

## COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

October 10, 2007

President's Board Room – 210 Burruss Hall

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** L. Coble, D. Cook, S. K. DeDatta, C. Dawkins, T. Fox, R. Grange, R. Hall, W. Huckle, D. Jones, R. Kapania, K. Miller, K. Roberto, P. Young, R. Veilleux

**Members Absent:** R. Benson, N. Raishevich, A. Ritter, U. Vandsburger

**Invited Guests:** C. Gray, T. Pickering, D. Leo, K. C. Das, S. Schoenholtz

**Others:** D. Nester

- 1. Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved as submitted.
- 2. Introductions:** Robert Grange, Chair
- 3. Elect a Vice-Chair for CoR:** Dr. Huckle said he is willing to be the Vice-Chair. No other nominations made. The motion was moved for Dr. Huckle to act as Vice-Chair of Commission. The motion was seconded and approved.
- 4. Receipt and approval of reports from the two committees that reviewed the Waters Center and the Housing Center – Tim Pickering:** Dr. Grange announced that Dr. Pickering would introduce to the committee the reports from the two committees from last year's Commission that reviewed the Water Center and the Housing Center. Tim pointed out that the committee received a copy of the reports. He said that there is a commission policy on these centers and it requires after every five years there is a review of the center. The main responsibility of the review committee is to determine whether or not the center is meeting its commission statement, whether it should be reauthorized for another period, comment on whether or not the director is doing a effective job, and whether the director should be re-appointed. Tim Pickering gave the procedures of the review.

**Water Center** - What the committee found in its review is that over this five year period the Water Center had been really more focused on what we would call outreach activity than educational activity and a research agenda. It's believed part of that is because of the state and federal funding that they have interaction with the community and all that you can do under the area of water resources. The committee felt that it was going to be a university research center that they would like to see a more robust research program. One of the recommendations was made to the Director, Dr. Stephen Schoenholtz, to see what he could do to make it a more robust research program. The review committee presented a number of other recommendations in the report, recommended overall the university have the Water Center, and was pleased to have Dr. Schoenholtz here to be the Director. Hence, the Water Center should be given authorization to go forward for another five year period.

Tim gave Dr. Schoenholtz, Water Center Director, an opportunity to respond to the report. Dr. Schoenholtz said that the review was initiated before he arrived at Virginia Tech and it was helpful to get the viewpoints from the review team. He sought out as much feedback from the review team as he could to determine where the Water Center had been and what some of the priorities should be.

Given the transition of oversight from the Office of Research to the College of Natural Resources, Hall questioned whether the Water Center was still a university center. He suggested that the commission vote on approval of the report pending the decision from the Provost about the status of the Water Center as a university center.

The motion was moved to accept the review and its recommendations. The motion was seconded and approved. (*Subsequent to the meeting Provost McNamee confirmed that the center should be a university center, although the director reports to Dean Kelly*).

**Housing Center** - Ms. Gray gave the overview for the Housing Center. Ms. Gray gave the background of the review process. The committee recommends that the Housing Center be continued. One of the final recommendations was that the Housing Center host a campus-wide housing symposium as a way to seek out other faculty and people associated with housing. This may be an opportunity to create new partnerships and funding.

Casey Dawkins, Housing Center Director, made some comments and announced he has been the director for 18 months, 2 years in January, 2008.

The motion was moved to approve this report and its recommendations. The motion was seconded and approved.

Dr. Grange thanked all the members of the committee and Dr. Pickering for organizing, collecting, and assimilating the information for these reports.

**5. Report on VT Centers to be reviewed this year; discussion of schedule; call for review committee members – Tim Pickering:**

The Commission received a list of university centers that have not been reviewed in the last five years. There was discussion about which centers actually fall under the purview of COR. Once some further definition is provided by the administration on which centers should be reviewed under the COR umbrella, the Commission will determine which centers it wants to review this year. Dr. Grange will work with Tim Pickering to develop a proposed schedule.

**6. Schedule and letter of request for submission of Charters from each of three VT institutes for approval by CoR – background information – Rodd Hall:**

Mr. Hall provided background on the charter process for the three newest university institutes – ICTAS, IBPHS, and ISCE. There have been several occasions when the process commenced, but was not completed. There were two main reasons for the delay:

- a) institute administrators have been hesitant to submit a charter without a director being in place
- b) COR has been hesitant to review only one of the charters without reviewing all three.

