

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

October 9, 2002
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 — 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: Jim Blair, Jim Burger, Linda Correll, S.K. DeDatta, Michael Ermann (for Jim Jones), Frank Gwazdauskas, Kriton Hatzios, Bob Hendricks, Edmund Henneke, Bradley Klein, Ed Lener, Thomas Olson, Rishi Pande, Joe Pitt, Vijay Singal, and John Tyson

Members Absent: David Bevan, Jim Bohland, and Len Peters,

Invited Guest: Tim Pickering and Joe Rees

Others: Melissa Simpkins (Secretary)

1. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved.

2. Approval of Minutes for September 11, 2002:

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

3. Old Business:

- a. Presentation of the 5-year review of the Virginia Center for Housing Research:** Joe Rees gave a brief overview of the status of the Virginia Center for Housing Research, which included a summary and recommendations. Following a brief discussion of how the committee was organized to achieve its goals, Joe Rees reviewed the past five years performance of the Center with the Commission. The following paragraphs summarize the committees report and recommendations.

The Virginia Center for Housing Research is a state-mandated center with a state appropriation as its base funding. The Center is provided facilities by the College of Architecture and Urban Affairs. It is staffed by a Director, an Associate Director, and a senior research associate. Its mission is to serve as an *interdisciplinary* study, research, and information resource on housing.

The committee interviewed the Center Director and a number of individuals both on and off campus who are familiar with the Center's activities. Based on these interviews the Review Committee found strong support for the Center and its Director. The Center serves a unique and positive role for the Commonwealth and it would be sorely missed if not continued. The committee also found that despite its ability to secure impressive amounts of

external funding for research, the Center is very much in need of additional support by Virginia Tech for its administration. Without such additional support the Center Director is in danger of burn out, the Center will not be able to extend its functions and communicate adequately with its constituencies, and the Center will not be able to develop as an internally attractive research unit.

The Review Committee recommends that the Center be continued, the Director be reappointed, and Virginia Tech provides additional funding. In addition they recommend that the Center establish an Advisory Council, that it seeks the means to increase its national visibility and recognition, and that it develop mechanisms to communicate more effectively with its constituencies.

A motion was made to approve the Center for Housing Research 5 year review. The motion was seconded and approved. The Commission Chair will forward the review to the Vice Provost of Research with a cover letter including the recommendation from the Commission to revise the Center's mission statement to be more in-line with the current budget situation.

- b. Intellectual Property Policy:** The Intellectual Property Policy 101 presentation will continue to educate campus departments and organizations. The IP Committee revisions of the Intellectual Property Policy will begin soon.
 - c. Research Computing:** Joe Pitt will invite Dr. Steger or Provost McNamee to come and discuss the direction of research infrastructure with relation to the Commission and the budget situation.
- 4. New Business:**
- a. Discussion of review procedures for Centers:** Policy 13,005 of the Commission on Research states that University Research Centers are normally established for period of five years and are required to undergo a comprehensive peer review and evaluation of their activities and accomplishments in their terminal year.

The terminal year review of a center should make some specific recommendations:

- i. The center should be reauthorized or terminated. If the review committee recommends reauthorization, it must include a request for reauthorization in the same manner and format as for initial establishment. The Commission on Research will follow the same procedure as for the establishment of a center. If termination is recommended, the center will have one calendar year from that date to conclude its affairs. The redistribution of any remaining center assets will be the responsibility of the Associate Provost for

Interdisciplinary Programs in consultation with appropriate deans and department heads.

- ii. If reauthorization is recommended, the review committee must also make a recommendation as to the continuation of the director. If a change in directors is recommended, the appointing authority specified in the GOVERNANCE section will select a new director.
- iii. The review committee may make any other recommendations they deem appropriate regarding the operation, structure, governance, direction or other activities of the center.

Discussion concerned the possibility of grouping centers and their review so as to reduce excessive work load. Commission on Research will explore this possibility.

- b. Discussion of relation with respect to Commission on Research of new Research Institutes:** This will be included in the discussion with Dr. Steger or Provost McNamee, to redefine the Commissions role with respect to new Research Institutes.

5. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Melissa Simpkins, Secretary for the Commission on Research

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

November 13, 2002

325 Burruss Hall

3:30 — 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: Michael Bertelsen (for S.K. DeDatta), David Bevan, Jim Blair, Linda Correll, Frank Gwazdauskas, Kriton Hatzios, Bob Hendricks, Edmund Henneke, Bradley Klein, Ed Lener, Thomas Olson, Rishi Pande, Joe Pitt, and Vijay Singal,

Members Absent: Jim Burger, Jim Jones, Len Peters, and John Tyson

Invited Guest: Ken Miller and Tim Pickering

Others: Melissa Simpkins (Secretary)

1. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved.

