Minutes

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

December 12, 2018

130 Burruss Conference Room

3:30pm-5:00pm

COR Documents available to COR members in Team Drive: [COR FY2018-2019](#)

Attended:

Members: Virginia Pannabecker, Marie Elisa Christie, Barry Miller (for Stefan Duma), Kevin McGuire, Deborah Milly, Brian Britt, John B. Phillips, Elizabeth Grant, R. Bruce Vogelaar, Zhen (Jason) He, Suzie Le, Uri Kahanovitch, Randy Heflin (for Sally Morton), Lijuan Yuan, Saied Mostaghimi

OVPRI: Theresa Mayer, Laurel Miner, Diane Zielinski

Presenters: Andi Ogier, Director, Data Services, University Libraries; Peggy Layne, Assistant Provost for Faculty Development, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost

   I. Approval of the Agenda
       A. Approved via vote

  II. Approval of November Minutes - approved by email

 III. Announcements
       A. Availability for January 9th meeting

  IV. [3:40] Unfinished Business
       A. Report of Ongoing Activities
           1. Committee on Research Competitiveness – S. Duma
              a) Continuing to interview. Have spoken with representatives at about 35 higher education institutions. Report will be shared in spring.
           2. University Library Committee – V. Pannabecker
              a) Discussing the Library search on the website, and interested in comments or feedback from the university community. Discussing a library hub model - minimum components of a library - for new and changing spaces and locations of Virginia Tech. Reviewing e-publications and subscription models to consider library collection options in an environment of ever increasing subscription costs.

3. Faculty Senate – B. Vogelaar or B. Britt
   a) Efars system: heard an update from the executive committee. There is concern about how it may be used to capture research and reflect other activities. Met with candidates for Provost position. Discussed Promotion and Tenure guidelines. If there is a change to make research the essential component for promotion to Associate, what does this mean for the other work and roles, such as Teaching and Serivce? Created a committee evaluating service component.
      (1) Comment: evaluating service should take into consideration relevance and quality of service towards area of expertise and accomplishing meaningful work as part of that service.
      (2) How do the following come up in Promotion and Tenure guidelines?: Role of higher education and state expectations, entrepreneurial activities, economic diversification, transition of discoveries into commercial products and services to existing commonwealth industries or new startups. Response: members of faculty senate are working on these guidelines - tension between opening guidelines for departmental areas of focus, and need for university standards; need for greater feedback between departments/colleges and university level review areas.
4. Update to Policy 13005 – A. Michaels
   a) Draft of a revised 13005 document is completed. It has been distributed to some institute affiliates and to Dee Harris of the office of Vice President for Policy and Governance for feedback.
5. Open Access Policy update – K. McGuire / V. Pannabecker
   a) The committee is working on a new presentation and a campus news article to build awareness. They welcome opportunities to share the presentation with groups around campus (departments, research groups, colleges, others). Contact the committee members at: openaccess@vt.edu.
6. Software Review Backlogs update - V. Pannabecker
   a) No update.
B. OVPRI Update - T. Mayer or L. Miner
   1. See below in new business.

V. [4:00] New Business
   A. Biocomplexity Institute - T. Mayer or L. Miner
      1. Would like address incorrect information that was in the *Roanoke Times* regarding the Biocomplexity Institute (BI), the move of many from BI to UVA, and the research funding dollars that will move with them. If you

hear concerns about the *Roanoke Times* report, please help clarify this. The total award amount for the research portfolio that was reported in the *Roanoke Times* was taken from the BI website, in place of the information provided to the *Roanoke Times* by the OVPRI. Virginia Tech rarely reports a total award portfolio. About 110 million was reported, and it was assumed that this was 110 million out of Virginia Tech's full 220 million HERD reported data. The HERD reported data is the annualized expenditure level for the institutes and colleges, Biocomplexity awards accounted for 13 million out of 272 million (total competitive expenditures) at Virginia Tech altogether; total BI expenditures were less than 5% of Virginia Tech's total portfolio. Also, much of BI's expenditures will remain at VT because many awards include remaining Virginia Tech faculty as co-PIs (about 25 awards). To date approximately 50 research faculty have transitioned to UVA or other opportunities. The transition is largely complete at this point.