Dr. Grange indicated that he had contacted ICTAS about having its charter reviewed at the COR meeting in November. If there is any indication from the university administration that this is unnecessary, the review will be cancelled. (*Post-meeting note: The ICTAS charter review will take place in November*).

## **7. Changes in the Office of Research – emphasis on service to VT faculty - Rodd Hall:**

Dr. Grange asked Mr. Hall to give an overview of the changes envisioned for the Office of Research under Dr. Walters' leadership. He said that the major intent is to get away from the conflicts that have happened between colleges and the Office of Research in the past. The two major themes for the office will be customer service and research partnership. Mr. Hall will be primarily responsible for the customer service focus and Dr. Inzana will be responsible for research partnerships. Hall's team, including Sponsored Programs, VTIP, and the Proposal Development team will work to directly serve the university community, providing proactive service from concept to the marketing of intellectual property. Dr. Inzana will be working with center directors and stakeholders to assure that the Office is working in concert with the academic units to facilitate new and existing research. The overriding goal of the office is to enable research, not control research.

## **8. Other Business**

### **a. Topics for Commission business over the course of the year?**

Robert Grange sent out an email of the two or three things that the Commission might consider during the course of the year. So far he has not received any suggestions but he has some and they are:

1. Library resources. They are underfunded. They have done a remarkable job but, he thinks, especially if we are going to have a joint medical school with Carilion that our library resources need to improve dramatically.
2. Office of Sponsored Programs performance.
3. Vivaria Cost Center. With the new Vivarium coming on-line in the life sciences building in early 2008, determinations need to be made about how the services are going to be paid for. Follow up is needed from committee work that initiated the process of a centralized service center last year.
4. A review of the lobbying effort of Virginia Tech at the Federal level.

## **9. Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

## COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

November 14, 2007

325 Burruss Hall

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** L. Coble, D. Cook, C. Dawkins, D. Dean, R. Grange, W. Huckle, D. Jones, R. Kapania, K. Roberto, J. Stewart, R. Veilleux, R. Walters, P. Young,

**Members Absent:** R. Benson, S. K. De Datta, T. Fox, R. Hall, T. Herdman, K. Miller, N. Raishevich, U. Vandsburger

**Invited Guests:** T. Pickering, C. Thompson, Sharon Barrett

**Others:** D. Nester

- 1. Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved as submitted.
- 2. Approval of the minutes for CoR meeting October 10, 2007:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved.
- 3. ICTAS charter (Christie Thompson, PE Associate Director for Administration Institute for Critical Technology and Applied Science):** R. Grange introduced Christie Thompson, and indicated she would answer any questions or comments committee members might have. C. Thompson declined to make an opening statement and said the charter could stand as written. The floor was open to questions and discussion of the ICTAS charter. D. Dean and K. Roberto suggested ISCE should be added to the list of clients served by ICTAS. K. Roberto asked about the required detail in a Charter. R. Grange said that Policies 3020 and 13005 indicated that significant detail was required. There was discussion on the funding section of the ICTAS Charter. R. Grange suggested that under the funding category, that Christie provide a brief forecast and detail the expected extramural funding in the Charter. There was a question about how or if overhead from funding flowed through from the home departments of faculty associated with ICTAS. R. Grange suggested that under the Research Focus, a qualifying statement be added to indicate that this would only be money directly associated with ICTAS. C. Thompson indicated that if the overhead was from one of Director Mahajan's projects, then that overhead would come to ICTAS because ICTAS pays his salary. Unless the funding is associated with someone ICTAS hires who is the PI, then no overhead comes to ICTAS.

There was some discussion on the employees depending on the Institute. R. Grange said that it would be helpful to be more detailed. Specifically, to indicate which employees depending on the institute would be displaced if the Center were terminated. This should include information about the employees directly dependent on salary from the institute, and those supported from outside the institute. Salary and fringe benefit information should be noted.

R. Grange thanked Christie Thompson for bringing the Charter together so quickly.

After Ms. Thompson left, the commission discussed various needed revisions to the charter; these are summarized below.