2. Approval of Minutes for October 9, 2002:

A motion was made to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. Old Business:

a. Discussion of review procedures for Centers: The Virginia Center for Coal and Energy Research, the Center for Applied Mathematics, and the Center for Gerontology are scheduled to receive their 5 year reviews this year. These are expected to be completed in the spring and then given to the Commission for review.

b. Report on Research Centers and Initiatives at Virginia Tech: Jim Blair presented the Commission with a PowerPoint presentation on Research Centers and Initiatives at Virginia Tech. The presentation explained the roles of Centers in the top-30 goal at Virginia Tech.

The Strategic Plan for Research states that we will enhance the stature of Virginia Tech as an internationally recognized University for research and scholarship, as indicated by competitively awarded extramural support for research, the recognized quality of our faculty's scholarship, and the ranking of our graduate programs.

Some of the reasons that we have Centers are:

- i. Universities are organized around disciplines, but society is concerned about solutions to problems.

- ii. Centers provide a mechanism for faculty to focus knowledge and resources on important problems facing society and industry.
- iii. Center organizations are flexible and can vary over time more rapidly than disciplines.
- iv. They can bring value added to disciplinary efforts.
 - a. Can attract students who would not otherwise come.
 - b. Can attract faculty who would not otherwise come.
 - c. Can attract funding (sponsors)
 - d. Can facilitate interactions among faculty, especially between departments and colleges.
 - e. Can enhance undergraduate research opportunities.
 - f. Can enhance scholarship, publications, and award.
 - g. Can be a source of intellectual property.
 - h. Can lead to spin-off companies.

Virginia Tech has 118 officially recognized centers and institutes. There are many Centers due to varied missions, varied scope, and some are state mandated.

Analysis of various models focusing on return on investment shows that to rapidly grow in NSE expenditures the University must:

- i. Seek the highest possible return on investment in seed funding.
- ii. Consistently reinvest the indirect return in new high return research activities.
- iii. Put as much as possible into the initial investment.
- iv. And, gain the highest possible indirect return for reinvestment (i.e. don't wave IDC or promise matching when not required).

Further analysis of how investments are made would support making enrichment investments in high probability areas in which VT already has a significant base investment and which represent cutting edges of the discipline. Multidisciplinary Centers and Institutes having significant base support in the form of participating faculty from many departments generally meet those criteria and could become a significant focus for future growth if properly managed. However, we must also find ways of continuing our existing base of research at all levels to underpin selected growth areas.

4. New Business: There was no new business.

5. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Melissa Simpkins, Secretary for the Commission on Research

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

December 11, 2002

325 Burruss Hall

3:30 — 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: Jim Blair, Jim Burger, Linda Correll, Frank Gwazdauskas, Rodd Hall (for Edmund Henneke), Bob Hendricks, Bradley Klein, Ed Lener, Thomas Olson, Joe Pitt, and Vijay Singal

Members Absent: David Bevan, Kriton Hatzios, Jim Jones, Rishi Pande, Len Peters, and John Tyson

Invited Guest: Randy Dymond, Mark McNamee, and Tim Pickering

Others: Melissa Simpkins (Secretary)

1. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved.

2. Approval of Minutes for November 13, 2002:

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

3. Old Business: Discussion with Provost Mark McNamee on the Role of New Institutes in University Governance Structure:

Provost McNamee clarified that the Top 30 goal is based on research expenditures in conjunction with the achievement of top rankings of departments and schools that cannot be measured by research expenditures. However, as we are faced with limited resources, university funds will be primarily channeled towards maximization of research expenditures for achievement of the Top 30 goal.

Provost McNamee also explained the structure of the three new Institutes and their relation to the Coordinating Councils. The Institutes are organizing structures to enhance the search for research funding. In the discussion that followed the Provost's presentation some concern was expressed regarding adding additional administrative layers without comparative gain. Since there is no agreement yet on the structure of each Institute, that issue could only be noted at this point. The relation between the Institutes and Commission on Research was also discussed.

4. New Business: There was no new business.

5. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:
Melissa Simpkins, Secretary for the Commission on Research

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

January 22, 2003
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 — 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: David Bevan, Jim Blair, S.K. DeDatta, Frank Gwazdauskas, Bob Hendricks, Mike Hyer (for Edmund Henneke), Jim Jones, Bradley Klein, Ed Lener, Thomas Olson, Rishi Pande, Joe Pitt, and Vijay Singal

Members Absent: Jim Burger, Linda Correll, Kriton Hatzios, and Len Peters

Invited Guest: Randy Dymond and Tim Pickering

Others: Melissa Simpkins (Secretary)

1. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved.

