

Minutes

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

September 14, 1994,
206 Sandy Hall,
3:30 PM

Members Present: R. Bates, J. Borda, J. Cowles, J. Johnson, H. Kriz,
A. McNabb, J. Nespor, L. Peters, R. Pitman, P. Rasnick, R. Reneau,
B. Richardson, J. Schetz, M. Smith, H. Tze, J. Wightman

Members Absent: V. Arya, P. Eyre, J. Pinkerton, E. Stout, H. Wisdom

Invited Guests: J. Merola, S. Trulove

1. Announcements

Meetings are held the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays at 3:30.

Deadline for agenda items are Tuesday noon one week prior to the meeting.

2. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed with the addition of discussion items for 1994-95.

3. Approval of Minutes of April 27

A shortened version of the minutes was prepared to facilitate electronic distribution. A motion was made and seconded to approve both the longer and summarized sets of minutes. The minutes were approved. When possible, the minutes of future meetings will be 2 to 3 pages.

4. Comments - Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School

Dr. Peters addressed the role of the Commission on Research (COR) and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policy (CGSP). He expressed a need for CGSP and COR to serve as an advisory body to evaluate policy and study and debate issues relating to research and graduate education. He suggested a goal of the business of the Commission be to devote a minimum of time to minutia in order to provide an opportunity for discussion of substantive issues. While serving as advisory bodies, the Commissions should not negate governance requirements. Dr. Peters requested that the two Commissions examine the future of research and graduate education at Virginia Tech.

He outlined four issues for COR: 1) The examination of the current conflict of interest policy to determine adjustments necessary to be in compliance with new NSF guidelines. The policy must be in effect by 6/29/95. 2) The appointment of a joint CGSP and COR committee to examine broader issues of academic integrity. 3) Study of the five titles of the research faculty series. A proposal is that the series mirror the titles of tenure track faculty - research assistant professor, research associate professor and research full professor. These faculty are involved in the research capacity but they don't have organized teaching responsibilities. 4) The study of the role of centers and institutes. In a broad examination, the questions to be asked are, 'What are Centers doing right or wrong?' and 'Are they used effectively?'

Dr. Peters announced a meeting on October 29 of the associate deans, deans, graduate chairs, department heads and Commission members to talk about graduate research and education.

5. Election of Committee for Interdisciplinary Research

Dr. Johnson outlined the responsibilities for the Committee for Interdisciplinary Research (CIDR) as the review of centers, the review of proposals for new centers, and other issues concerning interdisciplinary research. There are five centers to be reviewed in 94-95. She proposed that there be five members of the committee plus one to chair and take care of the affairs of the committee but not chair a review. She called for nominations from the floor. Dr. Wightman nominated Drs. Wisdom, Richardson and Tze. Dr. Richardson agreed to be on the committee as did Dr. Tze. No other nominations from the floor were accepted by the nominees. Therefore, Dr. Johnson stated the committee will get started with the two faculty accepting the nomination in addition to herself and Dr. Stout.

6. Election of Conflict of Interest Appeals Committee

The conflict of interest appeals committee is a part of the conflict of interest procedure. Dr. Kriz agreed to continue on the committee. Dr. Johnson said she would ask Dr. Eyre to continue and Dr. Smith volunteered.

7 Election of Representative to Supplemental Grants Committee

Dr. Schetz volunteered and was elected by acclamation as COR representative to the supplemental grants committee.

8. Provost Search Update

Dr. Bates informed the membership that there had been approximately 130 applications and nominations for the provost position. The deadline was August 15 or when the position is filled. He said that they are continuing to take applications. They hope to finish screening by early December. Dr. Bates stated that the search has gone very well to this point.

9. Library Report - Update on Search for New Director

Dr. Kriz mentioned that we have had an interim library director for the past two and a half years. He stated that three candidates were interviewed in May and June. A candidate from Drexel met with the President and Provost this week for a second interview. Mr. Blythe hopes to have the search concluded in the next three weeks.

10. Report of Exit Interview Survey of Undergraduates

A survey was conducted in 93-94 as a result of past discussion about the perception of undergraduates on the importance of research. Generally about half of 423 respondents responded positively to the value of research. Dr. Wightman mentioned that the legislature feels that our business is teaching the undergraduates and that everything else is secondary. The lack of awareness by undergraduates of the importance of research may contribute to the perception of the legislature. We have an opportunity with undergraduates to tell what is happening and how the university is involved in research. The discussion students have with parents is an important avenue to the visibility of research. Dr. McNabb reminded Commission members that we previously discussed the possibilities of what could be done to help faculty integrate research with classroom activities. Dr. Peters added that undergraduates may not understand the breadth of research or the contribution of other disciplines beyond his/her principal area of study.

Dr. McNabb asked invited guest Susan Trulove about the status of articles publicizing research. Packages have been submitted to media and to the schools. A stronger response was received from schools. Dr.

Johnson mentioned that a task force was appointed to study the problem but has not convened at this date. Dr. Bates discussed strategy to bring to the classroom a broader concept of research as well as the research interests of the teacher. Dr. Johnson will invite members of the Academy of Teaching Excellence to the next meeting to facilitate a discussion of these issues. The task force will not be convened pending more discussion.

11. Election of Vice Chair September 28

Dr. Kriz and Ms. Rasnick presented the slate of Dr. Tze and Dr. Wisdom for vice chair. Additional nominations from the floor will be accepted at the next meeting just prior to the election.

