

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
November 15, 2000
210 Burruss Hall
3:30 - 5 p.m.

Members Present: Dr. Terry Herdman (Chair), Dr. Eugene Brown, Dr. Peter Eyre, Dr. Hara Misra, Dr. David Russell, Dr. Robert Hendricks, Dr. Brad Klein, Ms. Linda Richardson, D. Jones for James Martin, Dr. Roberta Russell Tillar, Dr. Muzzo Uysal

Members Absent: Dr. Len Peters, Dr. Ken Reifsnider, Dr. S.K. DeDatta, Dr. John Tyson, Dr. George Lacy, Dr. Heinrich Schnoedt, Valerie Binetti, Israel Christie

Invited Guests: Dr. Tim Pickering

Others: Mrs. Sherri Box (Secretary)

Call To Order: Dr. Terry Herdman called the Commission on Research committee meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda:

Upon no further discussion, Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve agenda; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

2. Announcements:

Dr. Herdman announced that a joint meeting between the COR, Commission on Graduate Studies & Policies, and the Commission on Faculty Affairs for a presentation by Dr. Len Peters on "Top 30 Status" has been tentatively scheduled for November 29, 2000 at 3:30, location unknown. This will be confirmed and a note will be sent to COR members.

RGS Retreat was held on 11/4/00 from 7:30 - 1:30 at the CEC with Dr. Steger serving as the keynote speaker. Attendance was excellent; there were 3 break-out sessions on Academic Indicators; Mentoring; and NIH funding.

Dr. Peter Eyre announced that the Provost search is proceeding smoothly; selection process will begin in January, 2001; campus visit/interviews will be held in March, 2001. There are 21 members of the search committee in order to include as many constituency groups as possible and to get as broad a representation as possible on the committee. Jerry Baker, who was consultant in the Presidential search and the search for the current VP for Development and University Relations, has been retained to assist with the Provost search.

2. Approval of Minutes of October 11, 2000:

Upon no corrections or additions to the minutes of October 11, 2000 COR meeting, Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve minutes; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

4. Old Business:

a. Commission on Research Policy 13005 -Dr. Pickering has received no additional comments/changes; he reviewed changes via transparencies.

Sections 2.2 through 2.9 were really procedures and thus were moved into section 3.0.

Under the section discussing indirect costs, there was some verbiage added to encourage centers to negotiate support for their center.

Section was added saying that the university policy on Intellectual Properties would be followed unless some other arrangement was made.

If a center isn't reauthorized, then they get one year as a phase-out; at the conclusion of that year they need to submit a letter to the COR notifying them that they are dis-establishing the center and what steps have been taken. The Center then requests the COR to de-commission the center, and then the COR will ask the Provost's office to remove them from the official list of university centers.

Dr. Pickering led a discussion about the differentiation between a college center and an official university center.

Dr. Pickering invited comments/questions to be sent to him before the next COR meeting on 12/13/00 regarding Policy 13005.

4. New Business:

a. Election of COR Vice Chair:

Dr. Herdman asked for nominations for the Vice Chair of the COR from the Nominations Committee; Dr. David Russell was nominated. Upon no further discussion, nominations were closed. Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to elect Dr. David Russell as Vice Chair of the COR; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

a. Agenda Items for future meetings:

COR committee members were asked to contact Terry Herdman or Sherri Box with any agenda items for future meetings.

Possible future topics for discussion might include:

Research computing at VT; who pays for it, why are charges so high, are researchers well served by current system, if not, what changes could be suggested, etc.

How could the university better coordinate the broad use of equipment and resources campus-wide and perhaps develop a centralized listing of equipment or possible shared lab space that is available for use by researchers across the VT campus to allow for a centralization of effort. A "needs assessment" is needed before a strategic plan is formulated. Strategic plan needs to be "top-down" as well as "bottom-up". Possibility of asking Rosemary Blieszner to attend a COR meeting to inform the Commission about the process in place for constructing this strategic plan. Dr. Eyre mentioned that Dr. Steger has met with the VP's and college deans and has given them his ideas about the strategic planning exercise; he wants it to go down into the departments so that there is some real grass roots involvement in how the university will attain "Top 30" status. A strategic planning committee will be created which will include but not be limited to all college deans as well as members of the University Advisory Council on Strategic Budgeting and Planning. Dr. Eyre will ask Dr. Steger what the Commission's role should be in this whole process and report back to the COR.

Problems incurred with post docs not being allowed to be principal investigators on sponsored grants and how this will interact with the special task force.

Revision of the Intellectual Properties policy; the update was presented to Dr. Peters by Dr. Brown and Dr. Pickering. Changes proposed by Kay Heidbreder have been made to the policy. The next step will be to take the revision before the Writing sub-committee of the Intellectual Properties Committee for their approval and then report to the IPC and then to the COR.

Newman Library may have a strategic plan ready for presentation to the COR around the beginning of the spring semester, 2001.

University center 5-year reviews, when completed.

4. Adjournment: meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:
Sherri Box, Secretary for the Commission on Research

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
December 13, 2000
210 Burruss Hall
3:30 - 5 p.m.

Members Present: Dr. Terry Herdman (Chair), Dr. Len Peters, Dr. Eugene Brown, Dr. Heinrich Schnoedt, Dr. Robert Hendricks, Dr. Brad Klein, Dr. George Lacy, James Martin, Israel Christie

Members Absent: Dr. Ken Reifsnider, Dr. Peter Eyre, Dr. S.K. DeDatta, Dr. John Tyson, Dr. Hara Misra, Dr. Roberta Russell Tillar, Dr. Muzzo Uysal, Dr. David Russell, Ms. Linda Richardson, Valerie Binetti,

Invited Guests: Dr. Tim Pickering, Dr. Robert Bodnar

Others: Mrs. Sherri Box (Secretary)

Call To Order: Dr. Terry Herdman called the Commission on Research committee meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda:

Addition to New Business on agenda: Introduction by Tim Pickering of a charter for a proposed new center - Center for Self-Assembled Nanostructures & Devices

Upon no further discussion, Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve agenda; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

2. Announcements:

None presented.