2. Approval of Minutes for December 11, 2002:

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

3. Old Business:

a. Proposal for the Center for Geospatial Information Technology: Randy Dymond presented the Commission with a Charter for the Virginia Tech Center for Geospatial Information Technology (CGIT). Below is the mission statement taken from the Charter:

The Center for Geospatial Information Technology is an institutional focal point for Virginia Tech faculty and staff who specialize in, or use geospatial information technology as an integral component of their research mission. In its primary role as a research center, CGIT generates visibility, procures research funding, and provides technical expertise in the areas of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Global Positions Systems (GPS) applications research. The center seeks to implement partnerships bringing researchers and partners together utilizing the newest and most applicable geospatial information technology tools for solving critical research questions in the Commonwealth and the nation.

Randy Dymond discussed the aspects of internal and external funding, matching faculty strength with funding opportunities, associated faculty, sponsors, and goals.

After discussion with the Commission about funding opportunities, competition between other Centers, and space issues, a motion was made to accept the Charter and forward it to the Vice Provost of Research. The motion was seconded and approved.

- b. Materials Research Institute name change:** Jim Blair reported that there was a request to change the Materials Research Institute name and the Polymers group is looking at possibly reorganization the Center. When this process takes place it will be brought to the Commission for approval.
 - c. Status for the Center for Survey Research:** Jim Blair reported that the Center for Survey Research is now considered a University Service Center and is not required to do financial reporting. The question was raised if the Center is considered a Service Center should it be decommissioned as a University Center. The Commission will continue this discussion during the Centers next 5 year review.
 - d. Status Report on Center Reviews for Spring 2003:** The following Commission member will serve on the Review Boards for the Center reviews: Jim Jones-Center for Gerontology, Tom Olson - Center for Coal & Mineral Processing, and David Bevan — Interdisciplinary Center for Applied Mathematics.
 - e. Status of IP 101:** The Intellectual Property 101 presentation has been placed on hold due to unexpected obligations of the IP 101 members.
 - f. Institute Structures:** Discussion remains open on the subject of new Institutes being established at Virginia Tech. What responsibility does the Commission hold in reviewing Charters for these Institutes? The Chair will go over the University Bylaws and report his findings to the Commission.
- 4. New Business:**
- a.** Tom Dingus — Presentation on the Virginia Tech Institute for Critical Technology.

5. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Melissa Simpkins, Secretary for the Commission on Research

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

February 12, 2003

325 Burruss Hall

3:30 — 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: David Bevan, Jim Blair, Jim Burger, Frank Gwazdauskas, Bob Hendricks, Jim Jones, Skip Jubb (for Kriton Hatzios), Ed Lener, Thomas Olson, Joe Pitt, and Vijay Singal

Members Absent: Linda Correll, S.K. DeDatta, Edmund Henneke, Bradley Klein, Rishi Pande, and Len Peters

Invited Guest: Tim Pickering

Others: Melissa Simpkins (Secretary)

1. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved.

2. Approval of Minutes for January 22, 2003:

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

3. New Business:

a. Presentation on the Institute of Critical Technology and Applied Sciences: Jim Blair presented the Commission with a presentation outlining the responsibilities of the Institute of Critical Technology and Applied Sciences (ICTAS).

The ICTAS goal is to provide an innovative organizational and financial structure that fosters collaboration and substantial growth in the sponsored research activities of promising engineering and science disciplines. It is modeled in many ways like existing large research centers at Virginia Tech, but on an even larger scale and will seek to develop new, multidisciplinary research enterprises with both Centers and Departments across the college.

The first organizational entities that will be part of ICTAS will be the research program associated with the School for Biomedical Engineering, a Information Technology research program, and a developing consortium of faculty that conduct research in the nanosciences and nanotechnology fields. Over 100 new research faculty will be employed full time, 200 GRAs will be funded by ICTAS research, with additional part-time funding for at least 100 students. Almost 400 additional scholarly publications will be generated from ICTAS research each year.

The ICTAS Director will report to the Vice Provost for Research and the Dean of the College of Engineering for day-to-day administrative oversight and the two Academic Coordination Councils as the responsible stakeholder group. The Academic Coordinating Councils will have oversight of finances and strategic directions and may invite outside members to participate in the ECTAS oversight process. ICTAS will also have an Advisory Board consisting of internal and external member to provide advice to the administration on resource investments and approve the selection of new initiatives or significant proposed changes in strategic direction.

Faculty participation will be by proposal invitation and review of business plan, requires Department Head and Dean approval, and a Memorandum of Understanding will be signed by all parties. Entities will be periodically evaluated in terms of research productivity and achievement of the return on investment goals.

4. Old Business:

- a. Center Reviews:** The College of Arts and Sciences will not be able to have the Associate Dean for Research participate in the Center Review for the Interdisciplinary Center for Applied Mathematics. It was recommended that we ask Dean Crofts to designate an alternate.

5. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Melissa Simpkins, Secretary for the Commission on Research

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

March 12, 2003
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 — 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: David Bevan, Jim Blair, Linda Correll, Frank Gwazdauskas, Mike Hyer (for Edmund Henneke), Jim Jones, Ed Lener, Jay Mancini, Rishi Pande, Joe Pitt, Vijay Singal, and Marc Vass

Members Absent: Jim Burger, S.K. DeDatta, Bob Hendricks, Bradley Klein, Thomas Olson, and Len Peters

Invited Guest: Tim Pickering

Others: Melissa Simpkins (Secretary)

1. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved.

2. Approval of Minutes for February 12, 2003:

A motion was made to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. New Business:

a. Nominations of Commission on Research Chair for 2003-04: The Commission discussed how to handle newly established college representatives and moved that individual representatives would continue to serve on the Commission during the next year to allow time for adjusting. A motion was made to approve this decision. The motion was seconded and approved.

Joe Pitt was nominated to serve as the Commission Chair for 2003-04. A motion was made to approve the nomination. The motion was seconded and approved. A Vice Chair will be elected at the first meeting in September 2003

b. Discussion of the role of the Commission on Research: A copy of the Commission's charge was presented to the Commission members. The charge states that the Commission on Research is to study, formulate, and recommend to University Council policies and procedures concerning research. Areas for consideration include: sponsored programs, core programs and interdisciplinary research; intellectual properties; animal care and human subjects; indirect cost and overhead; research facilities, centers, and institutes; library resources; liaison with affiliated corporations and institutes, and other matters that affect research.

The Commission discussed different issues related to indirect cost and overhead distribution. The question was raised as to if the Commission should discuss making recommendations to try and redirect the handling of indirect funds and what was the proper way to handle this issue.

4. Old Business:

Discussion of the Role of Un-sponsored Research: Vijay Singal will discuss the following with the Commission on the role of un-sponsored research: i) highlight the differences between sponsored and un-sponsored research, ii) explain why certain kinds of research are not sponsored, iii) present data on business schools nationwide, and iv) present data on published research that is not funded.

There will be open discussion for the following: i) do we and should we care about un-sponsored research, ii) where does un-sponsored research and colleges/departments that do un-sponsored research fit into the university's Top 30 objective, iii) what should be the criteria for evaluating un-sponsored research, and iv) how do we encourage un-sponsored research?

5. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Melissa Simpkins, Secretary for the Commission on Research

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

April 9, 2003
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 — 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: David Bevan, Frank Gwazdauskas, Bob Hendricks, Edmund Henneke, Jim Jones, Skip Jubb, Ed Lener, Jay Mancini, Thomas Olson, Joe Pitt, Vijay Singal, and Larry Vaughn (for S.K. DeDatta)

Members Absent: Jim Blair, Jim Burger, Linda Correll, Bradley Klein, Rishi Pande, and Marc Vass

Invited Guest: none

Others: Melissa Simpkins (Secretary)

1. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved.

2. Approval of Minutes for March 12, 2003:

A motion was made to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. New Business:

Discussion of the role of research in the College of Business: Vijay Singal made a presentation to the Commission that highlighted the qualitative differences in research conducted at business schools and at engineering schools.

In particular, he explained that business schools do not generate funded research because i) there is limited ability among researchers to create data required for business research, ii) there is limited return to sponsoring firms because the results of business research cannot be patented and are quickly available in the public domain, and iii) there is limited need to route funds through the university because researchers and sponsoring firms do not require university resources to conduct research.

The logic behind little sponsored research in business schools was supported by three pieces of evidence. Vijay showed that the media assign zero weight to sponsored research for ranking business schools whereas they assign 25% weight to sponsored research for ranking engineering schools. Second, a survey revealed that there was very little sponsored research among the top-50 business schools. The median sponsored research for an entire business school was less than \$100,000 in 2002. The minimum and maximum amounts are \$0 and a little over \$3 million. Third, a survey of Finance journal articles showed that few articles were funded by external sources and the overall amount of funding seemed to be small.

There was general support for Vijay's conclusion that the current uniform focus on sponsored research for all colleges should be changed. For the Pamplin College of Business, he suggested that the evaluation criteria include publications in top journals by the faculty, ranking of the MBA program, and ranking of the undergraduate program. Progress on these dimensions should bring in more students, greater success in executive development programs, and higher level of philanthropic contributions. These will also assist in enhancing the reputation of the university.

The Commission will continue to discuss this issue in the next meeting. There was an expectation that other colleges will also present their own perspectives on research for consideration of the Commission.

4. Old Business:

- a. There was no old business.

5. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Melissa Simpkins, Secretary for the Commission on Research