12. Items for Discussion in 1994-95

Dr. Johnson listed the items for discussion provided by the chair of last year. Highlighted issues were polices regarding maintenance of on- and off-campus research facilities and computing issues.

13. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:50PM.

Next Meeting September 28, 3:30

Minutes,
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

September 28, 1994.
206 Sandy Hall,
3:30 PM

Members Present: J. Cowles, J. Johnson, H. Kriz, A. McNabb, J. Nesor, L. Peters, J. Pinkerton, P. Rasnick, B. Richardson, T. Diller (for J. Schetz), E. Stout, H. Tze, J. Wightman

Members Absent: V. Arya, R. Bates, J. Borda, P. Eyre, R. Pitman, R. Reneau, M. Smith, H. Wisdom

Invited Guests: J. Knight, J. Sawyers, D. Shelton, S. Trulove

1. Announcements

Dr. Johnson announced that the Academic Integrity Committee has been formed and that it will be convened soon. The members from the Commission on Research are Anne McNabb, John Pinkerton, Harold Wisdom, and Mark Smith.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Dr. Johnson added a slide presentation by Susan Trulove to the agenda. A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed.

3. Approval of Minutes of September 14

A motion was made to approve the minutes and seconded. Minutes were approved.

4. Perception of Research by Undergraduates

Susan Trulove introduced a slide presentation used at Freshman Orientation targeted to visiting parents about research projects at Virginia Tech and the benefits of a research university for undergraduate education. Jim Knight, director of the Center for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching and Janet Sawyers, chair, Academy of Teaching Excellence, addressed the Commission.

Dr. Knight cited literature that states " better teachers are the better researchers and better researchers are better teachers." Teachers can be more effective teachers by bringing research to the classroom. Students indicated in focus groups that they were not aware of research or of eminent researchers in their area. We have missed an opportunity to bring about awareness of research activity during the students' undergraduate years. Research is a sound effective teaching tool. He mentioned a proposal for a future competitive grant program through the CEUT to enhance undergraduate research opportunities and proposal writing. He asked for feedback from the members of the Commission on the plan.

Dr. Sawyers gave four examples of undergraduate involvement in research: 1) A team project in creativity open to all undergraduate students that evolved over several semesters, 2) Assistance to a graduate student in data collection and analysis, 3) Placement of faculty reprints in offices where students and parents pick them up, and 4) class projects which include a critique of research.

Discussion that followed included points that some faculty consider teaching and research to be dichotomous when in fact the two can

compliment. Some students have the perception that faculty involved in research may be in their lab rather than keeping office hours. Dr. Wightman suggested that the restructure of undergraduate education include incorporation of undergraduate research into the curriculum. He added that ineffective communication to undergraduates to notify them of research opportunities is a barrier. Mailboxes for undergraduates in all departments is a proposed solution.

Dr. Knight added that the promotion of undergraduate research needs to be a part of the faculty rewards project. Dr. McNabb suggested there be a development of materials to be shared with all faculty that facilitate bringing research reports into the classroom. Projects similar to that concept have been supported by CEUT.

Dr. Peters raised the question, "Should we directly educate the student about what a research university is all about?" Dr. Knight responded that while a central approach might be possible, a more effective focus may be at the department level. Education about research should be broad based to expose students to the interdisciplinary possibilities among departments. Dr. Wightman stated that it should be a goal of all faculty to devote some time to share their own research in the classroom. Dr. Richardson commented on "scholarship" and the definition of a community of scholars when considering the importance of sharing research.

Discussion will continue to propose what action might be taken by the Commission.

5. Research Faculty Titles

Dr. Johnson introduced the discussion of research faculty titles and asked members to solicit comments from constituencies over the next two weeks on the proposal. Dr. Peters introduced a draft of a proposal that provides for a research title series parallel to the tenure track faculty titles of assistant, associate and full. The titles acknowledge the progress of research faculty. He mentioned tenure is not an issue and judgment on promotion would be based on their research. Depending on the policies of a department, the new series may allow the research faculty member to advise graduate student research. He stated it would be complimentary to the current policy and not necessarily replace current titles.

6. Intellectual Properties Committee Report

Dr. Stout gave a summary of the actions taken by the Intellectual Properties Committee in 1994.

7. Election of Vice Chair

Dr. Tze was elected vice chair by paper ballot.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Next Meeting October 12, 3:30

Minutes,
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

October 12, 1994,
206 Sandy Hall,
3:30 PM

Members Present: P. Eyre, J. Johnson, H. Kriz, A. McNabb, J. Nespor,
L. Peters, R. Pitman, P. Rasnick, B. Richardson, J. Schetz,
R. Schubert, M. Smith, E. Stout, H. Tze, J. Wightman

Members Absent: V. Arya, R. Bates, J. Borda, J. Cowles, J. Pinkerton, R.
Reneau, H. Wisdom

Invited Guests: S. Trulove

1. Announcements

The Conflict of Interest Subcommittee members are Dr. Eyre, Dr. Kriz, and Dr. Smith. Dr. Tze was elected vice chair of the Commission at the September 28 meeting. From the subcommittee for Interdisciplinary Research, Dr. Richardson will chair the review of the Natural History Museum, Dr. Tze will chair the review of the Center for Survey Research and Dr. Johnson will chair the review of the Women's Research Institute. Chairs have not been selected for the reviews of Center for Stochastic Processes in Science and Engineering and Biotechnology Center. Dr. Johnson encouraged members to respond to the invitation to the research and graduate issues meeting at the Donaldson Brown Conference Center on October 29, at 8:30.