Requested revisions:

- Add the date the Institute was established and the date the Charter was approved (for the latter, use February 13, 2008)
- Under Nature of the Groups Involved, in addition to the affiliated and associated faculty and the ICTAS faculty fellows, add the core faculty of the institute
- Add ISCE to list of clients served by ICTAS
- Under Other prospective intramural/extramural funding, provide a brief forecast for and detail of the expected extramural funding
- Under Employees depending on the Institute who would be displaced if the Center were terminated, include information about the employees directly dependent on salary from the Institute, and those supported from outside the institute. Include salary and fringe benefit information.
- Briefly describe the function/role of each employee
- Under Qualifications of Director, include the advertisement used most recently to hire Dr. Mahajan to clarify the director qualifications

R. Grange asked for a motion to approve the ICTAS charter with suggested revisions. A motion was made and seconded to approve the ICTAS charter with suggested changes. Motion carried.

- 4. Response to request from Dr. Bob Walters to provide feedback on university research organization:** R. Walters announced that he wanted to have an open discussion on organizational structure on where we are now and where we are going five and ten years from now. R. Walters wants to know how we can help the centers more. Since we are trying to grow interdisciplinary research, there might be some opportunities for the Office of Vice President for Research to provide more support. One concern is that there are so many centers and that there is overlap. It is not apparent that they communicate with one another. R. Walters mentioned that communication and networking are on his list and would appreciate ideas from the CoR to improve these aspects.

R. Grange mentioned that the CoR has a specific charge to be responsible in giving advice to R. Walters, the Provost and the President on all aspects of research on campus. How can we do that with the huge institutes other than put a member on the review committee? K. Roberto said that the newest institutes are different because they are designed on a return on investment model. A primary purpose of these new Centers is to support and facilitate research projects with various amounts of funding. D. Dean commented that IBPHS was a faculty driven creation out of Dr. Meszaros cross cutting initiatives. Faculty were appointed to look at the possibilities, and from this analysis, IBPHS was created. D. Dean said that his responsibility as a director is to bring some focus and direction to that the goals of IBPHS. D. Dean said that the object of these centers and institutes is to enrich the whole enterprise by bringing in good research to the campus. There was more open discussion. R. Walters said that

there may be a different structure on the reviews than it just being all on the CoR committee.

R. Walters appreciated all the discussion. He will go over this topic with the President and see if he will need to come back and talk to the committee again.

- 5. Other Business:** W. Huckle asked who was the Research Integrity Officer? R. Walters let them know that Tom Inzana is in that role.

R. Walters announced that in the NSF tables, we moved up two places in the research rankings. We are number 54. NSF also has a separate table that list colleges without medical schools. We ranked 13<sup>th</sup> in that category.

R. Grange announced at our next meeting, December 5, he will ask Eileen Hitchingham, Dean of Libraries, to come and give a presentation.

- 6. Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 4:50pm.

## COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

December 5, 2007

325 Burruss Hall

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** L. Coble, D. Cook, C. Dawkins, D. Dean, R. Grange, R. Hall, T. Herdman, W. Huckle, D. Jones, R. Kapania, K. Miller, K. Roberto, R. Veilleux, P. Young,

**Members Absent:** R. Benson, S. K. De Datta, T. Fox, N. Raishevich, U. Vandsburger

**Invited Guests:** T. Pickering, E. Hitchingham

**Others:** D. Nester

- 1. Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved as submitted.
- 2. Approval of the minutes for CoR meeting November 14, 2007:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as amended.
- 3. Report by Dean Eileen Hitchingham on the current status of the library; discussion to follow:** R. Grange introduced Dean E. Hitchingham. E. Hitchingham thanked the committee for the invitation to report on the status of the Library. E. Hitchingham provided handouts of the Library's annual report. She presented the current operations of the library, their present and future needs, and the members of the commission discussed these points. R. Grange asked what the major limitations were and how might the commission help. E. Hitchingham indicated there had been a steady increase in funds since Dr. McNamee became the Provost, but to provide current services and institute new ones, would require additional funds to move the VT library from its current 8<sup>th</sup> percentile status among its peers, to the 30<sup>th</sup> percentile. She asked that the members talk to their Deans and emphasize the importance of more support for the library. She also mentioned that with the proposed medical school starting up, that the library likely will need additional resources, and this is yet another challenge to the already strained library budget.

Other key points included:

- a. An increase of \$500K per year was still not enough to move the library services forward because of the difference in the US dollar/Euro exchange.
- b. It would be helpful for Department Heads and Deans to include money in start up packages to account for the library research needs of new faculty hires.
- c. A Faculty survey on Library use and satisfaction would be coming soon.

