

Approved
3-4-85

Minutes
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
President's Board Room
January 9, 1985
3:30 p.m.

Members Present: E. N. Boyd, D. Frederick, D.P.H. Hasselman, O. Yucel (for W. R. Hibbard), D. E. Hinkle, R. L. Kirkpatrick, F. Krimgold, Y. C. Lin, S. E. Markham, J. McLaughlin, L. M. Potter, W. J. McAuley, R. P. Schubert, A. W. Steiss, T. E. Bell (for L. T. Taylor), R. A. Teekell

Members Absent: M. R. Geasler, T. W. Keenan, R. E. Nance

Invited Participants: G. R. Hooper, B. E. Selvey, C. D. Waring, F. Ventre

1. Announcements.

Dr. Steiss distributed several items of interest to the Commission, including a summary by Colleges of research proposals and awards for the period 1976-84; an article from Science relevant to some of the issues that have been discussed about the C.I.T.; and an update on research proposals submitted and awards received through December, 1984. Dr. Steiss explained that the downward "trend" in proposal submissions in December, in part, is related to a shift in federal deadlines from December to November. Awards received through December, 1984 show an increase of 23.3% over December, 1983.

2. Approval of Minutes of December 12 Meeting

The minutes of the December 12 meeting were approved as distributed.

3. Committee Reports

No committees met since that the last Commission meeting.

4. Ad-Hoc Committee on Research Associates

Dr. Steiss reported that the two resolutions passed by the Commission at the November 28 meeting have been forwarded to the University Council and will probably be on the agenda of the January 21 meeting. These items need to clear before May to become policy this year. Several items are still on the table awaiting input from the Commission on Faculty Affairs.

5. Procedures for University Originated Patents

Dr. Steiss distributed a memorandum offering further clarification on the letter from Dr. Hasselman included with the meeting agenda. The focus of Dr. Hasselman's concern is the involvement of principal investigators in any matters which emerge from sponsored programs.

Dr. Steiss indicated that it is important that P.I.'s are cognizant of matters that relate to sponsored programs under their purview.

A Disclosure Guide has been available for several years and is distributed to anyone who asks for it. It is proposed that a specific requirement be added to this guide requiring the identification of the Principal Investigator if a sponsored project is involved. In reviewing the minutes of the Patent Committee meetings, only one instance was found where an inventor made a disclosure but failed to identify the sponsored project on which he had worked. Only later was the sponsored project identified and the information on the invention submitted to the sponsoring agency.

To ensure that, as a regular procedure, all disclosures are made, it has been suggested that the faculty be surveyed annually. It was generally agreed that Department Heads should review disclosures and identify any perceived problems.

Dr. Steiss said that, if the Commission approves, the procedures developed by the Patent Committee will be sent out to the faculty to reaffirm and clarify the present University Patent Policy. A motion to accept the recommendations of the Committee with regard to the procedures was made and seconded. In discussion of the motion, Dr. Hooper asked if the Disclosure Guide would be changed to identify the Principal Investigator where a sponsored project was involved. It was agreed that this was a part of the motion.

Dr. Hasselman asked that that particular section of the procedures be expanded upon to protect a P.I. up front. Where a sponsored project is identified, the P.I. could verify if the inventor has a legitimate claim to the invention. Dr. Hasselman suggested that a person submitting the disclosure form may not be the sole inventor. Dr. Steiss said that one responsibility of the Patent Committee is to arbitrate such disputes. Dr. Hooper suggested that, at the time of disclosure, it should be a requirement that the Department Head be apprised, since he or she is the logical one to oversee these matters. Dr. Hasselman proposed that a signature block be added on the disclosure form for the Department Head and the Principal Investigator.

The motion was amended to include this provision on the form and in the procedures. The motion was approved as amended.

Dr. Steiss suggested that we will be hearing more about patents, copyrights, and intellectual properties. This seems to be an area of considerable discussion and increasingly so, if one looks at The Chronicle and other publications.

6. Expanded Definition of Types of Awards

Dr. Steiss indicated that this item is primarily one of information. In the past, faculty and/or sponsors have tended to use the term grant-in-aid rather loosely in describing a relationship into which the University was entering. Efforts have been made to achieve some

clarification on distinctions between a gift or donation, a grant-in-aid, and a grant. These distinctions are needed to identify where funds should be deposited when received by the University. The Virginia Tech Foundation is set up to handle the eleemosynary requirements to protect both the University and the donor. Efforts have been made to identify what criteria must be met for either property or monies to be considered gifts or donations. The term grant-in-aid should be limited to "an award made to an individual or to an institution on behalf of an individual to support his or her educational pursuits." If an award meets that definition, then it seems appropriate to waive any indirect cost recoveries to ensure that the funds are available to support the basic objectives.

Dr. Hooper said a number of issues need to be discussed with the Foundation. If approved, this definition will help clarify one area of concerns.

Dr. Steiss said that definitions of the four types of awards will be published in revised Manual of Procedures. This matter will be pursued further to identify the differences between these awards and the proper routing of funds.

7. Graduate Project Assistants

This item is also for information. The Board of Visitors at its February meeting will be asked to approve a new position classification called Graduate Project Assistant (GPA). There are several reasons for this new position. It is thought that this option will allow the University to attract superior students, and also will remove the temptation to use the Research Associate title indiscriminately. A GPA can be paid \$200-225 more per month than that provided for a GRA or GTA. This higher stipend should help attract and involve students in these research efforts and still keep us within guidelines established by federal and other agencies.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50.

mrw