2. Adoption of Agenda

A revised agenda was distributed and approved.

3. Approval of Minutes of September 28

The minutes were approved as distributed.

4. Institute for High Energy Physics (IHEP) Review

Dr. Johnson announced that report of the review of IHEP was approved by the Subcommittee for Interdisciplinary Research. Dr. Wightman stated that this center is unique in that the focus is on high energy physics and there is no outreach to departments and centers as with other centers on campus. The Institute collaborates with others of the same focus both nationally and globally. The Institute has been successful in external funding and attained a national reputation. While not a truly interdisciplinary center across departments and Colleges, the presence of the Institute makes it more competitive for funding awards. The Commission accepted the report which included the recommendation that the Institute be reauthorized for three years rather than five. In three years the review will determine the progress made on other recommendations such as the formation of an advisory board and development of a budget.

5. Research Faculty Titles

Dr. Johnson stated that the proposal for faculty on restricted appointment whose primary responsibility is research, somewhat mirrors the tenure-track faculty titles - Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor and Research Professor. This may overlap with two titles of the current series, research scientist and senior research scientist which require a doctoral degree. Other provisions of the proposal are that these faculty would direct graduate students, would have appointments for three or five years and would be eligible for promotion.

Dr. Johnson stated she had received one response from the College of Human Resources which expressed concern about there being a full research professor. Dr. Eyre stated he had some concern about a person transferring from a regular research position into a tenure-track position and discounting the person's work experience while in the research title series towards the probationary period as a tenure-track faculty. He prefers the title Research Assistant Professor and Research Associate Professor. Dr. Peters said the elimination of consideration of service during the research faculty appointment could work in the favor of a newly appointed assistant professor from the research series in that the full 6 year probationary period is available to establish a teaching program and student evaluations. Dr. Eyre suggested the language should be changed from "service . . shall be eliminated" to "service . . . may be eliminated" to accommodate more options. Dr. Wightman said if it could serve some people then it is a good move.

Dr. Stout mentioned a Science article on current career paths. He said that there are in many fields a growing cadre of very well trained Ph.D. level people who don't have jobs commensurate with their education and want to work in a university. Many of those people could be competitive for funding and for establishing a viable research program. The university could increase its sponsored program activity and its faculty wealth by having the proposed research faculty series. Dr. Stout stated that may be the only way we grow and renew our intellectual capital. Dr. Johnson asked the Commission members to continue to get some feedback. Dr. Peters suggested that Dr. Hyer be involved to make procedural suggestions.

6. Indirect Costs: Some Impacts

Dr. Stout reported that the negotiated indirect cost rate for FY 95 is 46% and for FY 96 is 45%, down from the 53.7 and 53.5 of 93 and 94 respectively. If there is no growth and no drop in sponsored program activity, the reduction in indirect cost rate will result in a loss of indirect cost recoveries of \$2M this year and \$2.2M next year.

Dr. Eyre asked what strategies we have for coping with this loss. Dr. Stout responded that the Research Division is scaling back with support that has been provided. Building loans are being paid off, rental payments are being phased out, and maintenance of research areas such as Prices Fork Road Station has been reduced. The primary core responsibility is to have an efficient Office of Sponsored Programs to serve the faculty. Since more than 2/3 of the staff in Sponsored Programs are paid from indirect cost recoveries, other support must be eliminated. Dr. Schetz stated that the money is still at the university. It is in the hands of the principal investigators many of whom will be pleased. Dr. Peters said that 46% is more in line with what other public land-grants are getting but awards have not increased as measured by the consumer price index. Dr. Stout said that both NIH and NSF are funding fewer proposals in order to make larger awards.

7. Grievance Form - Research Faculty

Dr. Johnson stated that two years ago a grievance procedure for research faculty was approved but the form available does not match the procedure. She will make the corrections on the form and ask two or three Commission members to check the form to assure it is appropriate for the procedure. Dr. McNabb mentioned that the grievance procedure references to tenure-track should be deleted. Dr. Stout stated promotion should be left in.

8. Library Report

Dr. Kriz reported an offer has been made to a candidate for

director. The minutes from last month's meeting will not be available until next meeting.

9. Action for Perception of Research by Undergraduates

Dr. Johnson provided a handout of 6 items of possible action to enhance perception of research. Dr. Wightman stated that items 1-5 (encouragement of faculty to present research in undergraduate courses, publications featuring undergraduate investigators, campus symposia, competitive grant programs and a listing of materials developed to bring research to the classroom) could be acted on immediately. Dr. Smith mentioned that the letter from the Provost to encourage faculty to discuss research in lectures should be carefully worded because of faculty sensitivity to the priorities of rewards in research vs. other missions.

10. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 PM.