2. Approval of Minutes of November 15, 2000:

Change on page 2 under "Old Business": minutes should read "phase-out", not "fade-out".

Upon no further corrections or additions to the minutes of November 15, 2000 COR meeting, Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve minutes; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

4. Old Business:

a. Post-docs as PI's on Grants - Dr. Bodnar indicated that he had 2 post-docs who had served as PI's on proposals; one as a sole PI and the other as a co-PI. When he submitted a proposal this past spring with another one of his post-docs as co-PI, he found out that this wasn't allowed. Currently, the only research faculty appointment that must have a Ph.D. to hold the appointment and that is not eligible to be a PI or co-PI, is a post-doctoral associate.

There is no formal, official definition of what a post-doc is. Faculty sponsor is called upon to determine an individual's title. In some cases, faculty would have different definitions of titles based on job responsibilities.

A post-doc is/has been traditionally considered as the transitional period between the Ph.D. and going out and getting your first "real job". Post-docs might actually welcome the opportunity to write a proposal because they know that this will be required when they acquire a permanent position. It may take a post-doc 2 - 4 years to acquire a really top-notch permanent academic position. What they do as a post-doc i.e. getting out papers, increasing their visibility, getting experience at writing proposals, is making them more competitive for those permanent positions.

One of the features of the post-doc is that it is more commonly used in the non-engineering academic departments than it is in engineering.

Engineering would be more likely to bring a person in as a research scientist and not as a post-doc. It is, however, very traditional for example in Chemistry and Physics to take that new Ph.D. individual and bring him/her in as a post-doc.

Dr. Peters pointed out that VT is a net importer of raw trained scholars to become our faculty members. An excellent way to build the real quality of VT would be to get more of our Ph. D's and post-docs who have worked here into meaningful faculty positions at other universities.

The question was raised as to the policy on equipment if someone has a research grant and leaves the university for another position? Does the equipment go with the individual or does it stay at VT? The policy states that if the piece of equipment has a university asset number assigned to it, then it is the property of the university and therefore state equipment and it has to remain in the Commonwealth. The tradition in most universities is that the equipment can be declared surplus and can be taken along because it isn't going to be used by anyone else in the department, .

The question was raised as to the definition of a senior research associate. The university's definition is - a senior research associate is reserved for persons who are working on research projects under the supervision of a principal investigator. A person appointed to this rank must have, as a minimum, a master's or equivalent advanced degree. Persons in this rank may be a principal investigator on a grant or contract in very specific circumstances approved by the department head and college dean. Appointment is on an annual basis and is indefinitely renewable.

Should post-docs be permitted to serve as PI's on grant applications?

Positives

- * Increased funding opportunities for the university
- * Post-docs contribute significantly to preparation of the proposals and this would provide an opportunity to acknowledge their contributions to the proposal preparation
- * If someone has written a proposal as a PI and submitted that for funding, this would indicate that this person has the capability for raising funds
- * Would allow VT's post-docs to be more competitive in looking for positions elsewhere.

Negatives

- * Post-docs are not permanent employees. They can't serve as lead or co-PI's. They're generally here for only 1 - 4 years. Most post-docs come here for initial appointment of 1 year with funding from a proposal that a faculty member has, or with funding from their home country. Then if they want to stay on, it becomes necessary to raise funding to support that person for additional years.
- * Since post-docs aren't permanent employees, they might move on before the project is completed
- * Post-doc doesn't really have any laboratory space at the university. If a proposal is submitted under post-docs name and the relationship with sponsor isn't maintained, then there would be no place to continue the research.

Possible Solutions:

- * Include an internal letter of approval on the grant application from the PI or department head saying that if this person moves on before the project is completed, we will see that the project is completed and that all of the requirements are met (this would not be in the grant application that goes out of the university but similar to the internal approval letters that go with any grant that goes through the university)
- * If a post-doc is involved in a proposal and if that person moves relatively early in the funding period, we could allow that person to take the funding with them so that they can continue to do the research. We currently have post-docs coming to VT with funding from another institution.
- * If a post-doc works in a particular group for 2 years and they are very successful but are not ready for tenure-track positions, then they are a resource that the university needs to maintain for new ideas. The possibility exists to promote them to research scientist or senior research scientist and leave the post-doc position as it is. This would allow them to go after the new money by promoting them to a more prestigious and higher-paying position that already has the mechanism by which they can do that job.
- * Create a new category; create a senior post-doc associate and empower that person to serve as a PI. The current post-doc position would serve as a "junior" position.
- * Eliminate the post-doc associate title and include that among the research scientist positions. For the most part, a post-doc and research scientist do the same thing and they are both at the same stage of their professional career, it is just a difference in title.
- * Indicate that post-docs can serve as co-PI's with a tenure-track faculty member also serving as a co-PI. This would recognize the training component of a post-doc position.
- * If a post-doc wants to serve as a co-PI, then they would need to have department head approval; if they want to serve as lead PI, they would need department head AND dean's approval.
- * Have a MOU based on the grant that the equipment will belong the State of Virginia or it will go with the grant.

After much discussion, the general consensus was to go back and look at the definition of a post-doc and see how it could be modified to make this allowance. Ideas will be presented to the COR at a future meeting.

a. Commission on Research Policy 13005 -Dr. Pickering received an objection that may be placed by the College of Engineering from Bob Hendricks.

