

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

November 11, 2009

325 Burruss Hall

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: J. Ball, L. Coble, D. Cook, D. Dean, S. K. De Datta, J. de la Garza, R. Hall, T. Herdman, W. Huckle, T. Inzana, D. Jones, J. Jones, K. Miller, S. Samavedi, R. Siegle, R. Veilleux, P. Young,

Members Absent: R. Benson, T. Fox, R. Jensen, B. Laing, S. Martin

Others: S. Muse, C. Montgomery

1. Approval of Agenda: A motion to approve the agenda was offered by D. Veilleux and seconded by L. Coble and carried.

2. Approval of the minutes for CoR meetings October 14, 2009: R. Hall read the insert that he requested to be substituted under item 3: Quarterly Expenditures Report. All were in favor of the change and a motion to approve the minutes as amended was offered by R. Siegle and seconded by R. Veilleux and carried.

3. Report from Library Committee: P. Young reported that a team had been formed to work on the library's portion of the university's strategic plan review. The strategies of the plan included developing collections, developing programs for information literacy, and repurposing physical space in the library. A report was developed and the main action recommended was to measure and compare library funding. P. Young reported that this year, the library budget is \$14.9 million, however, in order to bring us up to the 30th percentile of our peers, that amount would have to be \$23 million. The committee also recommended instituting a student library fee for 2010-2011 of \$50 per semester which would increase library funding to \$18 million. Other recommendations include an increase in library endowments, and the establishment of FDI workshops for on-line library resources.

P. Young reported that we had exceeded the original Capital Campaign fundraising goal of \$6 million by receiving a total of \$6.9 million. The library now has 13 collection endowments. B. Huckle asked about the income generated from those endowments. P. Young later reported that the total came to about \$125,000.

4. Virginia Center for Coal & Energy Research (VCCER) Review: S. Muse reported that she had been in contact with the chair of the review committee and that their report should be ready for our next meeting in December.

5. Virginia Tech Transportation Institute (VTTI) Director Review: R. Hall shared a draft outline for the review process of institute and center directors. R. Hall explained that reviewing the director separate from the center or institute is a new component of the center/institute review process. With this new process, there will be two outputs of center reviews: recommendation for continuation of the center/institute; and

recommendation for continuation of the director. Therefore, there will also be two separate committees reviewing the center/institute and the director.

R. Hall explained that a survey is currently under development for the review of center/institute directors. The Office of University Organizational and Leadership Development will assist us with the design and conduct of this survey instrument. R. Hall explained that the survey is referred to as a '360 Review' which is a copyrighted term and is completed by one's peers. A three-person committee composed of two elected members of the Commission on Research and one ex-officio (representative from the Office of Research) will be appointed to constitute the Personnel Committee. Our current Personnel Committee members are J. de la Garza, R. Jensen, and R. Hall (ex-officio). The results of the review will not be available to the entire Commission, but to the personnel committee only. R. Hall explained that once the survey results have been collected and reviewed, the Personnel Committee will provide a list of strengths and weaknesses to the Vice President for Research. It is to be understood that the committee will not make a recommendation regarding the director's continued service; but will simply provide the results of the review. The VP for Research will then review the results with the chair of the stakeholders committee and make a decision regarding the reappointment of the director.

R. Hall asked for recommendations regarding the Personnel Committee. S. Muse inquired if those two Personnel committee members from the Commission would be limited to be tenure-track faculty. R. Hall made the recommendation that they did not have to be. K. Miller suggested that a stakeholder or member from that field participate on the Personnel committee and share their expertise/knowledge in that area. R. Hall stated that the Vice President for Research would consult with the stakeholders chair as part of the final review process.

R. Hall reported that Tom Dingus, Director of VTTI, had requested to be the first person reviewed. There are also two other centers that are up for review. R. Hall explained that the goal was for the Center review and the Director review to be done separately. However for the two centers under review this year, they would be done concurrently. R. Hall estimated that the surveys for director reviews will commence in January after the semester break.

6. Macromolecules & Interfaces Institute (MII) Review: S. Muse reported that T. Inzana has notified MII that the Commission is ready for their review. The packet requesting submission of required materials has been sent, and recommendations for review committee members have been received from the director. T. Inzana reported that he anticipates that committee will be convened by beginning of January.

7. Center for Peace Studies & Violence Prevention Center Charter: The Peace Center charter was submitted to the Commission by Center Director Jerzy Nowak. S. Muse explained that the center is currently assigned to report through the Institute of Society and Culture and Environment (ISCE). S. Muse explained that they had been in operation for a year developing their mission, staffing, and collaborations with other colleges and groups and had received a small operational budget. Thus, they have generated an annual report prior to being chartered. S. Muse explained that the

Director of ISCE, Karen Roberto, has requested that the Commission review their charter as an official entity.

R. Hall suggested that reviewing centers that are located administratively within institutes is not consistent with the Commission's mission. T. Herdman stated that after his review of the charter, he did not feel that research was the primary goal of the center, and thus it did not fit the definition of a university research center. B. Huckle stated that the center does not identify with a college or department. T. Inzana stated that research did not appear to be the primary aim in the vision of the center. B. Huckle agreed and stated that the goals of the center appear to be more outreach or educational based, not research based. R. Veilleux stated that the relationship between ISCE and the Peace Center is vague.

It was the sense of the Commission that the center is more outreach-based than research-based and therefore it recommendation that the center charter be reviewed by the Commission on Outreach. B. Huckle offered to draft a letter to J. Nowak with the recommendation that the charter be reviewed by the Commission on Outreach.

8. Center for Human-Computer Interaction (CHCI) review: B. Huckle stated that a formal request from the Chair of Computer Sciences was received to review the CHCI center and the director. Even though the center was most recently reviewed in 2006, B. Huckle explained that the principal participants of the center appear to be largely from the Department of Computer Science. The chair of CS questions the interdisciplinary nature of the center, and thus the need for it to be a University Center. T. Inzana noted another issue was the fact they had not submitted an annual report nor held a stakeholders meeting since their last review.

B. Huckle made a request for volunteers for this center review. B. Huckle was the first to volunteer. T. Inzana noted as per policy for the center review, the review committee would be comprised of a dean or associate dean, a Department Head, three recommended faculty members and one member from the Commission. Therefore, B. Huckle will be our representative on this committee.

9. Adjournment: A motion to adjourn was made by D. Dean and seconded by J. Ball and the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.