Next Meeting October 26, 3:30

MINUTES

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

December 14, 1994,
206 Sandy Hall,
3:30 PM

Members Present: P. Eyre, J. Johnson, H. Kriz, A. McNabb, J. Merola,
J. Nespor, L. Peters, R. Reneau, J. Schetz, M. Smith, E.
Stout, J. Wightman

Members Absent: V. Arya, R. Bates, J. Borda, J. Cowles, J. Pinkerton, R.
Pitman, P. Rasnick, B. Richardson, R. Schubert, H. Tze, H. Wisdom

Invited Guests: S. Trulove

1. Announcements

Dr. Johnson thanked Dr. Tze for chairing the Commission meetings during her absence. The discussion about the Commission sponsoring an undergraduate poster session to showcase undergraduate research projects is a reality. The officers of the GSA invited the Commission to jointly sponsor the poster session to include undergraduate research as well as graduate research. The Center for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching will support monetary awards for the undergraduate posters. The session will be held March 21 in the Commonwealth Ballroom. Commission members are asked to help promote the participation by sharing the announcement with faculty and students. Two to three Commission members are needed to serve as judges. Those interested in judging should notify Dr. Johnson. Ed Freeman, Darden School of Business, U VA, has been invited to speak on ethics at the symposium associated with the poster session.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Agenda was adopted as presented.

3. Minutes of November 9

Minutes were approved as written.

4. Resolution: Conflict of Interest

The joint subcommittee with CGS&P on Academic Integrity presented a resolution and policy on Conflict of Interest that is within compliance of the Federal guidelines. The Federal guidelines mandate that a Conflict of Interest policy must be in place by all agencies of over 50 employees that receive awards from Federal agencies such as NSF by 6/28/95. The guidelines of the policy include the definition of conflict of interest, the designation of a reviewer of disclosures of potential conflict of interest and how potential conflict of interests will be managed. A personal interest is defined as interest valued at greater than \$5,000 or represent more than 3% ownership. The procedure for review and resolution of the conflict of interest begins with the investigator and the Department Head. The matter will be referred to the appropriate Dean in the event that the Department Head and Investigator do not reach an agreement on the management of the conflict of interest. If no resolution is reached with the Dean, the matter will be referred to the Vice Provost for Research with input from the faculty ethics committee. Appropriate action will be taken if an investigator deliberately falsifies a conflict of interest disclosure.

Dr. Schetz asked about the use of the words private firm. Dr. Merola responded that the internal approval form will still probably have

to be modified to accommodate the subcontracting of private firms as part of a Federal grant.

Dr. Johnson reported that the University Legal Counsel reviewed the policy and added one sentence, "These conflict of interest rules are in addition to and not in lieu of any obligations and/or restrictions contained in the State and Local Conflict of Interests Act, 2.1-639.1, Code of Virginia." This statement allows for compliance to both the Federal AND State guidelines. Dr. Schetz expressed concern about the addition of the sentence from Legal Counsel. Dr. Stout mentioned that starting in section 2.15.4 there will need to be a preamble saying that this policy meets the Code of Virginia conflict of interest act, and the National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health, the FDA and others. He mentioned that the state and local conflict of interest act covers a multitude of other things other than conflict regarding research and development. A faculty member may have conflict of interest that does not fall into this. Dr. Schetz said some sentence like that would be good.

Dr. Peters mentioned changing the sentence to read these conflict of interest rules are consistent. Dr. Eyre added that the Code of Virginia guidelines are the minimal standards and the new Federal guidelines go beyond the State requirements. Dr. Stout said that we need something to the effect that it meets the requirements of the code for research and development contracts as amended in 1992 so that it is clear that this speaks only to research and development.

Dr. McNabb mentioned section 2.15.7 although the whole section addresses mixed funding. She stated she wonders if we need to add more words to number 3 to reiterate other support received for the same or related projects. Dr. Peters stated that it removes doubt. Dr. McNabb mentioned section 2.15.8 - must be submitted for administrators signatures. Change to read ... submitted for approval as defined below.

Dr. Johnson asked Dean Eyre about bypassing the Dean in the procedure approval when the Department Head and investigator are in agreement. He stated that is fine.

Dr. Schetz asked about what the internal approval form would say. Dr. Johnson responded we have not yet dealt with the form. Dr. Merola stated that the committee had felt there would be a separate form developed. Dr. Stout asked about the form that is to be developed. Will every NSF and NIH proposal require a conflict of interest declaration or will checking no on the back of the form be sufficient. Dr. Johnson responded that the approach of the academic integrity committee is if you check no, you don't do any more forms. Dr. Reneau asked that if they check that there is no conflict of interest then the Vice Provost is going to have to have additional paperwork to sign or shouldn't it go through the regular signature route. Dr. Schetz mentioned that the flow chart is inconsistent with the words - the left hand side of the chart implies more than the wording. Dr. Peters mentioned that perhaps another sentence needs to be added to specify action to be taken if no conflict of interest is indicated.

The Commission on Graduate Studies and Policy will discuss the resolution. The comments of both Commissions will be incorporated before approval and submission to University Council. The resolution will also be shared with the Commission on Faculty Affairs in the later stages of discussion.

5. Resolution: Research Faculty Series

Dr. Wightman made a motion to approve the resolution. Dr. Eyre seconded. Resolution was approved. Dr. Johnson stated that it will be included on the agendas of the Commission on Graduate Studies and the Commission on Faculty Affairs for endorsement before submission to

University Council.

6. University Coordinating Council on Materials Research and Education

Dr. Wightman provided a brief history on the University Coordinating Council on Materials Research and Education. He stated that he would have a resolution at the next or following meeting for the Commission's approval. Dr. Wightman discussed the purpose of the council and the membership. The Council membership will consist of appointed and elected members from faculty with interests in materials research. The formation of the Council is a new approach and should be reviewed by the governance system. The Commission on Research is the most appropriate forum for the first discussions.