Dr. Stephenson and Dr. McPherson have raised the question as to the need for Policy 13005 which essentially states the same thing that is found in Policy 3020. The argument is that 3020 was run through the Executive Branch at the direction of the Board of Visitors and the old 13005 done through governance. The issue of the new 3020 was essentially to address quickly and appropriately, for the BOV, issues that were being discussed in the legal system outside the university. The general feeling in the Deans Office of the College of Engineering, is that it is their belief that 3020 applies across the board to all centers (university, college or departmental) and that 3020 is the governing document, especially with regard to financial matters. Their position is that it is appropriate and proper for any person in the administration to whom a center reports to require of their center directors, anything that they wish above and beyond 3020. They foresee possible difficulties in the event that someone amends 3020 but forgets to amend 13005. They feel that it would be dangerous from a managerial point of view, to have parallel documents, At this point, although they currently correctly parallel each other and do state the same things, one or the other could get modified without the companion document being modified also. Additional questions were raised: why does there need to be two documents; why can't we have

one; and why shouldn't it go through governance rather than through the executive branch.

For clarification on this issue, 13005 refers to university research centers; 3020 refers to all centers. The intent was to get 13005 and 3020 more consistent with each other and to create a document for the university research centers that is all-inclusive. Also, the language in 3020 has been clarified and is more instructional on how to prepare a center charter document. There are extra requirements in 13005 that apply only to university centers.

Dr. Peters pointed out that the COR has governance responsibility for looking at policies that affect all research on this campus. This commission has never felt that it was necessary or appropriate to issue a policy relative to college and departmental centers.

Dr. Herdman suggested that Dr. McPherson be asked to come and express his concerns at the next COR meeting. He and Bob Hendricks will contact Dr. McPherson and issue the invitation.

Dr. Herdman will also research which policy takes precedence (13005 or 3020) and report his findings at the next COR meeting.

4. New Business:

a. Introduction of a charter for a proposed new center - Center for Self-

Assembled Nanostructures & Devices - Tim Pickering
A group of faculty members, primarily in Chemistry and Physics and a couple of other departments across campus, would like to form a university Center for Self-Assembled Nanostructures & Devices. They have prepared a charter based on the proposed Policy 13005 and would like the approval of the COR so that they can move forward.

When all COR members have reviewed the charter and it is approved and signed by the commission, then it will be deemed that this center has been established. The charter will be signed by the center director, Dr. Herdman (COR) and Dr. Ken Reifsnider (Associate Provost for Interdisciplinary Programs).

COR members were asked to review the proposed charter and send Tim Pickering any suggestions/changes/questions.

Pending no serious issues or concerns, the charter will be brought before the COR at the January 24, 2001 meeting for adoption. The new center will be asked to provide a listing of their proposed stakeholders committee along with the name of the center director for review and approval by the COR at the time of the signing of the official charter.

Tim Pickering will ask a representative from this proposed center to give a 15 - 20 minutes presentation with 10 - 15 minutes of discussion to follow, to the COR at the January 24 meeting.

a. Agenda Items for future meetings:

COR committee members were asked to contact Terry Herdman or Sherri Box with any agenda items for future meetings.

Revision of the Intellectual Properties policy; update from Gene Brown.

Newman Library may have a strategic plan ready for presentation to the COR around the beginning of the spring semester, 2001.

4. Adjournment: meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Sherri Box, Secretary for the Commission on Research

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
January 24, 2001
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 - 5 p.m.

Members Present: Dr. Terry Herdman (Chair), Dr. Eugene Brown, Dr. Roberta Russell Tillar, Dr. Muzzo Uysal, Ms. Linda Richardson, James Martin, Israel Christie, Dr. Jim Jones (representing Dr. Heinrich Schnoedt)

Members Absent: Dr. Len Peters, Dr. Ken Reifsnider, Dr. Peter Eyre, Dr. S.K. DeDatta, Dr. Peter Eyre, Dr. John Tyson, Dr. Hara Misra, Dr. George Lacy, Dr. David Russell, Dr. Robert Hendricks, Dr. Brad Klein, Valerie Binetti,

Invited Guests: Dr. Tim Pickering, Dr. Rick Davis, Dr. Randy Heflin

Others: Mrs. Sherri Box (Secretary)

Call To Order: Dr. Terry Herdman called the Commission on Research committee meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda:

Order of Business was changed to allow earlier presentation of proposed CSAND Charter by Randy Heflin.

Upon no further discussion, Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve agenda; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

2. Announcements:

Dr. Herdman announced that chairs of all Commissions met with Dr. Charles Steger on Monday, January 22, 2001 to discuss agenda items and possible resolutions coming out of the various commissions for the spring semester. President Steger was very appreciative of the individuals serving on the commissions and their dedication to the tasks at hand.

3. Approval of Minutes of December 13, 2000:

Upon no corrections or additions to the minutes of December 13, 2000 COR meeting, Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve minutes; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

4. New Business:

a. Proposed CSAND (Center for Self-Assembled Nanostructures & Devices) Charter - Dr. Randy Heflin presented

Dr. Heflin, Associate Professor/Physics and Dr. Rick Davis, Associate Professor/Chemical Engineering are the proposed associate directors of CSAND; Harry Dorn, Professor/Chemistry is the proposed Director of CSAND.

Personnel in the Center would include:

Harry Dorn, Professor/Chemistry
Harry Gibson, Professor/Chemistry
Rick Davis, Associate Professor/Chemical

Engineering

Kevin Van Cott, Assistant Professor/Chemical

Engineering

Randy Heflin, Associate Professor/Physics
Massimiliano di Ventra, Assistant

Professor/Physics

Stephane Evoy, Assistant

Professor/Electrical & Computer Engineering

This group was brought together by a Packard

Foundation "Interdisciplinary Science Awards" solicitation in the summer of 1998 and will provide multidisciplinary, synergistic expertise in nanoscience, self-assembly, polymers, fullerenes, and optoelectronics for a proposed \$20 million total effort. It is expected that successful funding will increase with the establishment of this center and that this center will not be in direct competition with other university centers.