R. Grange said the committee will look at the issues raised by Dean Hitchingham and see how best to help. R. Grange thanked Dean Hitchingham for her report.

- 4. Update on status of the Animal Cost Center – Rodd Hall:** R. Hall reported that the cost center process is still being developed. One question to answer is to what

degree should the institution subsidize to keep the per diem rates reasonable. One proposal is to centralize all resources and then provide services across the campus. There is a need to demonstrate to the deans, how prices will ramp up and what strategies are available to subsidize. There was some discussion. R. Hall reported that the first plan, the “Ferrari” plan, was to make sure services were up to par. Since that plan was first considered, the administrative structure for the cost center was reduced. A key need was a good business manager to centralize the system so it is competitive with our peers.

**5. Brief update on proposed Center Charters/reviews:** The centers charters reviews listed:

- a. IBPHS – Institute for Biomedical and Public Health Sciences; Charter (TBD)
- b. ISCE - Institute for Society, Culture and Environment; Charter (Feb, 2008)
- c. MII - Macromolecules and Interfaces Institute; Review (Fall, 2009)
- d. VCCER – Virginia Center for Coal and Energy Research; Review (Fall 2008)
- e. Fralin Biotechnology Center; Review (TBD)
- f. CGIT – Center for Geospatial Information Technology; Review (Fall, 2008)
- g. VTTI – Virginia Tech Transportation Institute; Review (TBD)

K. Roberto asked when the Center for Gerontology was up for review since it was not listed. T. Pickering said that it should be up for review in a couple of years.

**6. Discussion and recommendations for amendment to Policy 3020; re: to whom do Directors of University Centers report:** There was some discussion on this. R. Grange suggested the policy should be followed. D. Dean suggested that M. McNamee address the group again on this. R. Hall reported that insight from M. McNamee via R. Walters that the institutes be held to a higher standard than in policy 3020. The higher standards are approved through the stakeholders. R. Hall asked the committee to look at Policy 3020 and see what the inconsistencies are and write what should be changed. President is to talk with the institutes and tell them how they work and the requirements. R. Hall said the committee should move forward to fix Policy 3020 to be consistent with Policy 13005. R. Grange asked the committee to look the policies over and make suggestions. This will carry over to the next meeting.

**7. Other Business:** There was no other business.

**8. Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 5:05pm.



## COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

February 13, 2008

325 Burruss Hall

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** L. Coble, D. Dean, S. K. De Datta, T. Fox, R. Grange, R. Hall, T. Herdman, W. Huckle, D. Jones, R. Kapania, K. Miller, K. Roberto, U. Vandsburger, R. Veilleux, P. Young,

**Members Absent:** R. Benson, D. Cook, C. Dawkins, N. Raishevich, B. Vogelaar, R. Walters

**Invited Guests:** S. Muse

**Others:** D. Nester

- 1. Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved with one amendment. There would be no review of the (revised) ICTAS charter at this meeting as the charter had not yet been submitted to the Commission.
- 2. Approval of the minutes for CoR meetings November 14, 2007 (amended) and December 5, 2007:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved.

Rodd Hall introduced Sandra Muse and indicated that since Dr. Tim Pickering had retired, Sandra would be attending in his place.

- 3. Review of the Charter for the Institute for Society, Culture and Environment (ISCE):** R. Grange opened the floor for discussion of the ISCE charter. Karen Roberto, Director of ISCE, was present to answer questions and receive comments. The committee discussed the charter and offered a few suggestions. K. Roberto will provide some clarification and make changes to the charter per the recommendations of the committee. R. Grange asked K. Roberto if she would please leave the meeting to give the committee time to vote on the approval of the charter. R. Grange commented that the charter was fluid and well written with few issues. The members agreed. L. Coble and S. K. DeDatta had some suggestions on the flow of the organizational chart. They will forward their suggestions to R. Grange.

A motion was made to accept the charter with amendments and seconded. The charter with amendments was approved.