Dr. Schetz stated that he would like to see a general definition for councils and centers. Dr. Johnson stated that we have the charge of discussing the nature of centers beginning second semester.

7. Library Report

Dr. Johnson mentioned that comments about the proposed bylaws of University Council are due by January 6. The changes of impact on the Commission on Research are that the Library Committee will report to the Commission on Graduate Studies. Dr. Kriz announced that the new library director will begin the first week of January.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Next Meeting January 25, 3:30

Minutes

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

January 25, 1995,
206 Sandy Hall,
3:30 PM

Members Present: R. Bates, J. Johnson, A. McNabb, J. Merola, J. Nespor,
L. Peters, R. Pitman, P. Rasnick, R. Reneau, B.
Richardson,
J. Schetz, R. Schubert, M. Smith, E. Stout, H. Tze, J.
Wightman, H. Wisdom

Members Absent: V. Arya, J. Borda, J. Cowles, P. Eyre, H. Kriz, J. Pinkerton

Invited Guests: L. McCoy, M. Naff, S. Trulove

1. Announcements

Dr. Johnson asked Commission members to volunteer to judge the poster symposium for undergraduate research on March 21. E-mail addresses were verified for the purpose of distributing Commission minutes and agendas electronically. Commission members should notify the chair if they do not receive the agenda and minutes.

Dr. Ed Freeman from the Darden School of Business will be on campus to do a seminar on business in ethics at the poster symposium.

Dr. Michael Davis from Illinois Institute of Technology will present a seminar on integration of ethics in technical courses on March 24. Times will be announced later. Commission members are encouraged to attend.

The resolution 94-95 A for Research Faculty Series was endorsed on 1/18 by the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policy and was presented to the Commission on Faculty Affairs (CFA). No action has been taken by CFA.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Dr. Wightman moved adoption of agenda; Dr. Tze seconded. Agenda was adopted as presented.

3. Minutes of December 14

Dr. Stout motioned approval; it was seconded. Minutes were approved with corrections.

4. Project Enable - Lenwood McCoy and Michael Naff

Mr. McCoy explained the Personal Activity Reporting System (PARS) form is to be studied as a part of the Human Resources System. The purpose of the PARS is to document the time charged to sponsored projects and to provide a basis for indirect costs. Mr. McCoy requested that a faculty member and a staff member from COR volunteer for the team to study the PARS. Approximately 2 hours per week will be required over the next few weeks.

5. Resolution: Conflict of Interest

Resolution 94-95 B; Conflict of Interest, was presented to the Commission with corrections as discussed at the meeting of December 14. The motion to accept the resolution was made by Dr. McNabb and seconded by Dr. Stout.

Discussion centered around the role of the department head in the appeal process to determine the resolution of the conflict of interest. The words "department head" will be added to the appeal process section to show a final approval in the appeal process. The wording will reflect the intent to return to the Department Head when a resolution is reached in the conflict of interest appeals process. The flow chart will be revised accordingly.

The resolution was adopted. After revisions are made, the resolution will be presented again at CGS&P and will then be forwarded to University Council.

6. Resolution: University Coordinating Council on Materials in Research and Education

Resolution 94-95 C was presented by Dr. Wightman. The purpose of the Council is to facilitate the identification of new and emerging opportunities in materials science and engineering, enhance the organization and pursuit of large grant-contract interdisciplinary proposals, provide mechanisms to enhance publicity of materials research and education at Virginia Tech and coordinate activities as necessary among the various materials science and engineering related centers, departments and programs.

The founding members of the Council have requested nominations of faculty. The discussion of the resolution focused on the fact that Councils are not clearly defined by the University. At such time when the nature of centers, institutes and councils are discussed and defined, this Council will conform to the definition.

The resolution was adopted. This resolution will be forwarded to the University Council for information purposes.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 PM.

Next Meeting February 8, 3:30

Minutes

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

February 8, 1995,
206 Sandy Hall,
3:30 PM

Members Present: J. Cowles, P. Eyre, J. Johnson, H. Kriz, A. McNabb, J. Nespor, B. Richardson, J. Schetz, M. Smith, E. Stout, H. Tze, J. Wightman

Members Absent: V. Arya, R. Bates, J. Borda, J. Merola, L. Peters, J. Pinkerton, R. Pitman, P. Rasnick, R. Reneau, R. Schubert, H. Wisdom

Invited Guests: W. Farkas, S. Trulove

1. Adoption of Agenda

Dr. Johnson added two items to the agenda - 1) Chair election and 2) Research Faculty Series - CFA Change. Dr. Wightman motioned approval of agenda; Dr. Stout seconded. Agenda was approved with the additions.

2. Minutes of January 25

Dr. Schetz noted a change on page 2 of the minutes. The sentence stating that a council should conform to new definitions was changed to "will" conform . . Dr. Stout motioned approval; Dr. Tze seconded. Minutes were approved with the change.

3. Research Opportunities Office

Wendy Farkas demonstrated the computerized bulletin board system for the membership. She asked for feedback from the group. Wendy stated there will be workshops, probably in the fall, to publicize the availability of the program.

4. Intellectual Properties Committee Report

Dr. Stout reported from the Intellectual Properties Committee. He noted that last year there were 59 disclosures, 28 patents and 21 licenses. Filing of disclosures is down but the number of patents and licenses is up.

