

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

February 10, 2010

325 Burruss Hall

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: J. Ball, L. Coble, S. K. De Datta, J. de la Garza, R. Hall, T. Herdman, W. Huckle, T. Inzana, R. Jensen, J. Jones, G. Kadlec (for D. Cook), B. Laing, S. Martin, K. Miller, S. Samavedi, T. Schroeder (for D. Dean), R. Siegle, R. Veilleux, P. Young

Members Absent: R. Benson, T. Fox, D. Jones, R. Siegle

Others: S. Muse, C. Montgomery

- 1. Approval of Agenda:** A motion to approve the agenda was offered by B. Laing and seconded by J. Jones and carried.
- 2. Approval of the minutes for CoR meetings December 9, 2009:** A motion to approve the minutes was offered by S. Martin and seconded by J. Jones and carried.
- 3. Announcements:** Greg Kadlec announced that he will be filling-in for Deborah Cook, the faculty representative from the College of Business, for the remaining meetings in 09-10.

R. Hall requested that our March meeting date be moved to the third Wednesday rather than the second Wednesday in March. All approved and the date was moved from March 10, 2010 to March 17, 2010.

- 4. Report from Library Committee:** P. Young reported on the University Library Committee meeting that was held on February 2nd. P. Young reported that the Provost had a positive response to the mid-term strategic plan. Exploration of student fees for support of the libraries was also supported by the Provost. A library web-page review will be explored in March. Also in March, the Dean will conduct a library visit open to spouses and family of the Board of Visitors. The Dean also hopes that the Board of Visitors members will be able to tour the library at a later date. P. Young reported that there was a small video on the automated storage and retrieval system that will allow storage of around 1 million books, thus allowing for more space in the library. P. Young announced that the café on the 1st floor is expected to open sometime this spring semester.

P. Young also reported on the recommendations from the white paper that was presented to the CoR at our December meeting. P. Young explained that the two main changes that other universities are incorporating are: 1. faculty are agreeing to archive their peer-reviewed journal articles, and the university agrees to provide an on-line depository for those articles; 2. the university provides an open-access fund for any faculty who wants to publish in an open-access publication. Most of those that apply for grants through NSF and NIH are allowed publication fees in the grant applications. P. Young suggested that there would be a policy requiring that those applying for

funding from those agencies to also apply for publication fees. Others who are not receiving funding from one of those agencies and would like to publish in a journal that has an authored processing fee are allowed to apply for open-access funding. P. Young requested feedback on these recommendations and invited suggestions on how to communicate this information with the faculty senate to attain their perception to these changes. W. Huckle inquired on what the costs would be to move this forward. P. Young explained that the software for on-line depositories is already on campus and that it would be a matter of developing workflows and getting the collaboration of different groups working together to make it happen. P. Young stated that the amount other universities assembled for pilot funds for open-access was around \$100,000.

J. de la Garza inquired if the open-access applied not only to new published articles but to past published articles as well. P. Young explained once the policy went in to affect it would be for archiving from that point forward. The faculty could grant an automatic, non-exclusive license to the university to display their article(s) in its final, pre-publication version. P. Young explained that this version would contain the same information as the publication.

P. Young asked what the best course of action would be to disseminate this white paper to the faculty senate. R. Hall suggested that either the Library Committee or the Library Faculty Association pass a resolution regarding this and then submit it to the Commission on Research for review and dissemination to the faculty senate.

- 5. Center Director Reviews- Revision of Policy 13005:** R. Hall distributed a draft revision of Policy 13005, Interdisciplinary Research Centers. R. Hall explained that this is one of two policies that address university research centers. Policy 13005 is the programmatic document that details the management of centers/institutes, and Policy 3020 details the financial management of center/institutes.

R. Hall explained that the revisions detail the review and evaluation of a university research center and the review and evaluation of the center/institute director independently. R. Hall explained that changes were made regarding the supervisor of the director in the section detailing the center/institute director review to reflect those instances where the director does not report directly to the Vice President for Research. T. Herdman suggested that in order to accurately reflect the direct reporting relationships, we should add “the supervisor as defined in the charter for the center/institute.” A section was added to clarify the center/institute director’s annual evaluations, and a separate section was added detailing the personal evaluation of the director, which occurs every three to seven years. The personal evaluation will be scheduled with the Office of Research in consultation with the Chair of the Commission on Research.

R. Hall explained that the procedures for conducting these separate reviews are summarized in section 3. Section 3.1 summarizes the procedures for the review of a university research center, and section 3.2 summarizes the procedures for the review of a center/institute director. W. Huckle suggested that we reference the complete review guidelines packet somewhere in the policy. Lastly, a statement was added regarding

Policy 3020 outlining that in cases where 3020 and 13005 conflict, policy 3020 shall be the ruling policy.

R. Hall requested that Commission members review and discuss these changes with their constituencies over the next month and vote on this policy as revised at our next meeting. It will then be sent to University Council for a first reading in April and second reading in May.

- 6. Virginia Center for Coal and Energy Research (VCCER) Review:** S. Muse reported that the report of this center is currently being reviewed by the Director, Michael Karmis. It has been requested that the chair of the review committee submit the report to the Commission no later than March 1st. The chair will provide a presentation summary of the report at our next meeting. Upon review of the report before our next meeting, we plan to vote and make a recommendation regarding the reappointment of the center and the director.
- 7. Center for Macromolecules and Interfaces Institute (MII) Review:** T. Inzana stated that the review committee for MII is reviewing the report and that they have requested a meeting with the Director Richard Turner. T. Inzana reported that the goal is to have this process complete by the end of the spring semester.
- 8. Center for Human-Computer Interaction (CHCI) Review:** T. Inzana announced that the director Francis Quek has reported that he is getting input for his report from over 30 faculty in the center. Dr. Quek plans to submit his report to the review committee next week. The target for this review completion is also the end of the spring semester.
- 9. Adjournment:** A motion to adjourn was made by J. de la Garza and seconded by T. Inzana and the meeting was adjourned at 4:38 pm.