**Amendment of Policy 3020:** The Commission discussed Section 4.0 of Policy 3020, and agreed this section of the policy should be amended to resolve a conflict that existed regarding University Centers and newly established University Institutes. Specifically, the concern was, "...the Chair of the Stakeholders Committee shall not be the Administrator to whom the Center Director reports." (Section 4.0 Definitions Re: A University Center..., Policy 3020), As indicated in the ICTAS and ISCE Charters, both Director Roop Mahajan of ICTAS and Director Karen Roberto of

ISCE report to their respective deans (Dean Benson, ICTAS; Dean Ott Rowlands, ISCE). Both deans are also chairs of the respective institute stakeholder committees, and hence, the conflict with Policy 3020. A suggestion was made to amend this section of Policy 3020 with the clause, “unless an exception is otherwise approved by the Provost.”

R. Grange will draft a letter and send to the Commission for comments and suggestions. He will explore who in administration he needs to send it to.

4. **Invitation to Ms. Linda Bucy to attend next CoR meeting (Rob Grange):** R. Grange announced that he will send an invitation to Ms. Linda Bucy to attend the next CoR meeting to discuss OSP.

W. Huckle said that he would like to have someone to come and talk to the committee about the Carilion Medical Institute. R. Hall informed them that he could talk with them on this at the April meeting.

5. **Other Business:** No other business.
6. **Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm.

## COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

March 12, 2008

325 Burruss Hall

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** L. Coble, D. Cook, T. Fox, R. Grange, R. Hall, W. Huckle, K. Miller, K. Roberto, R. Veilleux, P. Young,

**Members Absent:** R. Benson, D. Dean, S. K. De Datta, C. Dawkins, T. Herdman, D. Jones, R. Kapania, N. Raishevich, U. Vandsburger, B. Vogelaar, R. Walters

**Invited Guests:** S. Muse, L. Bucy

**Others:** D. Nester

- 1. Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved as submitted.
- 2. Approval of the minutes for CoR meetings February 13, 2008:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as amended.
- 3. Review of the revised ICTAS Charter:** R. Grange opened the floor for discussion of the revised ICTAS charter. He reported that the revised charter covered all the revisions in the letter to R. Mahajan, with just a few minor revisions required. K. Roberto asked for ISCE be named in the charter on page 4 with the other institutes.

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

- 4. Review of the revised ISCE Charter:** R. Grange opened the floor for discussion of the revised ISCE charter. He reported that the revised charter covered all the revisions in the letter to K. Roberto, with only minor revisions required.

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

- 5. Amendment of Policy 3020:** R. Grange thanked everyone for their comments and suggestions on the letter that was drafted and sent to Provost M. McNamee and Associate Provost D. Hanna.

**a. Response from Provost re: proposed amendment to Policy 3020:** R. Grange received a signed acceptance from the Provost for the proposed amendment. The actual amendment is taken care of by Associate Provost D. Hanna. The CoR's role is complete.

**b. Need a statement for appendix in University Institute Charters (re: exception to 3020 Policy, Section 4 approved by Provost). Suggestion: "The Provost has**

approved the following exception to Policy 3020, Centers Financial and Administrative Policy and Procedures, Section 4, Definitions, for the Institute for Critical Technology and Applied Science (ICTAS): the director of ICTAS, Dr. Roop Mahajan, will report to Dr. Richard Benson, Dean College of Engineering, who is both administrator and chair of the stakeholders committee.” Signed... **Provost Mark McNamee. (suggestions welcome). Similar statement for ISCE.** R. Grange suggested that for the ICTAS and ISCE charters, there would be a statement in an appendix signed by the Provost indicating that there had been an approval of a change in the policy i.e., that a director of an institute can report to an administrator who is also a chair of the stakeholders committee. R. Grange drafted in the agenda a statement to that affect. He asked if the committee had any changes to the statement. The committee did not have any changes. R. Grange will forward this to the Provost and D. Hanna for their approval and then get the Provost’s signature on the statement for each respective institute. R. Grange asked for a motion to approve the draft statement for the approval of the Provost for exception to 3020.

A motion was made to accept the draft memo and seconded and approved.

6. **Ms. Linda Bucy, Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Programs Administration:** R. Grange welcomed Ms. Bucy. L. Bucy opened by saying that she appreciates the opportunity to be here. She started off by giving an update on what is going on in Sponsored Programs. She indicated the commission should be aware of some new issues, but would first give an overview of The Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP). OSP really tries to adhere to their mission to provide the best possible service that they can to our faculty and staff as they pursue external funding, and to monitor and administer those awards once received. She showed proposals increased from 2006 and 2007, and indicated the number of proposals would likely be even greater in 2008. L. Bucy said that OSP have 45 people including her on staff.