5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

A new chair for the Commission was elected to complete the academic year. Dr. Johnson is no longer eligible to serve as chair. Dr. Johnson opened the floor for nominations. Dr. Stout nominated Dr. Tze. Dr. McNabb and Dr. Wightman seconded. Dr. Tze was elected as chair. Dr. Stout nominated Dr. Reneau to be vice chair. Dr. Wightman motioned closure of the nominations. Dr. Cowles seconded. Dr. Reneau was elected vice chair.

6. Research Faculty Series

Dr. Johnson informed the Commission that the research faculty series was endorsed by the Commission on Faculty Affairs with the addition of a sentence stating that in two years all 8 titles for research faculty will be evaluated to determine the need. The membership agreed.

7. Centers, Institutes and Councils - A Discussion

Dr. Johnson started the discussion by providing the membership with a copy of the document on policies and procedures of interdisciplinary

centers. Dr. Stout provided some background information prior to 1990-1991 when the Commission and University Council approved the document. Dr. Schetz raised concerns that some Centers in the past have not been in compliance. Dr. McNabb stated that in the future newly created centers should have uniform names. Dr. Tze mentioned that Dr. Peters was concerned about the reporting procedures. A working task force was created. Members of the task force are Drs. Peters, Schetz and Smith. Dr. Wightman agreed to contact center directors.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 PM.

Next Meeting February 22, 3:30

Minutes

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

February 22, 1995,
206 Sandy Hall,
3:30 PM

Members Present: V. Arya, J. Cowles, P. Eyre, H. Kriz, A. McNabb, J. Merola, J. Nespor, L. Peters, P. Rasnick, R. Reneau, B. Richardson, J. Schetz, R. Schubert, M. Smith, E. Stout, H. Tze

Members Absent: R. Bates, J. Borda, J. Pinkerton, R. Pitman, J. Wightman, H. Wisdom

Invited Guests: J. Johnson, S. Trulove

1. Announcements

Dr. Tze thanked Dr. Johnson for her leadership of the Commission this year.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Dr. Eyre motioned adoption of the agenda; Dr. McNabb seconded. The agenda was approved as written.

3. Minutes of February 8

Dr. Stout motioned approval of the minutes of February 8; Dr. Eyre seconded. Minutes were approved.

4. Updates

The major concern raised at University Council on the resolution of research faculty series was the ability of research faculty to advise. Dr. Merola pointed out that departments will have more flexibility as to the advising of graduate students. He mentioned that the Faculty Senate expressed concern that the policy would be abused. Dr. Johnson asked the Faculty Senate if they had suggestions for wording the policy. They did not. The conflict of interest policy had its first reading at University Council. No concern was expressed there with regard to that document. It will have its second reading at the Council's next meeting. Dr. Peters announced that the summer tuition program will be phased out over a 2-3 year period. A memo will be sent outlining the plan. He mentioned that everyone feels that this approach is a good way to proceed recognizing the budgetary impact. He said that the deans and the new provost feel comfortable with it. By the summer of 1997 it will be completely phased out. Dr. Eyre stated that it should be clear that it will have a significant economic impact on the departments and colleges. He said that he is in favor of it if it is understood by everyone that such a move will result in a loss of revenue.

5. Library Report

Dr. Kriz stated the Library Committee met in January and discussed the fine policy and how letters are sent out on overdue books. The library must move out of Cheds by August 1 when the lease expires. The new storage building will become available some time after April 1. The library will

6. Centers, Institutes and Councils

Dr. Tze provided the membership with the document on procedures for centers and a listing of current university centers on campus. Dr. Peters said that we need to protect the ability of people to do interdisciplinary research that is in no way conflicting with interdisciplinary activities. We need to make sure to have in place reasonable administrative, reporting and programmatic structures facilitating interdisciplinary research. Dr. Peters stated that at other universities it appears that, by their very nature, centers are in conflict with departments. He said that it has been a little unclear where the centers have sat at Virginia Tech. Dr. Peters stressed that we need to rethink how these centers are formed, how they are designated, what constitutes a departmental center, a college center or an university center and how does one become an university center. He stated that it is an important issue not only from the programmatic side but also from the administrative side as well. He asked the membership to be proactive. Dr. Schetz mentioned the terminology issue - what the centers, institutes, etc. are called. In particular the matter of hierarchy was also mentioned - the perceived problem of department versus college versus university centers. Dr. Peters agreed that we need to tidy these things up a bit. A lively wide ranging round table discussion ensued. Dr. Eyre stated that the task force needs to look at the total picture. Discussions on this topic will continue at the remaining COR meetings.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Next Meeting March 8, 3:30

Minutes

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

March 8, 1995,
206 Sandy Hall,
3:30 PM

Members Present: H. Kriz, A. McNabb, L. Peters, R. Pitman, P. Rasnick,
B. Richardson, J. Schetz, R. Schubert, M. Smith, E. Stout,
H. Tze

Members Absent: V. Arya, R. Bates, J. Borda, J. Cowles, P. Eyre, J. Merola, J.
Nespor, J. Pinkerton, R. Reneau, J. Wightman, H. Wisdom

Invited Guests: J. Eaton, M. Williams

1. Announcements

Dr. Tze announced that 1) in accordance with the COR election procedures, a nominating committee for COR chair will be organized and elections should be held at the April 12 meeting. 2) Dr. Johnson has kindly agreed to serve on that committee along with Drs. Nespor and Wisdom.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Dr. McNabb motioned adoption of the agenda; Dr. Stout seconded. Agenda was approved.

