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,


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 8th 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 it 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.