
 - III. Unfinished Business
 - a. Report of Ongoing Activities
 - i. University Library Committee – J. Petters (reporting for V. Pannabecker) reported the University Library Committee (ULC) met on March 15th and continued discussion of the results from the peer institution survey on libraries. A new summary data report was reviewed and areas of interest and concern for the University and for particular groups, such as graduate students, undergraduate students, faculty, and community partners were noted. The next meeting in April will discuss options to report the results beyond the ULC.
 - ii. Update from Faculty Senate – B. Corl reported Dean DePauw joined the Faculty Senate last night reporting that she is engaging in an initiative around creating an affirming environment for graduate students. A more specific objective is to reduce or eliminate academic bullying that is occurring occasionally on campus. DePauw reported there were many difference levels of bullying on campus. Faculty Senate recommended or asked that this becomes a broader conversation. Members mentioned that sometimes it is peer to peer bullying, sometimes administrative and at times students bullying faculty members. DePauw indicated that she is starting with the Graduate School but hopes it will become a broader conversation to eliminate behavior that should not be present on campus. DePauw wanted to engage Faculty Senate because she thought they could have a role in trying to propagate the kind of environment we are trying to achieve but also to engage with department heads and other administrators at the faculty level.
- The Faculty Senate passed a resolution on free inquiry to affirm that there are a number of different directions for scholarly work that are important. In addition to metrics which tends to capture numbers, there should be other avenues to provide information to administration that are equivalent, may

clarify and are more transparent. The Faculty Senate would like to see this followed up on.

It is likely Faculty Senate will follow up at the next meeting on a discussion on the budget and faculty concerns regarding the direction on the partnership for incentive based budgeting. There is a future meeting planned with the Faculty Senate, department chairs and Provost in hopes that everyone will be in the room to negate misinformation and what can be done to avoid them in the future.

- iii. Centers and Institutes Update – No Report
- b. Committee on Research Competitiveness – Barbara Lockee reported that the focus groups with faculty are planned to meet over the next couple of weeks. Four colleges were invited and there has been a higher than expected agreement to participate. There was also a pilot test run of the questions with six lab managers. As individuals who run the facilities on a daily basis, they provided beneficial information and have great insight into what some of the issues and challenges are. They have great access to information, not just acquisition of equipment and maintenance of existing equipment, but they also had great ideas about how to go about addressing some of the challenges. A report will be compiled from the focus group information and an update will be made available at the next COR meeting.
- c. Open Access Policy Draft – J. Petters (reporting for K. McGuire, G. Pannabecker) reported that at this point in the drafting process the OA Policy working group is seeking feedback from faculty around the university. The group is reaching out to arrange presentations for faculty groups and others with an interest in the policy around campus, such as Faculty Senate, the Commission on Faculty Affairs, and departmental faculty meetings. A presentation was recently provided addressing OA for the Graduate Student Assembly. There is a proposal to provide several NLI sessions over the summer and into the fall. These presentations will cover the definition of open access, the policy rationale, benefits to faculty, how other universities have implemented policies, and the potential working details of a policy. Each occasion will include a discussion of questions and time to gather feedback.
- d. Update to Policy 13025 – B. Corl reported the changes previously reviewed in March by COR were forwarded to the President's office to be incorporated into the existing policy. The updated policy was submitted to Theresa Mayer for approval as administrative changes. And the changes to the policy are now official.
- e. Update to Policy 13005 – No Report
- f. Task Force on Shared Governance Update – No Report
- g. Update on Revisions to Faculty Handbook - M. Daniel reported on proposed revisions to chapter 6 of the faculty handbook. COR members, Myra Blanco, Saied Mostaghimi, Kevin McGuire and Barbara Lockee reviewed and edited the chapter to clarify and update the handbook language. Section 6.2 was edited to reflect a change to the timing of research faculty promotions that aligns the process for research faculty with the process for other faculty. It was suggested that, in the future, the commission review the criteria for promotion, the dossiers, and the guidance given to departments to improve the opportunities for research faculty promotions. Section 6.13 was edited to align reappointments of restricted research faculty to the appointment anniversary date instead of during the merit cycle. 6.14.1 added that termination for cause may be immediate if circumstances are serious enough. Section 6.16 was added to formalize a pilot program that enables research faculty to be compensated for teaching. Members questioned the impact of a payment for teaching on faculty PAR's. Ken Miller clarified that if the faculty member is teaching they cannot charge 100% to a sponsored project on their PAR even if overload pay is made. A vote was made to accept the changes.