The CSAND proposed charter; a proposal to establish CSAND; proposed funding information; technical focus; track record of proposals, publication and joint presentations; list of equipment needed; along with other pertinent information, was presented and submitted to the COR for their consideration.

There has been a verbal commitment at this time from individuals asked to serve as the stakeholders for this center. Dr. Davis is in the process of securing signatures of agreement from those individuals.

After discussion and clarification of several issues/questions, a motion was made, seconded and the motion carried that the CSAND charter be approved pending two items: 1) signatures of stakeholders will be obtained; and 2) Tim Pickering will work with CSAND on the wording of the governance section of their proposed charter to bring it into conformance with the current University Policies and Procedures on Center Establishment, Policy 3020.

b. Agenda Items for future meetings:
COR committee members were asked to contact Terry Herdman or Sherri Box with any agenda items for future meetings.

Comments from Dr. Peters about the division of responsibility between the Research Division and the Graduate School as a result of the announcement that Research & Grad Studies will be split into two separate entities.

Revision of the Intellectual Properties policy; update from Gene Brown.

Newman Library may have a strategic plan ready for presentation to the COR around the beginning of the spring semester, 2001

Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment policy was approved with review to take place after one year. There would be a committee to conduct this review that would answer to the COR and then return to University Council. A report should be forthcoming from that committee to the COR on either 2/14/01 or 2/28/01.

Pat Hyer will be attending one or both February COR meetings to continue the discussion and update the COR regarding the progress of redefining university research ranks.

Future discussion regarding Policies 13005 and 3020.

5. Old Business:

a. Update on university IP policy - Dr. Gene Brown presented.
It is anticipated that the recommended changes in the Intellectual Property policy will be presented to the COR at one of the February meetings

b. VTTI 5-year review - Dr. Tim Pickering presented
Policy 13005 requires a 5-year review of all university centers. VTTI has been very successful with remarkable growth in projects, sponsored funding, publicity for the university and in a

cooperative relationship with VDOT. The VTTI 5-year review committee members are being solicited; there will a representative on the committee from the COR, at least one from the financial area of the university, several faculty members, at least one from outside the university, Gary Allen (chairman of the Virginia Transportation Research Council), and the director of the transportation center from Penn State. This review process should also serve as an outline to help formulate a plan of action to help the VTTI better manage its growth and the problems that are naturally incurred when remarkable growth occurs very quickly.

c. Fralin Biotechnology Center charter (updated) - Dr. Tim Pickering presented.

The updated Fralin Biotechnology Center charter will be reviewed by members of the COR and will be discussed and approved at a later date.

d. Center for Survey Research charter (updated) - Dr. Tim Pickering presented

The updated Center for Survey Research charter will be reviewed by members of the COR and will be discussed and approved at a later date.

6. Adjournment: meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:
Sherri Box,
Secretary for the Commission on Research

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
February 28, 2001
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 - 5 p.m.

Members Present: Dr. Eugene Brown (Acting Chair), Dr. S.K. DeDatta, Dr. John Tyson, Dr. Hara Misra, Dr. Jim Jones (representing Dr. Heinrich Schnoedt), Dr. Robert Hendricks, Dr. Jim Burger, Dr. Muzzo Uysal, Dr. Brad Klein, Ms. Linda Richardson, James Martin,

Members Absent: Dr. Terry Herdman, Dr. Len Peters, Dr. Ken Reifsnider, Dr. Peter Eyre, Dr. George Lacy, Dr. David Russell, Dr. Roberta Russell Tillar, Israel Christie, Valerie Binetti,

Invited Guests: Dr. Tim Pickering, Pat Hyer, Sandra Muse

Others: Mrs. Sherri Box (Secretary)

Call To Order: Dr. Gene Brown called the Commission on Research committee meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda:

Upon no discussion, Dr. Brown asked for a motion to approve agenda; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

2. Announcements:

Dr. Jim Burger was introduced to the COR as the representative from the College of Natural Resources.

Pat Hyer announced that the Provost search was proceeding as planned; candidates are scheduled to be interviewed between March 19 and March 30.

3. Approval of Minutes of January 24, 2001:

Upon no corrections or additions to the minutes of January 24, 2001 COR meeting, Dr. Brown asked for a motion to approve minutes; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

4. Old Business:

a. Update on charters - Tim Pickering presented

1. CSAND charter - signature document has been received by the Office of Interdisciplinary Programs and charter with changes stipulated at 1/24/01 COR meeting has been distributed to COR members via e-mail. There were several editorial suggestions made for the charter and those changes can be made with no difficulty. Dr. Herdman's and Dr. Reifsnider's signature will be obtained on the charter.

2. Other charters (Fralin Biotechnology Center & Center for Survey Research).

E-mail vote was taken and several objections were noted to adopting these charters. Tim Pickering asked the COR to consider approving the charter for the Center for Survey Research with the explanation that this group has been in existence for a period of time and they did not have a charter. When the new policy went into effect, a stakeholders' committee was established as required by the policy, they met with their stakeholders, the stakeholders instructed them to develop a charter in October, 2000 and Alan Bayer worked closely with Tim Pickering to develop the charter appropriately.

Motion was made to approve the Center for Survey Research charter with changes as noted; motion seconded; motion carried.

It was suggested that the Fralin Biotechnology Center be deferred for discussion at a later COR meeting.

b. Special Research Faculty Positions/Task Force proposed changes - Pat Hyer presented.

The University Task Force on Special Research Faculty was charged with reviewing the existing ranks for research faculty and recommending changes or additions as appropriate. A review of job descriptions for all special research faculty revealed that some sponsored faculty are not conducting "research" per se, but rather delivering services or providing consultation to clients. For them, the use of the rank title such as research associate is not especially helpful in the grant preparation process nor in carrying out projects that involve technical assistance or outreach. To address this mismatch, the task force is recommending creation of three new ranks - Project Associate, Senior Project Associate, and Project Director. These titles would be used to recognize faculty employees on sponsored funding who are involved in the delivery of services, technical assistance, and/or project management and administration.