2. Re-envisioning the Institute with next steps. Cal Ribbens, Patricia Dove, and Theresa Mayer are conducting a listening tour to meet with stakeholder groups - Deans, Associate Deans for Research, faculty stakeholders, faculty senate; other groups. At these meetings, they hope to hear feedback and thoughts on:
    a) Understanding perceptions about integration between university and institutes
    b) Interests in high level themes for the institute's next iteration
    c) Happy to share notes from these meetings with COR - the meetings bring up many ideas and opportunities for research
    d) Wrapping up at end of year
3. Re-envisioning
    a) Areas of greatest opportunity to achieve goals of programs to compete for; types of scholarly activity; strengthen integration of institutes with colleges
    b) Take a look at the 13005 policy in relation to this
    c) Slow things down to make a thoughtful decision for VT
4. Actively working with UVA to transfer grants and projects
5. High-performance Computing (HPC) facility is staying? Yes
6. Facilities
    a) HPC facility, sequencing facility
        (1) New data center was just brought online recently with HPC system that was donated by NASA; was used very heavily by one contract that transferred. The team that supports this system has decided to stay. Interested in exploring how this integrates more closely with ARC. If you have feedback related to this, please share. Will continue to subsidize but need to look at cost recovery. Anticipate

trying to make the system affordable; these systems are open to external users who pay the full rate, which helps with cost recovery.

    7. Does SCHEV have any part to play in this event regarding BI faculty move to UVA?

        a) State leadership is involved in looking at how this process happened.

B. Center update - T. Mayer - Research division did receive a letter of intent for a center in Civil and Environmental Engineering - a college level center; OVPRI reviews letters and proposals; this has moved on so they're working on a proposal to bring to the Commission in the next 2 meetings.

C. AAU/APLU Data Workshop and proposed charge for: (1) an Advisory Group and (2) A COR Public Access to Research Data Committee - A. Ogier, P. Layne, V. Pannabecker

    1. Virginia Tech had representative attendance at the AAU/APLU workshop

    2. Goal of the workshop - to promote sharing and increasing public access to research data (regarding data that makes sense to share, that can/is allowed to be shared (in accordance with privacy/protocols) to assist with science and scholarship)

    3. Expectations of research institutions

        a) From the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) Public Access Working Group recommendations, "In light of governmental mandates and the scientific benefits of making data accessible to the public, universities will need to adopt new institutional policies, procedures, and approaches that actively support and promote research data sharing, while at the same time ensuring rigor in the research process and the veracity of its intellectual outputs."

        b) Not about monitoring rigor or requiring all data to be shared

    4. Mandates and Benefits - see slide 3 for more

        a) OSTP 2012 policy memo re: data sharing, defined data

        b) Funders, journal requirements

        c) Benefits - increases use of data gathered for research studies and possible meta-analyses, economic growth, integrity of scientific record.

    5. Barriers - see slide 4

        a) Communication, policies, training on curation/documentation processes; incentives are varied; time commitment.

    6. Projected Committee Deliverables

        a) A report of services and support available to support researchers who need to share their data, including examples of datasets that have been shared by VT researchers.

b) A review of relevant policies at Virginia Tech that govern researchers' ability to share their data.

c) A review of Data Management Plans (DMPs) from active research studies tracked by Office of Sponsored Programs, which considers the feasibility of compliance with submitted DMPs.

d) A recommendation document addressing how Virginia Tech should move forward to better support researchers in sharing their data.