3. Minutes of February 8

Dr. Stout motioned approval of the minutes of February 22; Dr. Smith seconded. Minutes were approved.

4. Updates

Dr. Tze announced that the Conflict of Interest Resolution passed at the March 6th meeting of University Council. However, there were objections from the Faculty Senate president on the Faculty Research series. As a result of the latter's objections, the resolution will be sent back to CFA. Dr. Shumsky's objections were : 1) is the resolution really necessary ? ; 2) it constitutes a dangerous precedent to set up a new non-tenure faculty series in view of the current political climate of the public perception of teaching versus research in the state. Dr. Peters stated that: a) Dr. Johnson had pointed out to the U C that the research series had two readings at the CFA and she was present at both of them, b) an insert was added as a result of the CFA deliberations that all of the research title series will be reviewed in two years to check for redundancy. Dr. Peters suggested that the membership talk with others in their college about the document. He stated that he will try to talk with the student members of University Council to make sure that they understand the document. Dr. Peters also observed that the above issue underscores the need over the next few years to better define the relationship between say the University Council and the Faculty Senate. Dr. Peters said that he would inform the membership by e-mail on the results of the CFA meeting on the research faculty series.

5. Research Computing

Dr. Williams gave COR a progress report on the work of the advisory committee on research computing. He said that this committee is still in the formative stage. He provided the membership with a handout. He said that there were 10 members representing the various colleges with a diverse

set of views. He said that the committee is currently in a phase where the membership is communicating with their constituencies, attempting to build a description of the capabilities and infrastructures that, in the view of the committee, would give researchers at Virginia Tech a competitive advantage. The hope is to build a vision to not only guide current activities but also to lay the foundations for attracting additional fundings. He mentioned the various issues which have arisen. Dr. Stout said that there is no advocate for research computing at the university and maybe one of the outcomes of the current initiative will be a campus-wide committee whose chair is the person who speaks for research computing. Dr. Williams mentioned research computing support for graduate students as a recurring issue. Dr. Peters agreed. He stated that it is an expensive undertaking if we want to stay near the forefront of research computing at universities. Dr. Peters observed that, compared to the top fifty research universities, Virginia Tech is clearly lagging behind in research computing while ten years ago this was not the case.

6. Centers, Institutes and Councils

Dr. Tze stated that Dr. Wightman sent him a note emphasizing that thus far he has only received one response from center directors, namely from the Center for Survey Research (CSR). Dr. Tze urged the membership to talk with the respective chair of their departments for greater input. Dr. Peters said that he would send a letter to that effect to the deans of the colleges. A lot of discussions followed on what constitutes an interdisciplinary university center and the diversity of support structure of centers, with specific focus on the CSR.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 PM.

Next Meeting April 12, 3:30

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

April 12, 1995,
206 Sandy Hall,
3:30 PM

Members Present: P. Eyre, H. Kriz, A. McNabb, J. Nespor, P. Rasnick, R. Reneau, B. Richardson, J. Schetz, R. Schubert, E. Stout,
H. Tze, J. Wightman

Members Absent: V. Arya, R. Bates, J. Borda, J. Cowles, J. Merola, L. Peters, J. Pinkerton, R. Pitman, M. Smith, H. Wisdom

Invited Guests: D. Moore, S. Trulove

1. Announcements

Dr. Tze announced that the research faculty series passed University Council. He stated that the Center for Survey Research review would be ready by the next commission meeting and the other center reviews will be ready in the fall.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Agenda was approved with the reversal of items 4 (election of COR chair) and 5 (adoption of research and teaching animals) and the addition of the library report.

3. Minutes of March 8

Dr. Stout motioned approval of the minutes of March 8; it was seconded. Minutes were approved.

4. Adoption of Research and Teaching Animals

Dr. Tze stated that the university needs a policy on the adoption of research and teaching animals. Dr. Moore said that in 1985 the existing committee indicated the need to have a policy on adoption of research and teaching animals. The Animal Care Committee at that time established a policy saying that no animals could be adopted out. The Animal Care Committee is outside of the university governance system so that policy was not passed through appropriate channels for review and approval. They subsequently determined that federal law did not preclude the adoption of animals as the committee had originally thought, therefore that abolished some of the rationale for forbidding the adoption of animals. There is the potential for negative public relations if animals that have been used in research or teaching have some sort of defect. Liability concerns were issued regarding animals that had been adopted out since they might bite individuals or transmit infections. There are also legal wildlife regulatory concerns about release of non-native species into the environment. Of regulatory concern as well is the possibility of animals, i.e. dogs, which may be used in the teaching program in CVM. They might make their way back to the pound and have the possibility of being picked up again and reused a second time. This would violate the prohibition on multiple survival surgeries. The pro-adoption position is that it provides good public relations. According to a survey, most other institutions do allow for adoption of teaching animals and to a lesser degree research animals. If they do not need to be killed, then this is a way to find them a home. The personal property issue has also been a problem for the Animal Care Committee. Legal Counsel feels that liability concerns are not really an issue and that no legal precedent exists forbidding the adoption of research or teaching animals. Dr. Peters indicated that the best method