With the above exception, the existing rank titles appear to serve the needs of the research community, but principal investigators and department heads seem to be unaware or unsure of appropriate rank titles when employing new faculty researchers and tend to overutilize the "research associate" category. Education on the appropriate use of the titles will be an on-going issue.

The Task Force recommends that the MASTER'S degree be stated as the minimum acceptable qualification for a special research faculty appointment (with exceptions to be considered for those with a lesser degree and experience) thereby reinforcing the importance of advanced credentials and the ability to carry out independent work generally associated with a faculty position. As the task force reviewed job descriptions of research faculty with only the bachelor's degree, it appeared that many were actually doing work that should have been classified. The truly exceptional senior person from industry with only a bachelor's degree can be accommodated by exception.

Pat Hyer presented a resolution (COR 2000-01A) in which changes to the ranks were summarized, including the creation of the three new ranks and statement of the master's degree as the minimal qualification. The resolution included a statement about notice of termination, however this item was not ready for Commission consideration and it was deleted. A motion was made to approve the resolution with the deletion of the clause concerning termination; motion seconded; motion carried. Pat Hyer will forward the resolution and supporting material to University Council for approval.

c. Recommended changes to the current IP policy - Gene Brown and Tim Pickering presented.

Gene Brown presented the Intellectual Property committee's recommendations for changes to the university's Intellectual Property policy and made the following points:

* The committee has retained current policy with regard to handling of patentable works (formerly "novel results of research")

* The committee has set out conditions in which copyrightable works (formerly "traditional results of academic scholarship") can be owned by the University.

Tim Pickering then led discussion about the

details of the suggested revisions. There was considerable discussion about the definition of ordinary office computers and software, and whether the definition should be specific or general in nature. Since the capabilities of computers and software have improved rapidly in the past, and are expected to continue to improve in the future, it was concluded that a specific definition would soon be out of date. Therefore it was decided to leave the wording general, with the definition to be interpreted in terms of what would be usual and customary in each particular set of circumstances.

A motion was made to accept the recommended revisions to the IP Policy and move this policy on to University Council; motion seconded; motion carried. Gene Brown and Tim Pickering will forward the resolution and supporting material to University Council for approval.

5. New Business:

Research No new business was brought before the Commission on

6. Adjournment: meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Sherril Box,
Secretary for the Commission on Research

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
March 14, 2001
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 - 5 p.m.

Members Present: Dr. Terry Herdman, Dr. Eugene Brown, Dr. Len Peters, Dr. S.K. DeDatta, Dr. John Tyson, Dr. Robert Hendricks, Dr. Brad Klein, Ms. Linda Richardson, James Martin,

Members Absent: Dr. Ken Reifsnider, Dr. Peter Eyre, Dr. Hara Misra, Dr. George Lacy, Dr. Jim Jones (representing Dr. Heinrich Schnoedt), Dr. David Russell, Dr. Roberta Russell Tillar, Dr. Jim Burger, Dr. Muzzo Uysal, Israel Christie, Valerie Binetti,

Invited Guests: Dr. Tim Pickering, Pat Hyer, Sandra Muse, Dr. Ludeman Eng

Others: Mrs. Debbie Nester (Acting Secretary)

Call To Order: Dr. Terry Herdman called the Commission on Research committee meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda:

Upon no discussion, Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve agenda; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

2. Announcements:

On March 21, 2001, there will be a joint meeting of the Commission on Research and the Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies; Dr. Len Peters will give a presentation on achieving "Top 30" status.

3. Approval of Minutes of February 28, 2001:

Upon no corrections or additions to the minutes of the February 28, 2001 COR meeting, Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve minutes; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

*

4. Old Business:

a. Conflict of Interest/Commitment - Ludeman Eng presented

Policy 13010 Rev. 2 was approved at the May 1, 2000 meeting of University Council and subsequently by the Board of Visitors on June 5, 2000, subject to the following provisions: "That the Policy 13010 be approved provisionally for one year as a 'pilot' policy process and that the Committee on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment be formally charged with responsibility to monitor the submission and approval of disclosure documents through the fall term and prepare a summary for the

Commission on Research and subsequently the University Council. In preparing such a report, the committee should consult with faculty members and administrators who have negotiated such disclosure agreements and solicit their recommendations for improvements to the process and policy. Further, the committee should take into account comments from other interested parties. Based on the Committee's recommendations, the policy should then be confirmed and/or revised through usual governance procedures by the last Council meeting in Spring 2001."

Surveys were sent to all Deans/Associate Deans and Department Heads in mid-October 2000, requesting information on the following for all Policy 13010 forms received:

- * Faculty name
- * Department
- * Number of Form 13010As received, and disposition (approved, denied,

pending)

* Number of Form 13010Bs received, and disposition (approved, denied, pending)

* Number of MOUs received, and disposition (approved, denied, pending)

Conflict of interest reporting activity was summarized for each college.

Every faculty member who filled out a form by the end of Fall 2000 was contacted by the Provost's Office and asked to provide feedback. Faculty reported few, if any, problems with the policy or forms.

A notice was published in Spectrum asking for feedback on Policy 13010 by the end of January. Limited feedback was received and considered by the committee for incorporation into this report.

Findings and Conclusions:

* Most departments and colleges have done a good job in making everyone aware of the policy. Some departments and colleges have hosted presentations and discussions led by Conflict of Interest and Commitment committee members.

* There were a total of 192 external activities submitted for approval from 137 faculty. The vast majority of requests are for simple consulting. A number of the old consulting forms were still being used.

* Nearly all report no difficulty with using the forms. Some suggestions for making the forms easier to use have been accepted and modifications are underway.

*

*

* As of February 20, 2001, all requests received to date have been approved.