IV. New Business

- a. Update from Dr. Theresa Mayer – B. Corl thanked Dr. Mayer for attending COR meetings and being engaged. T. Mayer thanked the commission members for their service as an important group and body, and is looking forward to continuing to work with the commission as there are on-going initiatives that are very important to Research. For a research update, Mayer focused on some on-going initiatives that are relevant, with some rationale behind them, and then open it up for questions. A couple updates included what was happening with the federal government and what that could mean to Virginia Tech.

Dr. Mayer gave an overview of the Business Engagement Center. From an initiative that Dr. Charles Phlegar, Vice President for Advancement brought to Dr. Mayer, a conversation ensued on the concept of developing industry partnerships. In the previous model, Corporate and Foundation Relations now under Advancement, was a group largely measured by an industry's philanthropic relationship of giving gifts to the University. It was not so much focused on developing a deeper research relationship with the company. Another area interacting with companies have been career services with internships and ultimately job placement. The discussion moved to how we might move beyond this model. Today, deep University-wide relationships are generally led by the research connections and the talent pipeline. Without support for that in the Research Office, it was recognized as a really good opportunity to partner in order to reach one of the President's University goals of deep partnership and think about this holistically, removing existing silo operations. This would go to a one stop shopping model where a company would know who to contact to reach out to conduct all the business with the University. Following extensive benchmarking with industry partners and other universities, Virginia Tech is now engaged in adopting the University of Michigan model which is an integrated business center model where a team (Virginia Tech is now recruiting), sometimes call business development professionals or strategic account managers, would be the primary points of contact who, largely technically, would know Virginia Tech and have a very different interface with the corporation. The interview process for a director has been completed and there is hope to have someone in place by July. Corporate and Foundations Relations will be merged into the Business Engagement Center. The business engagement group will interface with our industry contracting group within the Office of Sponsored Programs to lower barriers in the negotiation of intellectual properties. Master research alliance agreements which is one of Tech's goals where you develop a flexible framework agreement so that faculty from anywhere on campus can execute tasks against that agreement without renegotiating the intellectual property every time. Activities have started and been very well received. In the last six months we have negotiated with four companies with a fifth on the way who have executed master research agreements with us. Previously we had two. The goal, from the research perspective, is to make it easy to have someone who can understand easy to execute tasks and have someone who is technically oriented who can listen to the needs of the company and understand the problems the company, the entire company, is trying to solve and try to do the match making. A company may have a limited amount of money. What we are really trying to do is grow the pie, not engage more people into a finite amount of money. But, if we deliver good value to the company how do we grow the resources that are coming to Virginia Tech by lowering those barriers and making it easier to come to Virginia Tech. So, one of the goals is where we have companies we have many projects with and can inch up the research dollars from fifty thousand to one hundred thousand overall to Virginia Tech to half million to over a million dollars to Virginia Tech. And we are seeing success in that model. And many parts of the University can benefit from that.

- b. Vice-Chair for FY2017-18 – B. Corl asked that members of COR be thinking about nominating someone or volunteering to be vice-chair for FY2017-18. COR will plan to take a vote on this in the May meeting. The current vice-chair Jen Irish will be the chair next year. In keeping with past practice, the vice-chair will chair the following year. If you are interested, contact B. Corl.
- c. Thoughts on Commission Topics for FY2017-18 – B. Corl commented it is typical in the May meeting to review items from our topics list. We have removed some of the items that we started which have been covered. But it is always good to capture topics from our members especially those rotating off. Bring your ideas in May or email them to B. Corl. As some items take time, it would be extremely helpful to have a list for next year's commission workers.

V. Adjournment