for resolving this question was to present this issue to the Commission, to establish two subcommittees, one from the Commission on Research and the other from the Animal Care Committee. These subcommittees would draft a policy on adoption which will be presented to the Commission on Research for review for potential adoption. Dr. Moore stated that some of the potential directions are: 1. to forbid adoption outright; 2. to involve a limited scope of animal species that would be allowed to be adopted; and 3. have a kind of unlimited adoption policy. Dr. Eyre said that we need a simple, straightforward and humane policy for the faculty, staff and students, namely a policy not involving the general public. Dr. Wightman asked if the committee which is already in place could prepare a draft and bring it to COR which will send it through the governance system. Dr. Eyre stated that it would not be a bad idea if someone from the commission sat on the committee. He stated that perhaps Dr. Peters feels that it would smack of a conflict for the Animal Care Committee to write the policy and submit it to COR. Dr. Wightman suggested that the commission could request that they prepare the draft. Dr. Eyre made the suggestion that someone with no conflict of interest should perhaps sit on the committee to represent the commission. Dr. Stout then motioned that the COR request that 1. the Animal Care Committee develop adoption procedures for research and teaching animals and submit that proposed policy to this commission when it is ready and 2. the COR chair appoint one commission member to serve as liaison to that committee for this purpose. Dr. Wightman seconded. That motion passed.

5. Election of COR Chair for 1995-96

The nominating committee consisting of Janet Johnson, Jan Nespor, and Harold Wisdom presented Dr. Tze as the only nominee for COR chair. Dr. Eyre motioned closure of nominations; Dr. McNabb seconded. Dr. Tze was elected by acclamation.

6. Centers, Institutes and Councils - Reports and Continued Discussion

Dr. Stout provided the membership with copies of the list of centers gathered from all the college deans. He went over the list with the membership adding and correcting the text. The university centers need to be added. Discussion followed about which centers should be included on the list and which should not. Dr. Stout suggested that the list be sent back out to the deans asking them to pay particular attention to centers which we have listed as university centers. Our questions to them are: 1) Do you agree that those so identified are university centers? 2) Have we missed some? Dr. Schetz requested that we ask the deans as a side question to indicate if the major activity of these groups is research.

7. Library Report

Dr. Kriz reported that the University Library Committee met on March 2. The library reported that the hours of operation of the Tech libraries ranked strongly when compared to other libraries in the Association of Research Libraries. To speed the response of overdue notices, the notices are now being mailed three times each week rather than twice. The next meeting date is April 13 and the agenda for that meeting is: 1) report by Dean Hitchingham on the library budget for 1995-96; 2) discussion of circulation and fines policies for videos; 3) tour of the storage facility.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:50PM.

Next Meeting April 26, 3:30

Minutes

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

April 26, 1995

206 Sandy Hall

3:30 PM

Members Present: J. Cowles, H. Kriz, A. McNabb, J. Nespor, P. Rasnick,
R. Reneau, B. Richardson, J. Schetz, M. Smith, E. Stout,
H. Tze, H. Wisdom

Members Absent: V. Arya, R. Bates, J. Borda, , P. Eyre, J. Merola, L. Peters,
J. Pinkerton, R. Pitman, R. Schubert, J. Wightman

Invited Guests: S. Trulove

1. Announcements

Dr. Tze thanked the departing members of the Commission as well as the secretary for their dedicated service this past year. He stated that the annual report will be ready at the first meeting of the Commission in the fall.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Dr. Kriz motioned adoption of the agenda; Dr. McNabb seconded. Agenda was approved.

3. Minutes of April 12, 1995

Dr. Stout motioned approval of the minutes of April 12; Dr. Cowles seconded. Minutes were approved.

4. Center for Survey Research Review

Dr. Tze presented the CSR review report to the membership. The Review Committee consisted of: George Crofts from Arts and Sciences; John Edwards from Sociology; Gerry McLaughlin from Institutional Research; Pamela Weaver from Hospitality and Tourism Management; Lee Wolfle from Administrative and Educational Services; and Ernest Stout from the Research Division with Dr. Tze chairing the Committee. Dr. Tze stated that the Center had been created to become self-supporting, which has not happened. The Review Committee's Recommendations for the future of the Center were: 1. The Center for Survey Research be reauthorized for an additional 5 years, subject to the recommendations given below; 2. The current Director and Deputy Director of the CSR should continue to lead the Center; 3. A task force, with representation from Outreach, Outcomes Assessment, the Research Division, and Institutional Research, be appointed to determine an appropriate funding classification (e.g., service center, auxiliary, private firm) for the center and to determine reporting lines and linkage with the university structure; 4. Suitable space be found to locate the CSR on campus, a high priority; 5. The university anticipate the continued need for surveys such as the 1996-98 self-study for accreditation. That anticipation may influence a decision in recommendation 3; 6. The appropriate part of the Director's salary and fringe benefits should be included in the cost calculations of the rates the center charges for its services. After much discussion, Dr. Schetz made a motion to combine recommendations 1 and 3. Recommendation #1 was changed to reauthorize the CSR for an additional one year instead of five years. The motion was seconded. It was further suggested that the task force be expanded and specifically that the College of Arts and Sciences be also represented. Motion passed. Dr. Schetz asked that we find out from Dr. Peters what the latter's interests are in the way of the centers listing for him and Dr. Smith.

5. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.