* The remaining area(s) of greatest uncertainty and confusion are related to issues of conflicts of commitment, which will be addressed by a new ad hoc committee.

It is the current committee's view that issues related to conflict of interest appear to be adequately addressed by Policy 13010, and no changes are recommended at this time.

A motion was made to approve the Conflict of Interest/Commitment resolution; motion seconded; motion carried. This resolution will be presented at the next University Council meeting for consideration.

b. Additional recommendations on Research Faculty - Pat Hyer

presented.

P. Hyer reviewed proposed changes and draft language for the Research Faculty Handbook related to:

* Searches

* Restricted appointments of one year or less

* Multi-year restricted appointments

* Calendar-year versus academic-year appointments for Special Research Faculty

* Reappointments

* Termination of appointment

The Task Force is proposing a new section to address instructional responsibilities for Special Research Faculty members.

P. Hyer also reviewed an outline of expedited search process for Special Research Faculty members.

Hyer expressed concerns they have had about the lack of searches for special research faculty positions; virtually all positions are filled by exemptions to the search process. The Task Force is considering a proposal that requires the announcement of most positions on the university's employment website for at least a minimal time so that more searches are opened up for competitive application. (Some exemptions would still be approved.) Discussion and questions continued regarding various points of the Task Force's proposed changes. The expedited search process appeared reasonable, but several members spoke in favor of an exemption for post-doc positions.

The Task Force was interested in feedback from commission members to several of the draft proposals. The next action would be for the Task force to come back to the COR for approval of their recommendations for changes regarding a number of these issues.

4. New Business:

Representatives from the Library will be presenting at the March 28, 2001 COR meeting to talk about changes in scholarly communications.

Dr. Gene Brown and Dr. Tim Pickering will present the revised Intellectual

Property policy, that has been approved by the Commission on Research, to University Council on March 19, 2001.

5. Adjournment: meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:
Sherri Box, Secretary for the Commission on Research

~~~~~  
Judy Davis, CPS  
Executive Secretary Senior  
President's Office, Virginia Tech  
210 Burruss Hall (0131)  
Blacksburg, VA 24061  
(540) 231-6232 FAX: (540) 231-4265  
~~~~~

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

April 11, 2001
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 - 5 p.m.

Members Present: Dr. Terry Herdman, Dr. Eugene Brown, Dr. Len Peters, Dr. S.K. DeDatta, , Dr. John Tyson, Dr. Robert Hendricks, Dr. Muzzo Uysal, Ms. Linda Richardson, James Martin, Israel Christie

Members Absent: Dr. Ken Reifsnider, Dr. Peter Eyre, Dr. Hara Misra, Dr. George Lacy, Dr. Jim Jones (representing Dr. Heinrich Schnoedt), Dr. David Russell, Dr. Brad Klein, Dr. Roberta Russell Tillar, Dr. Jim Burger, Valerie Binetti

Invited Guests: Dr. Tim Pickering, Dr. Pat Hyer, Sandra Muse, Dr. Fred Lee, Dr. Bruno Sobral, Dr. Dennis Kafura, Dr. Gary Brown, Dr. Tom Dingus, Dr. Bob West, Dr. Gene Cliff

Others: Mrs. Sherri Box, Secretary

Call To Order:

Dr. Terry Herdman called the Commission on Research committee meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda:

Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve agenda; with no corrections or additions, a motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

2. Announcements:

A nominating committee has been formed for the selection of the COR ChairPerson for the 2001-2002 AY and their recommendations will be presented at the 4/25/01 COR meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes of April 11, 2001:

Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve minutes; with no corrections or additions, motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

4. New Business:

a. RESEARCH FACULTY APPOINTMENTS IN CENTERS & INSTITUTES - Dr. Fred Lee (Center for Power Electronic Systems), Dr. Tom Dingus (Virginia Tech Transportation Institute) and Dr. Bruno Sobral (Virginia Bioinformatics Institute) made invited presentations.

Presentations were made indicating that there is an increasing need to have research faculty appointments in centers and institutes not

directly tied to departments and colleges. Several key points were made in discussion:

- . Ever increasing number and percentage of non-academic faculty is necessary.
- . Retention of this important resource would be improved with research professor status and the opportunity to occasionally teach.
- . There is a substantial Ph.D.-level talent pool that is going to waste as a teaching resource.
- . Would help to integrate centers and departments.
- . Would provide more knowledge of center activity on campus, potentially leading to greater collaboration and opportunities for academic faculty.
- . Currently losing top researchers because of time involved in processing paperwork from departments through chain of command that currently exists.
- . Salary issues currently exist in hiring through departments; those issues would be alleviated if hired through centers and/or institutes.

Several problems might occur but could be easily managed with appropriate checks and balances in place:

- . Fear of abuse of research faculty who have a heavy teaching load.
- . Research faculty are not tenure track faculty members
- . Research faculty title is not perceived to be as prestigious as tenure track academic faculty positions
- . Fear of centers offering more academic programs and thereby undermining departments.
- . Funding would be with "soft" money.

Dr. Pat Hyer reviewed Special Research Faculty Positions/Task Force proposed changes regarding allowing units that don't have degree programs to have authority to make initial appointments and/or promotions at these special ranks without approval by an academic department. No authority would be conveyed to advise graduate students until there has been an action by the academic department that is relevant. The units would also be allowed to set up their old promotion process that would be reviewed and approved in advance by the Provost and the Vice Provost for Research.

Dr. Herdman called for a motion to send the Special Research Faculty Positions/Task Force proposed changes with latest revisions back to University Council for 2nd reading; motion made; motion approved; motion carried.

b. RESEARCH COMPUTING - Dr. Dennis Kafura, Dr. Gary Brown and Dr. Bob West made invited presentations.