L. Bucy reported that they are modifying procedures to become more efficient, both for their and the faculty’s benefit. For example, the 60 day notification that a grant or contract is ending has been automated. In addition, a new system developed in-house will allow tracking of cost sharing budgets. OSP is putting the budgets into the system and downloading expenses from the banner warehouse. This change should enable production of electronic PANs.

Something else new is that OSP/University is working with Sunguard HE (which was SCT), the company who own Banner or administrative systems. OSP is working with them to improve all research modules. Virginia Tech will be a beta test site. This modification should provide for electronic approvals using a workflow application. The modules are scheduled to come out in October of 2008. Virginia Tech will probably not put them into effect until Spring 2009 to accommodate the various administrative cycles such as student and financial cycles when doing upgrades to Banner. Also coming out with this modification, is on-line labor redistributions that your department fiscal people work with. Part of this research enhancement is a PI portal so that researchers can go out and find reports. L. Bucy said they are still getting suggestions on what should be on the portal. If you have suggestions on

things you would like to see on the portal that will be helpful to you, please let her know.

L. Bucy said they are going to have a customer service advisory board to identify and resolve issues, and hopefully, to help explain the OSP process. L. Bucy suggested that a baseline survey be conducted.

L. Bucy mentioned their training modules. OSP has a research certificate program mainly geared toward fiscal staff and business managers. OSP is looking to convert these to an on-line format so that they can design more specialized training programs.

Two hot topics with more information coming for the faculty are:

1. NIH Pub Med Requirement. If you have any NIH funding, any of your reviewed articles that have been published on or after April 7 that result from this funding, must be deposited into the Pub Med Repository. L. Bucy described what this means and that additional information would be forthcoming. L. Coble mentioned that this is different from Pub Med Central. The library is looking to see if there is something that they can do to help with this. W. Huckle mentioned that this affects the publishers more than the faculty. L. Bucy mentioned that you have to watch the copyright language. OSP is not clear yet on how NIH is going to handle the copyright issue..

2. NSF Competes Law. This came out of a NSF appropriation bill and right now NSF is reviewing the implications. This is not something NSF asked for, but something that the government gave them. It states, if you have NSF funded projects, you are required to provide training to all involved undergraduates, graduates, and post doctoral students on the responsible conduct of research. Also, there is a mentoring component, but it is anticipated this will not be a problem, as faculty are doing this anyway. The impact of this law was mentioned at the COGR meeting. Dr. Tom Inzana, Research Integrity Officer, is aware of this issue and sees it as the Ethics of Responsible Research Conduct. This was discussed by the commission.

L. Bucy mentioned that they have a budget template. They are working to put in a gold sleeve feature, so if an item is changed in one place, it will be updated throughout the budget. This is a tool not a requirement.

T. Fox complimented the Office of Sponsored Programs for their service.

7. **Other Business:** R. Grange asked for new business. He has two items to mention. There is one more meeting of this year in April. Hopefully at that meeting we can vote for the chair of the next year. In that regard, he requests that you send nominations either for yourself or others. R. Grange asked the commission to email him their suggestions so that he can bring the nominations forward at the next meeting.

The second thing to think about is come up with two or three topics to consider for next year. He has a few that he will share with you.

R. Grange asked for any other business. R. Hall will talk about the Carilion Medical School at the next meeting. K. Roberto asked if we will be seeing the IBPHS charter this year. R. Hall said that it is probably fair to ask them for something early next year instead of in April.

**8. Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 4:26pm.

## COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

April 9, 2008  
325 Burruss Hall  
3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** L. Coble, D. Dean, S. K. De Datta, C. Dawkins, R. Grange, R. Hall, W. Huckle, D. Jones, K. Miller, K. Roberto, R. Veilleux, P. Young,

**Members Absent:** R. Benson, D. Cook, T. Fox, T. Herdman, R. Kapania, N. Raishevich, U. Vandsburger, B. Vogelaar, R. Walters

**Invited Guests:** S. Muse, D. Leo

**Others:** C. Montgomery, D. Nester

- 1. Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved as submitted.
- 2. Approval of the minutes for CoR meetings March 12, 2008:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as amended.
- 3. Update on Provost statement of approval for exception to Policy 3020 for University Centers:** R. Grange reported that he sent the two charters recommended for approval (ICTAS and ISCE) to the Provost yesterday. For each charter an appendix was added with a statement for the Provost to sign indicating that he has made an exception to section 4 of Policy 3020, (i.e., that the director of an institute can report to the dean of the respective college who is also the chair of the stakeholders' committee). We have one charter review left which will be done next year.