7. Questions

a) "The data here means raw data, I assume?" It depends on the project, this may mean raw, processed, or other forms of data.

b) In the list of barriers, potential IP is a major barrier and that time aspect is very formidable to get that prepared
   (1) Data sharing can be from 6 months to two years or other time periods that meet funder / researcher requirements
   (2) Sometimes people want to share right away, ahead of publishing, some want to share later on when publishing

c) Feel there is a need for guidelines to make younger faculty aware of possible repercussions of sharing data early

d) File size, formats - what is considered data? Images? Yes, anything that underlies research - text, images, audio, software code, scripts that may be run; anything that happens outside a peer-reviewed, published article that is not included in that article could be data

e) Time and Return on Investment - what if you put in all this time to curate a dataset and then no one ever looks at it?
   (1) Frequent answer is that we don't know how useful the data will be; a reasonable time investment is worthwhile to make it available for the long tail of data research
   (2) VTechData repository offers DOIs so can track and see usage and citation of datasets

f) Documentation will be important to accompany a dataset to be sure that data is used responsibly later on. If you don't know how much was missing from a sample, etc., conclusions may not be valid. Other examples include keeping measurement information, materials, etc.

g) Publishing data and supplementary materials is becoming more and more common - to address issues - include example of how the work was conducted (along the lines of JOVE (Journal of Visualized Experiments) that shows procedures
   (1) Open Science Framework is another tool available to the Virginia Tech community to track, document, and share research project information (can be private or public)

h) Comment: Presentation mentioned AAU as a source of standards - does meeting these standards inch us closer to meeting AAU status?

i) Concerns about quality control - as peer review is not (commonly) included in dataset sharing; is there an implication that the library endorses the datasets within VTechData? No, the datasets are not reviewed; the library does not manage the quality or guarantee the quality. Peer review of data sets is something that funders and publishers are talking about. Some journals provide 'data papers' as an option to publish a detailed description of a dataset, and these papers may be peer reviewed. (Example, *Scientific Data*, a Nature journal)

8. Motion to create a Public Access to Research Data Committee via COR to investigate this topic. S. Mostaghimi motioned and D. Miller seconded. Vote approved creation of the committee.

VI.   [4:55] Adjournment

*Please take note of the following upcoming meetings which will all take place in Burruss 130 from 3:30pm-5:00pm unless otherwise noted:

9 January 2019
13 February 2019
13 March 2019
10 April 2019
8 May 2019

Supporting Public Access to Research Data

Andi Ogier
Director, Data Services
University Libraries

Presentation to the Commission on Research, Virginia Tech, on December 12, 2018

From the [Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) Public Access Working Group recommendations](#):

"In light of governmental mandates and the scientific benefits of making data accessible to the public, **universities will need to adopt new institutional policies, procedures, and approaches that actively support and promote research data sharing**, while at the same time ensuring rigor in the research process and the veracity of its intellectual outputs."

Mandates

Federal and Private Funding

https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/dmp.jsp

Federal Agencies

SparcOpen Article and Data Sharing Requirements by Agency

http://datasharing.sparcopen.org/

Academic Journals (Nature, Science, PLOS, PNAS)

Benefits

Accelerate the pace of discovery and fuel innovation

Potential for re-use and meta-analyses

Potential to grow the economy

Improve integrity of scholarly/scientific record

What are the barriers to research data sharing?

- Communication
- Policies
- Training on curation/documentation processes
- Incentives
- Time

What resources does VT have to lower these barriers?

Charge a Committee to investigate and deliver:

1. A report of services and support available to support researchers who need to share their data, including examples of datasets that have been shared by VT researchers.
2. A review of relevant policies at Virginia Tech that govern researchers' ability to share their data.
3. A review of Data Management Plans (DMPs) from active research studies tracked by Office of Sponsored Programs, which considers the feasibility of compliance with submitted DMPs.
4. A recommendation document addressing how Virginia Tech should move forward to better support researchers in sharing their data.

[Charge](#)