Ideas were presented to support the idea that research computing needs to increase significantly if VT is to achieve top 30 ranking status. Research computing has many users, unlike specialized, project specific

equipment; research computing is a university-wide resource; increased reliance upon simulations rather than expensive, hardware specific equipment is the future; research computing is a relatively cheap way for faculty and students to obtain results.

At the current time, VT has no meaningful policy or commitment to research computing that can be used to guide present or future actions.

User-based revenue generation will be erratic and highly unscheduled and the concept is not consistent with the manner in which other research essential services are supported.

SGI is the only source of maintenance, including parts, for SGI computers and as such, has a monopoly on the upkeep and repair of their equipment.

Possible solutions/suggestions:

Administration & Operation

- a. Vest A & O with consortium of user colleges/department, i.e., CoE, CALS, Math, Physics, Chemistry.
- b. Remove the Computing Center from any research computing responsibility except space.
- c. Physically locate resources at the Computing Center.
- d. Create an Office of Research Computing that would have: technical staff support; a budget to support strategically targeted research computing; a director who reports to the Provost (or other senior academic officer).

Funding for Maintenance & Upgrade

- a. Add to our "cost of doing business" overhead
- b. Work with other state universities to form a consortium for purpose of negotiating a single, commonwealth-wide SGI maintenance contract i.e., negotiate a single rate, train internal personnel to accomplish maintenance, have a structure so that parts only are needed from SGI

In summary, Dr. Herdman mentioned that the COR would discuss this again at the next meeting with a possible plan of action of putting a committee together to bring a report and/or recommendation to the COR next fall.

5. OLD BUSINESS:

- a. Center for Race & Social Policy Research Center - Dr. Terry Herdman presented.

A copy of the proposed charter for this center was sent electronically to COR members prior to the meeting.

Terry Herdman called for discussion regarding this charter; there being none, he called for a motion to approve charter; motion made, motion seconded, motion carried.

- b. Center for Global Accountability Studies Charter - Dr. Terry Herdman presented.

An electronic copy of this proposed charter will be sent to COR members for their review prior to the 4/25/01 meeting and discussion will occur at that time.

c. Update on Recommended changes to current IP Policy
- Dr. Terry Herdman presented.

The 2nd reading of the proposed revisions to the current IP policy will occur at the University Council meeting on May 7, 2001. Further discussion will occur at the April 25, 2001 COR meeting.

6. Adjournment: meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Sherri Box,
Secretary for the Commission on Research

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

April 25, 2001
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 - 5 p.m.

Members Present: Dr. Terry Herdman, Dr. Eugene Brown, Dr. S.K. De Datta, , Dr. John Tyson, Dr. Robert Hendricks, Dr. Muzzo Uysal, Ms. Linda Richardson, James Martin

Members Absent: Dr. Ken Reifsnider, Dr. Len Peters, Dr. Peter Eyre, Dr. Hara Misra, Dr. George Lacy, Dr. Jim Jones (representing Dr. Heinrich Schnoedt), Dr. David Russell, Dr. Brad Klein, Dr. Roberta Russell Tillar, Dr. Jim Burger, Valerie Binetti, Israel Christie

Invited Guests: Dr. Tim Pickering, Dr. Mitzi Vernon

Guests: Dr. Peter Rony

Others: Mrs. Sherri Box, Secretary

Call To Order: Dr. Terry Herdman called the Commission on Research committee meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda:

With one change and one addition noted, Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve agenda; a motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

2. Announcements:

This is the last scheduled meeting of the COR for the 2000-2001 AY.

Dr. Herdman introduced Peter Rony from the Department of Chemical Engineering who is past Chairman of the Engineering Faculty Organization (EFO) and is currently on the EFO Executive Committee.

The minutes of this meeting will be sent out electronically for approval by the COR so that the final version can be forwarded to University Council for approval at the May 7, 2001 meeting.

The COR expressed their appreciation to Dr. Herdman for his exemplary leadership in chairing the COR for the 2000-2001 AY.

Dr. Herdman thanked Sherri Box for all her assistance and outstanding service to the COR.

3. Approval of Minutes of April 11, 2001:

With three changes noted, Dr. Herdman asked for a motion to approve minutes; motion was made; motion seconded; motion was carried.

4. Old Business:

a. Faculty Senate Meeting update re: proposed IP Policy - Dr. Mitzi Vernon was invited to present.

The Faculty Senate, representing 1600 faculty members from all colleges across the campus, spent 1.5 hours at their meeting on April 24, 2001 discussing the proposed revisions to the IP policy. All faculty members seem to have similar concerns for different reasons. For example, the English Department receives

an

extremely small amount of money from the texts or books that they create within their discipline, unlike receiving an NSF grant, and they see the one opportunity that they have, if the policy is to be interpreted and implemented as they read it, as being taken away. Their interpretation of the policy is that, suddenly, they will not be allowed to use University resources to produce their texts or books.

The Faculty Senate unanimously (minus 1 vote) does not want the proposed revised IP policy to pass on May 7; they would prefer that it be referred until early Fall, 2001. They would like more time for input and they would like to see additional revisions so that the written word more adequately reflects the intent and spirit of the document. A suggestion was made to allow, for example, three Faculty Senate members, perhaps from Engineering and the Humanities, as well as Dr. Vernon, to sit with members of the IPC during the summer months, to refine the language and to look at the issues that the faculty members have identified as troublesome and try to collectively, with the IPC, come to some resolution in a timely manner.

Some additional discussion took place regarding the composition of the IP Committee i.e. the possibility of adding Faculty Senate representatives with the understanding that the IPC is a year-long committee, therefore designated faculty members that are AY would have to commit to a year-long appointment to this committee. (The actual process of selection of faculty members to serve in this capacity to be determined). The question was raised about the possibility of having the IPC and designated faculty members serve for three-year terms.