Dr. Grange mentioned before R. Hall's presentation that he has one item under other business for today's agenda. At the Faculty Senate meeting yesterday he received a request for a resolution from the Commission on Faculty Affairs to be reviewed by the Commission on Research. This resolution was passed to the commission members later in the meeting.

- 4. Status of VT-Carilion Medical School and Research Institute:** R. Hall gave a review of the Medical School and Research Institute. R. Hall reported that this initiative was unveiled in January 2007. The Governor has been very supportive of this as an economic development issue. The purpose was to create a medical school that leverages the strengths of Carilion Clinic and Virginia Tech to establish Southwestern Virginia as a site for high quality, advanced medical care with an emphasis on research and education. The objectives are to improve the region's healthcare, create economic growth and improve Virginia Tech's research stature. In talking about the region's healthcare, this refers to talking about bringing in high flying doctors that will enable the VT-Carilion Medical School to become a medical destination like Wake Forest. Virginia Tech will greatly benefit from the research resources that the research institute will generate.

R. Hall said that it is very important to understand that the purpose of the new medical school is not to solve a physician shortage in Southwest Virginia. Rather, the emphasis is on improving the health care of Southwest Virginia by having a medical education program that encourages people to come into Southwest Virginia. They don't anticipate that our students will stay in the area.

R. Hall said that the facility is a \$59 million building and this is where the governor comes in. R. Hall reported that the state veto session is April 23 and that is where the capital part of the budget is going to be finalized. The location will be in Roanoke, VA. It is hoped that the Medical School building will be open by the time the first class enrolls (2010 is target). The medical school is going to be a private school. It will not be giving a Virginia Tech degree. The diploma will say Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine. The research component is going to be a part of Virginia Tech as any other institute. The medical school will be a four year program. Research will be a major component.

R. Hall reported that the medical school will have board members comprised of an equal number of Virginia Tech and Carilion representatives and three external members. The restructuring act made it possible for us to have the partnership with a private entity. He reported that the accreditation is being done by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME). This is a private organization that is supported by AMA. Pricewaterhouse Coopers will lead the effort to obtain this accreditation.

R. Hall reported that the teaching at the medical school will be done by Virginia Tech faculty, Carilion Clinic doctors, and a minimal number of dedicated faculty at the medical school. The delivery will be in small blocks ("problem-based learning") and not via traditional didactic teaching. Years 1-2 will require approximately 13,000 compensated hours.

R. Hall reported that the Research Institute is exciting. Dr. Roop Mahajan has been named Director of the Research Institute to get it moving quickly and make sure that Virginia Tech was the driving force behind this. Dennis Dean is the Associate Director of the institute. The institute director will report to the provost and the board of directors, not the dean of the medical school. He reported that approximately 40 proven research teams will be hired. The teams need to have the strengths that will provide synergy with existing Virginia Tech or Carilion faculty members.

R. Hall reported that the start-up packages will likely be significant to induce researchers. The current plan is to pay them 100% their first year with the institute. Then they would be responsible for bringing in their own salary proportioned as it goes down in the next couple of years. The total start-up package for a team of researchers that will be coming in is about \$1.5M. The optimistic projections are that there will be stabilization in the research institute financials in 2014. This is because we are getting a free building.



R. Hall asked if there were any questions. D. Dean reported that Dr. Mahajan is going to concentrate on the programmatic aspects and he will be leading on what we will want to put in to this infrastructure. A question was asked on the construction money was in a bond that has to be voted by the people or did that get through on the budget. R. Hall said that it will not be in a bond that is voted by the people. It will be in a higher education type bond that does not require voters. The committee had discussion on the research faculty and teaching faculty. R. Hall said that the forty research teams will not have tenure with dollars behind them. That is a new philosophy. The research institute director will be evaluating them.

R. Grange thanked R. Hall for giving the presentation on the VT-Carilion Medical School and Research Institute.

**5. Nominations and election for Chair of Commission on Research for 2008-2009:**

R. Grange requested nominations and then a vote for the chair for the Commission on Research for 2008-2009 year. Dr. Grange nominated Bill Huckle. B. Huckle agreed to stand for nomination. Dr. Grange asked for any other nominations. There were none.