The concerns from the College of Engineering will be clarified by Dr. Bob Hendricks, who will consult with Dr. Michael Fury and the EFO. He will put those concerns into a concise, bulleted listing which will then be re-submitted to the IPC for their review.

b. Affirmation of editorial changes made in proposed IP Policy - Dr. Gene Brown and Dr. Tim Pickering presented.

Dr. Brown reviewed the Executive Summary that was sent electronically to all members of the COR prior to this meeting. This summary compared the proposed policy with the current policy, indicated how the IPC has collected input from the faculty and staff, the proposed changes compared with the University Council version and some examples of questions and answers that may arise when discussing intellectual properties.

Dr. Herdman indicated that at the February 28, 2001 meeting of the COR, the motion was made to put forth the IP resolution to University Council. It was then brought to University Council and it was deferred on the 1st reading; it will stay on the UC agenda for up to six weeks. During that time, the University Council members and others can make comments or suggestions relative to the resolution. The next action on this resolution will have to occur on May 7, 2001. The possibilities are: 1) that it go through 2nd reading, a motion is made for adoption and approved or 2) that it could be referred meaning that it would come back to the COR and before it went before University Council again, it would be presented as a new resolution with a new 1st reading or 3) that the COR could vote to withdraw the resolution.

Dr. Brown asked for ratification of the current proposed revised IP policy so that it can move forward for additional changes, additions and/or revisions.

A point of order was raised by Dr. Tim Pickering that it would seem inappropriate to discuss how the COR is to proceed on this matter with a guest present. The suggestion was made that it would be appropriate to vote to move to executive session which would, at this point in time, exclude guests or that the guest simply be asked to leave. Dr. Peter Rony refused to leave and hearing no further support for the point of order raised, discussion continued.

After lengthy discussion about the issues involving the IP policy, the wording of the document, the intent of the document and the concerns of the faculty members for the current as well as the proposed IP policy, a motion was made to withdraw the resolution from University Council for reconsideration and revision by the Commission on Research; motion was seconded; motion was carried.

A second motion was made to accept the suggested revisions to the Intellectual Property policy (dated 4/25/01) to date, as presented by the IP Committee and to commend the committee for their hard work and diligence on this document; motion was seconded; motion was carried.

A third motion was made to require that the IP Committee continue to actively seek input on the IP policy revisions from the university community and to take Dr. Mitzi Vernon's concerns from the Faculty Senate into consideration and to refer the policy back to the COR by its first meeting Fall 2001; motion was seconded; motion was carried.

When Dr. Herdman withdraws this resolution from University Council, he has been instructed by the COR to indicate the importance of bringing this issue to an acceptable conclusion in a timely manner. It was noted that this is a component of the "top 30" initiative at VT.

COR members were encouraged to provide input/comments to the IP Committee regarding their concerns/questions regarding the policy, as well as any suggestions that might help clarify the policy. COR members will be made aware of IP Committee meetings over the summer so that members may attend if they so choose.

c. Research Computing - Dr. Terry Herdman presented.

There was a presentation on Research Computing at the 4/11/01 COR meeting. That presentation provided a sampling of the research faculty members who believe that VT needs to do something relative to research computing. Per Dr. Herdman, a suggestion was made at the Pre-Commission meeting to put together an ad-hoc committee over the summer to further study this issue with the intent of formulating a written document outlining the problems and solutions regarding research computing to be considered by the COR during the upcoming academic year.

d. Center for Global Accountability Studies Charter - Dr. Tim Pickering presented.

After further evaluation by the Office of Interdisciplinary Programs and after discussions with the proposed center director regarding the scope of work of the center, this proposed center charter has been referred to the Provost's office for consideration as a college or departmental center.

e. Update on VTTI 5-year review - Dr. S.K. De Datta, Dr. Tim Pickering presented.

David Kibler is chairing the VTTI 5-year review committee with input from various VT faculty members as well as a representative from the Controller's Office and the director of the Pennsylvania Transportation Institute (PTI) and the director of the Virginia Transportation Research

Council. There are several sub-groups on this 5-year review committee; Research Issues, Academic Issues, Internal/External Assessment; and Organizational Structure. All sub-groups reported the progress made with their part of the review in a series of meetings held on April 17, 2001 at DBH&CC. Dr. Bohdan Kulakowski from PTI was in attendance and presented information on how PTI operates, the similarities and differences between PTI and VTTI, and the level of support that PTI receives from Penn State. A striking difference is, in fact, the level of support that Penn States gives to PTI, unlike the small level of support that VTTI receives from VT. Dr. Tom Dingus has also been involved in this review process in giving the committee information about the issues that VTTI faces. VTTI is the largest university research center bringing in an enormous amount of research dollars and resources under a very tight environment with little university support. They are also second at the university in terms of sponsored research expenditures; they are larger than almost every other department on campus in this area. In addition, they support a large number of graduate students (approximately 80) which is very significant in light of the university's goal of moving into the "top 30".

A draft of the final report is anticipated by the middle of May. However, the final report will not be brought to the COR until the fall of 2001. The committee would like to move forward with its recommendations to university administration with its preliminary findings/suggestions regarding VTTI. Dr. Herdman indicated that the COR would support this action.

5. New Business:

a. Election of COR ChairPerson for 2001-2002 AY - Dr. Terry Herdman presented.

The nominating committee consisted of Linda Richardson, Dr. Gene Brown and Dr. Terry Herdman. No one contacted any member of the committee with any nominations. Dr. Brown reported that one nomination was sought out and was received with a positive response. Dr. Bob Hendricks has indicated his willingness to chair the COR for the upcoming academic year. Dr. Herdman opened the floor for additional nominations; none being heard, a motion was made to close nominations from the floor; motion seconded; motion carried. Dr. Herdman called for a vote and by unanimous vote, Dr. Bob Hendricks was elected to serve as Chair of the COR for the 2001-2002 AY.

6. Adjournment: meeting was adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Sherry Box,
Secretary for the Commission on Research