A motion was made to accept B. Huckle for chair for 2008-2009. It was seconded and approved.

**6. Nominations and election for Vice-Chair of Commission on Research for 2008-2009:** R. Grange requested nominations and then a vote for the vice chair for the Commission on Research for 2008-2009 year. Dr. Grange nominated Laurie Coble. L. Coble agreed to stand for nomination. There were no other nominations.

A motion was made to accept L. Coble for vice chair for 2008-2009. It was seconded and approved.

**7. Commission items for next year?**

Suggestions:

- a. IBPHS (Fralin...) review
- b. Library – budget; open source publishing vs. existing journals and impact on tenure – VT's status in the 8<sup>th</sup> percentile is discouraging for an institute that is soon to have a medical school affiliation and a research institute among other institutes. This message needs to be brought to the faculty.
- c. Animal Cost Center – status; effect on researchers' budgets R. Grange asked for brief update on this. R. Hall gave a brief update. He reported that Research met with the deans of the associated colleges about two months ago. The question is whether or not we build a centralized management structure for this new capability we have as we add the Vivarium in Integrated Life Sciences and Life Science 1. There will probably be triple the amount of animal space. At this time Veterinary Medicine independently manages its own animal care facilities. Do we start from scratch and build an infrastructure and charge accordingly or do we

turn it over to Veterinary Medicine and let them manage it marginally? Right now it looks like it will go through Veterinary Medicine and run marginally. This will probably be better for the faculty who are bearing those costs. R. Hall reported that Sharon Barrett is working on a new cost study as opposed to the cost study that was done previously with centralized management structure.

R. Grange said that the original committee that was charged with coming up with those ideas be reconvened so that all the information can be shared. Also, to make sure that all the concerns originally identified can be addressed.

R. Hall reported that the provisional rates are on the Office of Sponsored Programs web site.

d. Defining role of Commission on Research. R. Grange suggested that the role of the Commission on Research be more clearly defined and that this information be archived/posted where it can be readily accessed by the members of future Commissions on Research as well as faculty, staff and administrators.

e. Other?

**8. Other Business:** R. Grange introduced the topic for other business mentioned earlier in the meeting. It is a resolution from the Commission on Faculty Affairs that addresses the problem of a removal of a lead investigator from a project. The resolution was discussed yesterday in the Faculty Senate. R. Grange brought up the issue that there was a policy on misconduct and research that the Commission on Research had drawn up under the federal guidelines last year. It is now a policy. R. Grange passed out the first page of that policy. R. Grange thought they had covered all the elements of misconduct in that particular document. He said evidently we did not. They have asked the Commission on Research to look at this resolution and vote on it today so they could move it to University Council next week.

R. Grange said the issue as he understands it, is that the administration can request that a lead investigator (i.e., PI) can be removed from a project for a number of different reasons. Examples include inappropriate use of funds and incapacity. There is no protection for the faculty member in the handbook. R. Grange said that he thinks this is what it is designed to do. R. Grange gave the committee some time to read it over.

R. Grange said that he told Hardus Odendaal, Vice President of the Faculty Senate, that we did not have enough time to look the resolution over, discuss it and vote. R. Grange said that he would bring it to the Commission but he did not feel that we would be ready to vote on it. R. Grange asked that the committee take it with them and that it be sent out to the other members of the commission and they read over the page on misconduct in research which defines what this covers. This differs from what this new resolution will cover. R. Grange asked the committee if it would be

reasonable to vote on it by email? K. Roberto said that this does not look different. The committee had discussion on this resolution. R. Grange said that our role is to raise the questions the commission has in a formal way and let Hardus Odendaal know that the commission is not comfortable with the way it is written. There are some points that are not clear. R. Grange asked that the commission to send him their questions and comments and he will forward them to H. Odendaal.

R. Grange asked that they also send him new agenda items for next year. It was mentioned that the CGIT will be reviewed next year. Also, the Center for Housing Research and Metropolitan Institute are proposing a new collaborative structure. R. Hall mentioned that the Macromolecules and Interfaces Institute at Virginia Tech (MII) is up for their 5 year review. R. Grange said that he does not see in the policy where the Commission on Research is responsible to run those reviews. He did see where they should have a member on the review committee and see the report. R. Grange said that we should define this and archive it.

The committee members thanked R. Grange for chairing the committee this year.

**9. Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm.