Agenda Book
May 15-16, 2017

Locations:

May 15 – Institute of Advanced Learning & Research, 150 Slayton Ave, Danville, Virginia

May 16 – Averett University North Campus, 707 Mount Cross Rd., Danville, Virginia
## May 15-16, 2017, Council Meetings
### Schedule of Events

*Note different locations May 15-16*

---

### Monday, May 15, 2017 (Institute for Advanced Learning and Research (IALR), 150 Slayton Ave, Danville, VA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>Executive Committee (IALR – Salon E) – <a href="#">Section B on the agenda</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15–1:15</td>
<td>(lunch) (all members are invited – agenda includes a closed session)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:15–2:15</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Committee (IALR – Room 205) – <a href="#">Section C on the agenda</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15–2:15</td>
<td>(committee members: Gene Lockhart, Carlyle Ramsey, Heywood Fralin, Ken Ampy, Pam Moran, Katie Webb)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:15–2:15</td>
<td>Resources and Planning Committee (IALR – Salon E) – <a href="#">Section D on the agenda</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15–2:15</td>
<td>(committee members: Marge Connelly, Henry Light, Stephen Moret, Bill Murray, Tom Slater, Minnis Ridenour)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:30–3:00</td>
<td>IALR tour (walking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:15–5:00</td>
<td>Private College Advisory (PCAB) meeting – (IALR – Salons A&amp;C) – <a href="#">Separate agenda</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:00–6:00</td>
<td>Averett tour (trolley/bus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00–6:45</td>
<td>Reception (President Franks’ home)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00–8:30</td>
<td>Dinner (Violet T. Frith Fine Arts Center)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Transportation back to IALR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Tuesday, May 16, 2017 (Averett University North Campus, 707 Mount Cross Rd, Danville, VA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00–9:00</td>
<td>Ad hoc committee on research – (Averett University North Campus - Frank R. Campbell Stadium – President’s Suite) – <a href="#">Section E on the agenda</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00–9:00</td>
<td>(committee members: Gene Lockhart, Ken Ampy, Bill Murray, Minnis Ridenour)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00–12:30</td>
<td>Council meeting (Averett University North Campus – Frank R. Campbell Stadium – President’s Suite) – <a href="#">Section A on the agenda</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Council meetings (note different locations May 15 and 16)

Time: May 16, 2017 @ 9:00am - 12:30pm EDT

Location: May 16: Averett University North Campus, 707 Mount Cross Rd., Danville, VA

Description: Meeting times are approximate and subject to change. Agenda materials will be available on the website approximately one week prior to the meeting at www.schev.edu. A public comment period will be allocated on the meeting agenda (typically at the beginning of the agenda). To be scheduled, those interested in making public comment should contact the person listed below no later than 5:00 p.m. three (3) business days prior to the meeting date. At the time of the request, the speaker's name, address and topic must be provided. Each speaker will be given up to three (3) minutes to address SCHEV. Speakers are asked to submit a written copy of their remarks at the time of comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. | COUNCIL MEETING  
May 16 - 9:00 AM - 12:30 PM  
(Averett University North Campus - Frank R. Campbell Stadium, President's Suite - 707 Mount Cross Rd, Danville, VA) | Chairman Minor | |
<p>| A1. | --Call to Order and Announcements | Chairman Minor | |
| A2. | --Receipt of Public Comment | Chairman Minor | |
| A3. | --Approval of Minutes: March 21, 2017, April 12, 2017 | Chairman Minor | 1 |
| A4. | --Remarks from Tiffany McKillip Franks, President, Averett University | Dr. Franks | |
| A5. | --Report of the Agency Director | Mr. Blake | 14 |
| | BREAK | | |
| A6. | --Report from Committees | | |
| | --Executive Committee (see Section B) | | |
| | --Academic Affairs Committee (see Section C) | | |
| | --Resources and Planning Committee (see Section D) | | |
| | --Ad Hoc Committee on Research (see Section E) | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>--Council Elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>--New Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>--Receipt of Items Delegated to Staff Mr. Blake 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>--Action on Resolution for Departing Council Member Mr. Fralin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>--Motion to Adjourn Chairman Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE May 15, 2017 - 11:15 AM - 1:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(IALR, Salon E, 150 Slayton Avenue, Danville, VA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>--Call to Order Chairman Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>--Approval of Minutes (March 21, 2017) Chairman Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>--Report of Nominating Process Mr. Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>--Closed Session (Discussion of Personnel Matters Related to Performance of the Director) Chairman Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>--Discussion of Updates to The Virginia Plan for Higher Education Mr. Blake, Ms. Kang 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>--Other Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>--Motion to Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE May 15, 2017 - 1:15 PM - 2:15 PM (IALR - Room 205, second floor, 150 Slayton Avenue, Danville, VA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>--Call to Order Mr. Lockhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>--Approval of Minutes (March 20, 2017) Mr. Lockhart 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>--Action on Programs at Public Institutions Dr. DeFilippo 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>--Action on Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Institutional Certifications Dr. DeFilippo 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>--Discussion of Updates to The Virginia Plan for Higher Education Dr. DeFilippo, Ms. Kang, Ms. Robinson 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>--Report of the Staff Liaison to the Committee Dr. DeFilippo 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>--Motion to Adjourn Mr. Lockhart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|   | RESOURCES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE - May 15, 2017 1:15 PM - 2:15 PM (IALR, Salon E, 150 Slayton Avenue,                     |
|   |                                                                                                                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Call to Order</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Connelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Approval of Minutes (March 20, 2017)</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Connelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discussion of Updates to The Virginia Plan for Higher Education</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Hix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E.**

**AD HOC COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH** May 16, 2017 - 8:00 AM - 9:00 AM (Averett University North Campus, 707 North Cross Rd, Frank R. Campbell Stadium - President's Suite)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E1.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Call to Order</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E2.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Approval of Minutes (March 20, 2017, April 12, 2017)</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E3.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action on Proposed Call for Proposals (Round 1 of the Virginia Research Investment Fund)</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Edwards, Ms. Seuffert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E4.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Updates from Staff</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Edwards, Ms. Seuffert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E5.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Motion to Adjourn</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Murray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Minor called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. in the Hall of Valor, Marshall Hall/Center for Leadership and Ethics, Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Virginia. Council members present: Ken Amey, Marge Connelly, Heywood Fralin, Henry Light, G. Gilmer Minor, III, Pamela Moran, Carlyle Ramsey, Minnis Ridenour, Tom Slater, and Katharine Webb.


Staff members present: Lee Andes, Peter Blake, Beverly Covington, Joe DeFilippo, Alan Edwards, Wendy Kang, Tod Massa, Jean Mottley, Paula Robinson, Sylvia Rosa-Casanova, Lee Ann Rung, Lynn Seuffert, and Greg Weatherford. Al Wilson from the Office of the Attorney General was also in attendance.

CALL TO ORDER AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Minor thanked General and Mrs. Peay for hosting the Council and for the informative tour and the delightful reception and dinner on May 20.

He distributed a VMI brochure depicting photos of the Institute Corps of Cadets' performance at the presidential inauguration on January 20, 2017. Virginia Tech was also represented at the inauguration.

RECEIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Minor reported that no requests for public comment had been received. He invited comments from those in attendance; no one came forward.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by Mr. Ridenour and seconded by Mr. Slater, the minutes from the January 10, 2017, meeting were approved unanimously:

REMARKS FROM GENERAL J.H. BINFORD PEAY, SUPERINTENDENT, VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE (VMI)

Mr. Minor introduced General Peay and read his many accomplishments. Because General Peay provided a full briefing to the Council on May 20 before touring the VMI post, he spoke briefly about the 2017 legislative session. He expressed concern with the concepts of some bills introduced this session and lamented that some bills failed
to recognize/support decentralization. He stressed the importance of allowing colleges and universities the flexibility to shape their boards and retain their unique attributes.

REPORT OF THE AGENCY DIRECTOR

Mr. Blake highlighted some of the recent activities from his written report. He reviewed briefly the new legislative duties assigned to SCHEV as a result of the legislative session, and mentioned a few of the notable bills that did not pass. He provided information regarding the agency budget reductions and said that $250,000 of the $400,000 reduction was restored to the SCHEV budget to perform duties assigned to the agency. Mr. Blake reported on his recent visits with legislators and answered questions from members.

Mr. Minor noted Mr. Blake’s outstanding reputation throughout the Commonwealth and among legislators, saying Mr. Blake’s leadership has played a major role in SCHEV’s renewed respect and is evident in the additional duties assigned to the agency from the two last legislative sessions.

REPORT FROM MATT MUELLER, VICE CHAIR, SCHEV STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC)

Dr. Paula Robinson introduced Mr. Mueller and reminded members that the 22-member SAC group is comprised of students from 15 four-year public institutions, Richard Bland College, and six rotating slots from the Community College System. The group meets at least three times per year and elects a Chair and Vice Chair yearly. Mr. Mueller holds the position of vice chair and addressed the Council in the absence of the SAC chair. VMI’s student rep, Cadet Luke Phillips, was also in attendance.

Mr. Mueller updated the Council on the work that the SAC has undertaken over the last year and answered questions from members. He spoke about his educational journey and his reason for attending a state university. Mr. Mueller encourages incoming freshmen to get involved, seek experiences outside the classroom, and get to know their professors.

He conveyed the three common themes that emerged from the SAC representatives over the last year as 1) financial aid, 2) state budgetary concerns, and 3) gender neutral protections.

Mr. Mueller and Cadet Phillips answered questions from members. Council members thanked them for their participation and congratulated them for having a good understanding of higher education in the Commonwealth.

UPDATE ON 2017 GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION
Ms. Covington provided a brief update on the bills from the 2017 session related to higher education and informed the Council of the studies that were assigned to SCHEV as a result of the legislative session. Much of the legislation was discussed in other areas of the agenda but she highlighted a few bills related to free speech on campus, board authority issues, and investment fund earnings. Ms. Covington answered questions from members.

The chairman called for a break at 10:30. The meeting resumed at 10:50 a.m. Mr. Fralin did not return to the meeting following the break.

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEES

Report from Executive Committee

Mr. Minor informed the Council that he has asked Mr. Light to poll the members individually to determine a slate of officers that will be proposed at the May 16 meeting. In accordance with the new bylaws change, the election of officers will take place at the May meeting rather than in July.

He reported that the Committee received an update from Ms. Kang and engaged in a productive discussion of initiative #5 from The Virginia Plan for Higher Education related to communications. Mr. Blake provided a brief update of the staff report. Mr. Minor thanked Ms. Webb for working with staff on the important communications success that has emerged to date.

Report from Academic Affairs Committee

Dr. Ramsey chaired the Academic Affairs Committee in Mr. Lockhart’s absence.

Action on Programs at Public Institutions

Dr. Carlyle provided an overview of the programs and the Committee’s recommendation was seconded by Ms. Connelly. The following resolution was approved unanimously (9-0):

BE IT RESOLVED that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia grants approval to J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College to initiate an Associate of Science (A.S.) degree program in General Studies (CIP: 24.0102), effective Fall 2017.

Dr. DeFilippo provided background information about the first Associate of Fine Arts degree in Virginia. He reported that he expects more proposals for this transfer-oriented program in the future. The Committee’s recommendation was seconded by Mr. Light and the following resolution approved unanimously (9-0):

BE IT RESOLVED that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia grants approval to Tidewater Community College to initiate an Associate of Fine Arts (A.F.A) degree program in Music (CIP: 50.0901), effective summer 2017.
Dr. Ramsey said the Committee had a constructive discussion regarding Old Dominion University’s (ODU) Master of Science in Sports Medicine proposal. He indicated that representatives from ODU distributed updated information but staff had concerns that the proposal contained information that was contradictory to approval standards. The committee did not take action but instead recommended that ODU rework the proposal. If the university chooses to resubmit the reworked proposal, it will be considered at a future Academic Affairs Committee meeting.

Status Report on Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS)

Dr. Ramsey reported that the Academic Affairs Committee did not have time to discuss this report. Dr. DeFilippo informed the Council that under Sylvia Rosa-Casanova’s leadership, a monitoring campaign has been established for the ACICS institutions. If institutions lose accreditation or Title IV after 18-months, it could result in school closures, which will require Council action. Dr. DeFilippo answered questions from members. Staff will continue to provide periodic updates at least through June 2018.

The Committee also engaged in a brief discussion of the updates to initiative #1 of The Virginia Plan for Higher Education, and received a succinct report from the staff liaison to the Committee.

Report from Resources and Planning Committee

Ms. Connelly reported on the update to the 2017 General Assembly budget actions that staff provided to the Committee. The Resources and Planning Committee also received an update to initiatives #2 and #3 of The Virginia Plan. Ms. Connelly reviewed briefly the Committee discussions related to these initiatives, particularly the options related to sustainable funding. Mr. Riddenour requested Council input on restructuring and Mr. Light asked that members provided feedback on the concept of a constitutional amendment to address this issue. Ms. Connelly reported that the Committee requested that staff provide language adopted by other state constitutions regarding higher education funding and report back at the next meeting. Dr. Ramsey suggested that if a constitutional amendment is advanced, the pre-K-12 language should be reviewed in an effort to draw similar language from it. Members provided their input on these issues and staff noted the suggestions.

Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Research

In Dr. Murray’s absence, Mr. Ampy provided the Committee’s report.

Action on Proposed Organizing Principles

Mr. Ampy informed members that the ad hoc committee discussed the Proposed Organizing Principles and added a 14th principle addressing proof of concept proposals to the original list of 13. A copy of the revised document was distributed.
Mr. Ampy noted that this will be discussed further at the April 12 ad hoc committee meeting.

The Committee’s revised proposed organizing principles was distributed and seconded by Mr. Light. The following resolution was approved unanimously (9-0):

BE IT RESOLVED that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia approves the proposed organizing principles as revised on March 21, 2017, to guide development of the guidelines for the first round of awards from the Virginia Research Investment Fund and instructs staff to disseminate these principles and initiate development of the Call for Proposals for Round 1 of VRIF awards.

Mr. Ampy also informed the Council that the ad hoc committee engaged in a discussion of the Virginia Research Investment Fund’s (VRIF) potential strategic opportunities and a timeline for Round 1 of the VRIF award competition.

RECEIPT OF ITEMS DELEGATED TO STAFF

Mr. Blake noted the categories of recent actions taken by staff as delegated by the Council. As required, a copy of these actions is attached to the minutes.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Minor requested members’ input on the 2017 legislative session and on progress being made on The Virginia Plan for Higher Education. Mr. Minor expressed his thanks to staff, particularly Mr. Blake, for setting the Council’s direction and maintaining focus on the important initiatives. He noted that Mr. Blake’s respect and experience in Virginia higher education has made it possible.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Blake reminded members that the next special meeting will be held at on April 12 at the offices of Owens and Minor. The ad hoc Committee on Research will meet from 9:00 – 11:00. A special meeting to discuss the Virginia Plan will be held from 11:00 till 4:00. Dr. Staples and Dr. Cannaday will join the discussion. The May 15-16 meetings will be held at Averett University and will include a meeting with the private college and university presidents.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 12:10 p.m.

Minnis Ridenour
Council Secretary
Lee Ann Rung
Director, Executive and Board Affairs
Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, § 23.1-203 and Council’s “Policies and Procedures for Program Approval and Changes,” the following items were approved/not approved as delegated to staff:

## Program Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree/Program/CIP</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College</td>
<td><strong>New Degree Program Approved:</strong> Associate of Applied Science degree program in Health Information Management (51.0707)</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td><strong>Facilitated Staff Approval:</strong> Master of Science degree program in Park, Recreation and Tourism Studies (31.0301) [Conferral: Fall 2019]</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td><strong>Facilitated Staff Approval:</strong> Bachelor of Science degree program in Sport Management (31.0504) [Conferral: Spring 2017]</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td><strong>Title Change Not Approved:</strong> Bachelor of Science in Education in Speech Communication Disorders to a Bachelor of Science in Education in Communication Sciences and Disorders (51.0204)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td><strong>Title Change Approved:</strong> From a Master of Education in Speech Communication Disorders to a Master of Education in Communication Sciences and Disorders (51.0204)</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td><strong>Substantial Program Modification Approved:</strong> Reduce the credit hours of the Master of Arts in European Studies (05.0106) from 48 to 36</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, § 23.1-203 and Council’s “Policies and Procedures for Program Approval and Changes,” the following items were reported:

### Diploma, Certificate and Discontinued Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree/Program/CIP</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>Initiate three new Graduate Certificate programs [Conferral: Spring 2018]:</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Arts and Entrepreneurship (50.1001);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health and Humanities (24.0199);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social Justice and Entrepreneurship (30.9999)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td>Discontinue the Graduate Certificate program in Educational Technology (13.0501) [SCHEV Acknowledgement Fall 2010]</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>Initiate a new Graduate Certificate program in Care Coordination (51.1504) [Conferral: Fall 2018]</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>Discontinue:</td>
<td>Spring 2018 and Spring 2022, respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Master of Science degree program in Hospitality and Tourism Management (52.0901) [Council Approval: May 1989]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Doctor of Philosophy degree program in Hospitality and Tourism Management (52.0901) [Council Approval: May 1995]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wytheville Community College</td>
<td>Initiate a new Certificate Program in Cybersecurity (11.1003) [Conferral: Fall 2017]</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, § 23.1-203 and Council’s “Policies and Procedures for Internal and Off-Campus Organizational Changes,” the following item was approved as delegated to staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Change / Site</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>Create the <strong>Department of Women, Gender, and Sexuality</strong>. The Department will reside in the College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. The Department will maintain its curricular offerings and sustain a professional environment to attract and retain faculty in the field.</td>
<td>January 18, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, § 23.1-211 and Council’s “Commonwealth of Virginia Policy on the Reciprocal Authorization of Distance Education and Related Activities,” the following items were approved as delegated to staff:

**National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (NC-SARA) Approvals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Virginia Career College</td>
<td>December 12, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory and Henry College</td>
<td>December 19, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td>February 7, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, § 23.1-213 to 229 and section 8VAC-40-31-90 of the Virginia Administrative Code, the following items were approved as delegated to staff:

**Postsecondary, Non-Degree Institutions Certified to Operate in the Commonwealth of Virginia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location(s)</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another Level Barbering and Cosmetology School</td>
<td>Petersburg, VA</td>
<td>October 25, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol School of Hair Design</td>
<td>Bristol, VA</td>
<td>September 22, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Institute for Health Careers</td>
<td>Fredericksburg, VA</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotus Signature Massage School</td>
<td>Manassas, VA</td>
<td>January 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracle Beauty and Nails Academy</td>
<td>Virginia Beach, VA</td>
<td>January 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Virginia Advanced Manufacturing Center of Excellence</td>
<td>Abingdon, VA; Duffield, VA; Bluefield, VA</td>
<td>September 19, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Institute of Blacksmithing</td>
<td>Waynesboro, VA</td>
<td>October 31, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Minor called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m. in Capital Room A, Owens and Minor, Mechanicsville, Virginia. Council members present: Marge Connelly, Heywood Fralin, Henry Light, Gene Lockhart, G. Gilmer Minor, Pamela Moran, Stephen Moret, Carlyle Ramsey, Minnis Ridenour, Thomas Slater, and Katharine Webb. Al Wilson from the Office of the Attorney General was also in attendance.

Committee members absent: Ken Ampy, William Murray.

Staff members present: Peter Blake, Joe DeFilippo, Alan Edwards, Jodi Fisler, Dan Hix, Wendy Kang, Tod Massa, Paula Robinson, Lee Ann Rung and Lynn Seuffert. Al Wilson from the Office of the Attorney General was also present.

WELCOME AND OVERVIEW OF THE DAY

Mr. Blake provided an overview of points Drs. Cannaday and Staples were asked to share with the Council. He introduced Dr. Stephen Staples, Virginia Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Dr. Billy Cannaday, President, Virginia Board of Education.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. Cannaday provided background on the Board of Education’s membership and discussed the timeline of the board’s reform work, including the major changes to the state’s accountability system in 2014. As a result of this work, the General Assembly eliminated the five Standards of learning (SOL) assessments and moved to local alternative assessments. After receiving feedback from 24 stakeholder groups, the Board of Education learned that students are not well prepared for life after high school.

In 2016 the board held a full-day work session to review, amend, and confirm a draft Profile of a Virginia Graduate. The board adopted revisions to certain parts of the Standards of Accreditation (SOA), which included the requirements for the Profile of a Graduate. The Governor and General Assembly supported the development of a Profile of a Virginia Graduate through the introduction and adoption of legislation which placed the recommendation in the Code of Virginia’s Standards of Quality.

Dr. Cannaday discussed the reasons the Board developed the Profile of Graduates, saying the current pre-K-12 system was built to prepare young people to work in a manufacturing dominated economy, which stakeholders agreed is no longer useful in the 21st century.

Dr. Staples indicated that more emphasis is being placed on engagement rather than time in a classroom setting.
Dr. Cannaday reviewed the Profiles of a Graduate with its four overlapping areas of student learning and achievement, which is considered essential to success beyond high school. He proposed a set of potential questions and engaged members in a discussion that allowed them to provide input.

Dr. Staples and Dr. Cannaday answered questions from members.

The chairman called for a break at 12:15 p.m. The meeting resumed at 12:45. Mr. Blake reminded members that any unresolved issues from the meeting would be addressed by the newly formed Taskforce on High School to Postsecondary Transitions that SCHEV will convene. More details about the task force were provided in the second half of the meeting.

Dr. Staples stressed the need for students to learn beyond content knowledge but reminded members that the current high school model was developed in 1895 and hasn’t changed much since that time. It will take time but all agreed that stakeholders (pre-K-12 and higher education) must speak with a singular voice when advocating for change. Dr. Staples suggested that legislation should be considered that will aid several constituencies rather than an individual sector. It was noted that lines of authority within each sector do not allow for overlap.

Dr. Cannaday expressed a desire to develop a list of 3-5 important ideas that could better align pre-K-12 and higher education rather than just developing a checklist of things that must be accomplished.

Mr. Fralin congratulated Drs. Staples and Cannaday for their efforts in evaluating what is working within the current system and what needs improvement. More communication between pre-K-12 and higher education was encouraged. Members were reminded that Mr. Blake will attend the May Board of Education meeting. In answer to a question raised by Mr. Fralin, Mr. Blake agreed to share with members the UVA study on early childhood development.

Ms. Connelly requested that the new task force use SCHEV data to help make tangible connections between pre-K-12 and higher education.

Mr. Minor asked that the dialogue continue in order to make progress from today’s discussion, and Mr. Blake reminded members that Dr. Moran and Dr. Ramsey will represent the Council on the Taskforce on High School to Postsecondary Transitions and will relay the discussion from this meeting.

The chairman called for a break at 2:15. The meeting resumed at 2:30.

Mr. Lockhart requested that staff provide a copy of the Virginia Department of Education’s strategic plan to Council members.

**INITIATIVE UPDATES FROM THE VIRGINIA PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**
Mr. Blake invited SCHEV staff that serve as leads on each of the Initiatives to provide brief updates. All materials were included in the agenda materials.

Dr. DeFilippo addressed Initiative #1, reporting that an ad hoc dual enrollment group has had initial discussions. As a result of the 2017 legislative session, SCHEV will develop a passport credit program.

Ms. Kang reported on the newly formed taskforce on quality and assessment (Taskforce on High School to Postsecondary Transitions) which will bring together those who can influence policy in this area.

Mr. Hix addressed Initiative #2, reminding members that at the March meeting information was provided about constitutional provisions in other states. He distributed a copy of the Constitution of Virginia language regarding funding for pre-K-12. Mr. Fralin suggested that a representative from Virginia be invited to a future Resources and Planning Committee meeting to discuss the student perspective on sustainable funding. Mr. Ridenour requested that in light of the recent New York decision to provide reduced or free tuition, Council explore and discuss a similar option to better understand the costs and implications of free tuition. Mr. Fralin asked for an estimate of income thresholds in Virginia if a similar option is considered. Mr. Hix said staff will present choices for sector-based funding at a future meeting, which could become part of the Council’s 2018-20 budget recommendations.

Mr. Hix addressed Initiative #3 and provided an update from a recent meeting with selected state officials. He said that staff will be seeking input on future restructuring opportunities. Ms. Connelly said institutions should emphasize in their six-year plans any collaborative initiatives they will undertake and any efficiencies that could be gained. Mr. Hix reminded members of the October 19 statewide conference to share innovative and best practices across the larger higher education community.

Dr. DeFilippo addressed Initiative #4 and reported that the taskforce on quality and assessment has concluded its work. The Council will consider the recommendations of the taskforce at the July meeting. SCHEV staff is coordinating a statewide meeting in June on civic engagement (in conjunction with the College of William & Mary) to share best practices and assist institutions in building capacity and defining and measuring civic engagement.

Communications Initiative #5 – Ms. Kang discussed the issues for each group (students and parents; business and economic development; and policymakers) as well as the goal and strategies for each. She explained that staff is working to get consistent baseline information. Mr. Fralin requested that a progress report on the Virginia Research Investment Committee (VRIC) initiatives be added to the communications initiative as well as the research initiative.

Research Initiative #6 – Dr. Edwards reported that effective January 1 Council will assume responsibility for development of the strategic roadmap. Mr. Lockhart suggested that Council consider making the Ad Hoc Committee on Research a standing committee to continue to track progress of the research initiative. Currently, the ad hoc committee is scheduled to end its work in June 2017.
Mr. Blake agreed to send data to members on out-migration occurring mostly in northern Virginia. Mr. Moret will attend the next GPAC meeting with college presidents to discuss economic growth and development issues.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN**

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

_______________________________
Minnis Ridenour
Council Secretary

Lee Ann Rung
Director, Executive & Board Affairs
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
Agenda Item

Item: Council #A5– Report of the Agency Director

Date of Meeting: May 16, 2017

Presenter: Peter Blake, Director
peterblake@schev.edu

Most Recent Review/Action:
☒ No previous Council review/action
☐ Previous review/action
  Date:
  Action:

Background Information/Summary of Major Elements: N/A

Materials Provided: “Report of the Agency Director.”

Financial Impact: N/A

Timetable for Further Review/Action: N/A

Resolution: N/A
State Council of Higher Education  
Director’s report  
May 16, 2017

**GPAC meeting.** Council chair Gil Minor and SCHEV staff met with the public college and university presidents (General Professional Advisory Committee) in March. The agenda included discussion with Rosemary Trible on her Fear 2 Freedom organization for victims of sexual assault. Staff also presented an update on a General Assembly-mandated study of the feasibility of establishing regional centers for the investigation of campus sexual assault. The next GPAC meeting is May 22.

**Board of visitors planning:** We convened the first meeting of the planning group for the 2017 board of visitors orientation session. Council members Tom Slater and Katie Webb participated in the planning. The group also includes two university presidents and other institutional representatives. This year’s event will be held October 24-25 at the Virginia Historical Society in Richmond.

**Student Advisory Committee:** SCHEV staff convened the final meeting of the 2016-17 Student Advisory Committee. Secretary of Education Dietra Trent and Secretary of the Commonwealth Kelly Thomasson discussed college access and board appointments. Virginia 21 director Jared Calfee shared information on a summer leadership camp.

**Presentations of The Virginia Plan for Higher Education:** I had the opportunity to present The Virginia Plan and the Council’s priority initiatives to the following groups: the State Board of Education; the State Board for Community Colleges; and the Virginia Business Council. I have upcoming appointments with the Greater Richmond Chamber of Commerce and the Charlottesville Regional Chamber of Commerce.

**GO Virginia and the Virginia Research Investment Committee and Fund.** I continue to represent the Council at GO Virginia planning group meetings and to chair the Virginia Research Investment Committee. Work related to VRIC is accelerating as it nears several key decision points by the end of May. These include the issuance of the call for proposals for round one of grants from the Virginia Research Investment Fund; approval of funds for the INOVA Global Genomics and Bioinformatics Institute; and the issuance of a request for proposals for an analysis of Virginia’s research strengths and opportunities for commercialization and job creation.

**University-based Economic Developers:** Virginia Economic Development Partnership President (and Council member) Stephen Moret, Center for Innovative Technology President Ed Albrigo and Council staff Wendy Kang presented to institutional economic development leaders. The leaders discussed opportunities to align their work with GO Virginia, to create and expand internship and other work-based programs and to speak more clearly about the role colleges and universities play in supporting economic development.

**Agency audit:** SCHEV is in the beginning stages of an audit. The Auditor of Public Account recently developed a new process for auditing agencies that are not required to be under audit every year. The process begins with a risk analysis, which includes...
an internal control questionnaire. SCHEV has received “clean” audits for the past nine APA audits. This is a significant accomplishment and clearly demonstrates our commitment to the finest skills, professionalism and stewardship of our public resources.

**Public Service Week:** At our annual meeting celebrating public service, Clerk of the House of Delegates G. Paul Nardo spoke to staff about the value of commitment of public service.

**Out and about:** This has been an especially active period for traveling around Virginia on behalf of the Council. Among other events, I attended the Virginia 21 annual luncheon; the Virginia Community College System philanthropy luncheon; and the Governor’s data analytics conference. I participated in panel discussions for the VCU chapter of the American Society for Public Administration; the 2017 class Lead Virginia; and a forum on economic mobility at the College of William and Mary. I participated in the announcement of a partnership agreement between Northern Virginia Community College and George Mason University; I was a keynote speaker at the annual convening of the public college and university fiscal officers and of the Virginia Association of Financial Aid Administrators.

**Time away from the office:** I will be out of the office from May 31 to June 21. I will be traveling in northern England, removed from routine communications. While I am away, Wendy Kang will be “agent in charge.” She can be reached at wendykang@schev.edu and 804-225-4416. Of course, Council members also can continue to contact Lee Rung.
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Item: Council #A9 - Receipt of Items Delegated to Staff

Date of Meeting: May 16, 2017

Presenter: Peter Blake, Director
peterblake@schev.edu

Most Recent Review/Action:
☐ No previous Council review/action
☒ Previous review/action
  Action: The Council approved delegation of certain items to staff

Background Information/Summary of Major Elements:
Council delegated certain items to staff for approval and reporting to the Council on
a regular basis.

Materials Provided:

Program actions approved:
  • Radford University
  • University of Mary Washington
  • Virginia Commonwealth University

Program actions reported:
  • Norfolk State University
  • Old Dominion University
  • Radford University

Policies and Procedures for Internal and Off-Campus Organizational Changes
  • Longwood University
  • Virginia Commonwealth University

Postsecondary, Non-Degree Institutions Certified to Operate in the Commonwealth
of Virginia
  • NOVA Training Center
  • Star Beauty School
  • The New York Code and Design Academy
Approved Changes for Private Institutions
- Virginia Wesleyan College
- Webster University
- Nova Southeastern University
Items Delegated to Director/Staff

Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, § 23.1-203 and Council’s “Policies and Procedures for Program Approval and Changes,” the following items were approved as delegated to staff:

**Program Actions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree/Program/CIP</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td><strong>Substantial Program Modification Approved:</strong> Increase the credit hours and change the name/title of the Master of Science (M.S.) in Corporate and Professional Communication (09.0101) with 30 credit hours to a Master of Science (M.S.) in Strategic Communication (09.0101) with 36 credit hours.</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mary Washington</td>
<td><strong>Simple Program Modification Approved:</strong> Increase the credit hours of the Undergraduate Certificate in Geographic Information Science (45.0799) from 18 to 19 credit hours.</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td><strong>Simple Program Modification Approved:</strong> Decrease the credit hours of the Master of Interdisciplinary Studies (M.I.S.) degree program in Interdisciplinary Studies (30.9999) from 39 to 36 credit hours.</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, § 23.1-203 and Council’s “Policies and Procedures for Program Approval and Changes,” the following items were reported:

**Diploma, Certificate and Discontinued Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree/Program/CIP</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td>Discontinue the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree program in Journalism (09.0401) [Council Approval: May 7, 1974]</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>Initiate two new Certificate programs [Conferral: Spring 2018]</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurship (52.0701)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Teaching for K-12 Teachers (13.9998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institution | Degree/Program/CIP | Effective Date
--- | --- | ---
Radford University | Discontinue the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate program in Professional Development in Educational Leadership (13.0401) | Summer 2017

Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, § 23.1-203 and Council’s “Policies and Procedures for Internal and Off-Campus Organizational Changes,” the following items were approved as delegated to staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Change/Site</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longwood University</td>
<td>Close the Southside Virginia Education Center, an off-campus instructional site located at 1300 Greensville County Circle, Emporia, VA 23847</td>
<td>August 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>Create the Department of Focused Inquiry. The Department will reside in the University College. The creation of the Department will provide the infrastructure for the management of foundational courses required for the General Education program. The Department will have direct management of its budget, department leadership, faculty, curriculum committees, bylaws, and promotion and tenure policies and procedures.</td>
<td>April 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, § 23.1-213 to 229 and section 8VAC-40-31-90 of the Virginia Administrative Code, the following items were approved as delegated to staff:

**Postsecondary, Non-Degree Institutions Certified to Operate in the Commonwealth of Virginia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location(s)</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOVA Training Center</td>
<td>Centreville, VA</td>
<td>March 7, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Beauty School</td>
<td>Winchester, VA</td>
<td>March 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New York Code and Design Academy</td>
<td>Ashburn, VA</td>
<td>March 21, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Approved Changes for Private Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Wesleyan College</td>
<td><strong>Name Change:</strong> Virginia Wesleyan University</td>
<td>March 21, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td><strong>New Branch Campus:</strong> Arlington, VA</td>
<td>March 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Southeastern University</td>
<td><strong>New Instructional Site:</strong> Tysons Corner, VA</td>
<td>March 29, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Minor called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m. in the Hall of Valor, Center for Leadership and Ethics, Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Virginia. Committee members present: Marge Connelly, Heywood Fralin, G. Gilmer Minor, Minnis Ridenour. Al Wilson from the Office of the Attorney General was also in attendance.

Committee member absent: Gene Lockhart.

Other Council members present: Henry Light, Carlyle Ramsey, Thomas Slater, Katharine Webb.

Staff members present: Peter Blake, Beverly Covington, Alan Edwards, Dan Hix, Tod Massa and Lee Ann Rung.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by Mr. Slater and seconded by Mr. Fralin, the minutes from the January 10, 2017, meeting were approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF NOMINATING PROCESS

Mr. Minor reported that the new changes in the bylaws require that Council elections take place at the May meeting to allow for the officers to be in place prior to the new member appointments that take effect July 1. He asked members to consider nominations for chairman and vice chairman. He requested that Mr. Light contact each member to gather input. This is not a committee assignment and Mr. Light will contact the members individually.

DISCUSSION OF UPDATES TO THE VIRGINIA PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. Blake reminded members that initiative #5 is the communication initiative for which the Executive Committee has been assigned. Ms. Kang provided an update on the strategies that staff has implemented, including 1) developed a statewide brand for higher education; launched a communications strategy during the General Assembly session to convey the value of higher education to policy makers; initiated a taskforce to identify strategies to improve transitions to postsecondary education to improve communications to students and parents; and set meetings with key stakeholders to discuss common connections with The Virginia Plan for Higher Education. Ms. Webb, who has worked with SCHEV staff on this initiative, reported that this is a first-attempt for SCHEV to educate legislators. She indicated that it was instructive and provided concise higher education information to the legislators. The one-page documents were not meant to be all inclusive. Ms. Kang indicated that
legislative liaisons from the institutions found the documents to be informative and useful. SCHEV staff will begin the process earlier when preparing similar documents for the next legislative session. Mr. Minor said he received positive response from the legislators with whom he met.

Mr. Fralin thanked Mr. Blake for the editorial that appeared in the *Virginian Pilot* newspaper clarifying misleading information regarding higher education funding. Other members agreed that SCHEV should continue to submit accurate facts to other publications. Ms. Webb reminded the Council that some members have joined staff in meeting with editorial boards. Members agreed that these relationships should continue to be developed.

Mr. Weatherford continues to work with communications officers at the institutions and is working on an overall brand strategy for SCHEV.

Mr. Minor summarized by expressing his appreciation to SCHEV staff for the current strides that have been made with The Virginia Plan initiatives and expressed his interest in seeing more progress in the coming year.

Ms. Kang met with staff from the Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP), as well as the University Based Economic Developers (UBED) to develop a message to business and industry on ways in which higher education can advance economic development and demonstrative ways in which Virginia’s decentralized higher education system can work in a coordinated manner. New Council member and president of VEDP, Mr. Moret, will play an important role in assisting with this portion of the initiative. Mr. Blake reported that he and Mr. Moret will be making a presentation to the university based economic developers in April.

In response to a question by Mr. Light, Mr. Blake informed the Council that Ms. Kang is seeking grants where appropriate. She also is looking to measure outcomes.

Mr. Ridenour suggested that SCHEV consider forming an advisory committee of the chief research officers on campus.

Ms. Webb thanked the SCHEV staff, particularly Ms. Kang and Mr. Weatherford, and said the progress that has been made in the last year on the communications plan is a direct result of their dedication and hard work.

Mr. Blake asked members for feedback on the board software that has been in use for approximately six months. Mr. Light finds the notes feature to be useful. Mr. Ridenour suggested that individual committee agendas be provided. Ms. Rung will take the feedback and work to make the product more user-friendly.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:50 a.m.
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
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**Item:** Executive Committee #5 – Discussion of The Virginia Plan for Higher Education Updates

**Date of Meeting:** May 15, 2017

**Presenter:**
- Peter Blake, Director
  (peterblake@schev.edu)
- Wendy Kang, Higher Education Innovation Director
  (wendykang@schev.edu)

**Most Recent Review/Action:**
- No previous Council review/action
- Previous review/action
  - **Date:** April 15, 2017
  - **Action:** Council discussed the communications initiative as part of its special Council meeting on The Virginia Plan for Higher Education

**Background Information/Summary of Major Elements:**

SCHEV staff members continue to work on communications through the three key stakeholder groups regarding the benefits of higher education and the objectives of The Virginia Plan for Higher Education.

Last month, we presented The Virginia Plan for Higher Education to the Virginia Business Council, the State Board of Education, and the State Board for Community Colleges. Additional presentations are scheduled with the Charlottesville and Richmond Chambers of Commerce.

Activities related to communications planned in the coming months include conducting a focus group and surveys pre-K-12 stakeholders on higher education information and resource needs; developing a *Virginia Higher Education 101* guide for legislators, boards of visitors members and new executive staff; and identifying a brand or message to use across multiple stakeholder groups on the value of higher education.

**Materials Provided:** None

**Financial Impact:** No financial impact at this time.

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:** No further action at this time.

**Resolution:** No resolution at this time.
Dr. Ramsey (Vice Chair) called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. at Virginia Military Institute in Richmond, Virginia. Committee members present: Ken Ampy, Heywood Fralin, Pam Moran, Carlyle Ramsey, Katherine Webb.

Staff members present: Beverly Covington, Joseph G. DeFilippo, Wendy Kang, Monica Osei, Paula Robinson, Sylvia Rosa-Casanova, and Greg Weatherford.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion by Ms. Webb, and seconded by Mr. Fralin, minutes from the January 10, 2017, meeting were approved unanimously.

ACTION ON PROGRAMS AT PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Associate of Science (A.S.) in General Studies (CIP: 24.0102)

In attendance:
Dr. Jackie Bourque, Director of Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Dr. Barbara Glenn, Dean, Humanities and Social Services
Dr. David Loope, Vice President of Academic Affairs
Dr. Jason Sampson, Program Head for General Studies

Dr. DeFilippo provided an overview of the proposed program. Under transfer policy, general studies degrees are not deemed transferable unless specifically approved to transfer by the State Committee on Transfer. The program has been approved for articulation by at least two institutions. The program was approved by the State Board in September. Dr. Ramsey asked that staff monitor the success of the program.

On motion by Mr. Ampy and seconded by Ms. Webb, the following resolution was approved unanimously to be forwarded to the full Council:

BE IT RESOLVED that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia grants approval to J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College to initiate an Associate of Science (A.S.) degree program in General Studies (CIP: 24.0102), effective Fall 2017.

Tidewater Community College Tidewater Community College, Associate of Fine Arts (A.F.A.) in Music (CIP: 50.0901)
In attendance:
Dr. Kerry Ragno, Dean of Languages, Mathematics, and Science
Dr. Kellie Sorey, Associate Vice President for Academics

Dr. DeFilippo provided an overview of the proposed program, which would be the first Associate of Fine Arts degree authorized by SCHEV to be offered in Virginia. As such, staff expects to see other community colleges emulate TCC and submit proposals to offer the award. The degree is intended to be an effective transfer degree. In the past, the curriculum did not mirror the lower level credits required at the four-year institutions for a bachelor's degree in fine arts.

On motion by Mr. Fralin, and seconded by Ms. Webb, the following resolution was approved unanimously to be forwarded to the full Council:

BE IT RESOLVED that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia grants approval to Tidewater Community College to initiate an Associate of Fine Arts (A.F.A) degree program in Music (CIP: 50.0901), effective summer 2017.

In attendance:
Old Dominion University, Master of Science (M.S.) in Sport Management (CIP: 31.0504)

Dr. Jane Bray, Dean, Darden College of Education
Dr. Gail Dickinson, Associate Dean, Darden College of Education
Dr. Jeanie Kline, Provost's Office, Academic Affairs
Dr. Lynn Ridinger, Chair Human Movement Sciences, Darden College of Education
Dr. Stephen Shapiro, Graduate Program Director, Sport Management, Human Movement Sciences

Dr. DeFilippo provided an overview of the proposed program and described why staff is not recommending approval of the program. When staff does not feel they can recommend approval, the institution is advised and offered the option of withdrawing the proposal or bringing it to Council to make the case for approval. ODU has elected in this case to come to Council. Dr. DeFilippo described the options available to Council in acting upon the proposal. Representatives from ODU provided a written response and testimony in support of approval.

Ms. Webb asked whether there are other sports management programs in Virginia. Dr. Osei said there is not such a program at any of the publics although some may have a concentration. Ms. Webb said a viable option for Council would be to try to resolve the issue if there is new information the institution can add to the original proposal. Mr. Fralin asked what it would take to recommend approval. Mr. Fralin asked if there is a trend toward sports managers needing to have a degree in sports management because we should be concerned about students getting not just jobs, but high-paying jobs. He would want to see examples to show that students are missing out on opportunities that they would have if they had this degree. Ultimately, he said the program has to improve the ability of the student to secure a successful line of employment. Dr. Moran said the program should place an emphasis on pathways for graduates and salary potential.
Dr. Ramsey said he would like the institution to work with staff to see if this can be resolved. He asked if there were discussions with the business school about the viability of the program. Dr. Schapiro said yes, they discussed how to partner, such as having a dual degree – MBA + MS in sport management.

Mr. Fralin made a motion, seconded by Ms. Webb and Dr. Moran, to continue consideration of the proposal to the next meeting of Council, which was unanimously approved by the committee.

STATUS REPORT ON ACICS SCHOOLS OPERATING IN VIRGINIA

Dr. DeFilippo suggested that the item be moved to the next meeting.

DISCUSSION OF UPDATES TO THE VIRGINIA PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Ms. Kang provided an update on initiative 1, related to Affordable Pathways. She said that the budget cuts to the Affordable Pathways Grant will necessitate postponing the second round of grants. Mr. Fralin said he has talked about getting the institutions to have a physical presence in their regional schools to create relationships. Ms. Kang said that many of the pathways grant programs involve that type of activity and that a task force of school and college representatives is also looking at such strategies. Dr. Moran said that those relationships are active in some institutions but sporadic or non-existent in others. Dr. Ramsey recomended looking across the state at similar programs that could use as examples for the April meeting.

REPORT OF THE STAFF LIAISON TO THE COMMITTEE

Dr. DeFilippo reviewed items in the liaison report. The report, on page 43 of the agenda, highlighted various activities that staff engaged in since the January meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Ramsey adjourned the meeting at 3:31 p.m.

__________________________________________
Carlyle Ramsey
Vice Chair, Academic Affairs Committee

__________________________________________
Beverly Covington
Staff, Academic Affairs
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
Agenda Item

**Item:** Academic Affairs Committee #C3 – Action on Programs at Public Institutions

**Date of Meeting:** May 15, 2017

**Presenter:** Dr. Joseph G. DeFilippo
Director of Academic Affairs & Planning
JoeDeFilippo@schev.edu

**Most Recent Review/Action:**
- [x] No previous Council review/action
- [ ] Previous review/action
  - **Date:**
  - **Action:**

**Background Information/Summary of Major Elements:**

*Program Recommended for Approval*
- James Madison University, Master of Science (M.S.) in Sport and Recreation Leadership (CIP: 31.0504)

**Financial Impact:** Program recommended for approval would be funded through existing resources and reallocations within the institution.

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:** N/A

**Resolutions:**

BE IT RESOLVED that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia grants approval to James Madison University to initiate a Master of Science (M.S.) degree program in Sport and Recreation Leadership (CIP: 31.0504), effective fall 2017.
Program Description
James Madison University (JMU) is proposing the creation of a Master of Science (MS) degree program in Sport and Recreation Leadership to initiate in fall 2017. The program would be located in the School of Hospitality, Sport and Recreation Management, and would offer two concentrations: sport and recreation, and campus recreation.

The program curriculum emphasizes ethical leadership, management development, fiscal management and skill development in industry-related areas relevant to many aspects of students’ professional lives. Program graduates will be positioned for leadership positions in a variety of sport and recreation roles, including: collegiate athletic directors, campus recreation and athletics administrators, park and recreation administrators, and marketing and front office personnel in professional sports. The curriculum requires 33 credit hours, with a 15 credit core and 18 credits in one of two concentrations—sport and recreation or campus recreation. Each concentration has thesis and non-thesis options; an internship is required for students pursuing a non-thesis option.

Justification for the Proposed Program
JMU contends that the emerging field of sport and recreation leadership has given rise to a need for qualified managers at all levels and that this has translated to the need for master-educated professionals in a variety of sports business and education settings. (See, e.g., Lewis, B.A., & Quaterman, J. (2006), “Why students return for a master’s degree in sport management.” College Student Journal, 40, 717. [https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-156364404/why-students-return-for-a-master-s-degree-in-sport].) JMU contends further that its master’s program, as opposed to bachelor programs, focuses on providing the advanced skills, knowledge and leadership ability required at more advanced stages of one’s career. The JMU program is, moreover, unique nationally in offering a concentration in campus recreation, a sub-field for which employment opportunities are robust and for which master’s level education is necessary. According to one recent study, “Virtually all full-time campus recreation professionals have obtained a four-year degree, and a significant majority hold a master’s degree. […] This is one area of the recreational sport field where a graduate degree is considered an entry-level degree” (http://www.humankinetics.com/excerpts/excerpts/professional-development-in-campus-recreation). This is borne out by job ads included with the proposal.

Student Demand
211 undergraduates in the Department of Sport and Recreation Management were surveyed. Of 73 respondents, 62% (45) indicated interest or strong interest in pursuing a master’s degree program.
The summary of projected enrollments for the proposed program shows a headcount (HDCT) of 20 in the program’s first year, rising to a HDCT of 42 by the target year. Enrollment projections show a full-time equated student enrollment (FTES) of 19 in the program’s first year (2017-18). The projections continue as follows: FTES 18-19, 19; 2019-20, 18; 2020-21, 19. JMU anticipates 21 graduates per year beginning in 2021-22. If projections are met, then this program will meet Council’s productivity standards within five years, as required.

**Market/Employer Demand**
Graduates of the proposed program would be prepared to fill positions in sports and recreation marketing or management, facilities management, campus recreation administration, and professional and college athletics administration. Both the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) and Virginia Workforce Connection show 10-year projected employment growth of 9% (slightly faster than average) for postsecondary administrators, with similar growth rates for other occupational categories related to the program’s professional tracks.

**Issues of Duplication**
Three public institutions (GMU, VCU, and VSU) offer master’s degrees in sports administration or management. All three of these programs offer substantially different options than the proposed JMU program. This is most clear in the case of the two concentrations. The JMU program concentration in campus recreation is virtually unique nationally. Even the sport and recreation concentration differs from the other institutions’ programs. To be sure, graduates from the four programs would and do compete for many similar positions, but in substance they impart different skills emphases and are related to different specific strengths of the institutions’ faculties.

**Resource Needs**
The proposed program would utilize existing faculty resources and thus does not require new resources to be initiated. Approximately $25,000 per year has been requested from the graduate school to support three graduate assistantships. These funds would be reallocated within the institution.

**Board Approval**
The JMU Board of Visitors approved the proposed program on September 26, 2014.

**Staff Recommendation**
Based on a thorough review of the application, staff recommends that the Academic Affairs Committee adopt the following resolution and transmit it to Council:

**BE IT RESOLVED that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia grants approval to James Madison University to initiate a Master of Science**
(M.S.) degree program in Sport and Recreation Leadership (CIP: 31.0504), effective fall 2017.
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Item:  Academic Affairs Committee #C4 – Action on Private and Out-of-State Post-secondary (POPE) Institutional Certifications

Date of Meeting: May 15, 2017

Presenter:  Dr. Joseph G. DeFilippo
Director of Academic Affairs & Planning
JoeDeFilippo@schev.edu

Sylvia Rosa-Casanova
Director, Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Education
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Most Recent Review/Action:
☒ No previous Council review/action
☐ Previous review/action
  Date:
  Action:

Background Information/Summary of Major Elements: University of Phoenix is seeking certification to operate three campuses in Virginia at the following locations: Virginia Beach, Arlington and Richmond

Materials Provided:
  • University of Phoenix application summary

Financial Impact:
University of Phoenix has submitted the required certification fee to operate a postsecondary institution in Virginia.

Timetable for Further Review/Action: N/A

Resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia certifies University of Phoenix to operate a degree-granting postsecondary institution with branches in Virginia Beach, Arlington, and Richmond in the Commonwealth of Virginia, effective May 16, 2017.
University of Phoenix
Application Summary

School Overview
University of Phoenix is an out-of-state, private postsecondary institution of higher education owned by Apollo Education Group, Inc. with its main location in Phoenix, Arizona. On February 1, 2017, Apollo Education Group was purchased by AP VII Queso Holdings, L.P., and Socrates Merger Sub, Inc. Three of the University of Phoenix campuses, located in Virginia Beach, Arlington, and Richmond Virginia are seeking certification under the current ownership.

School Officers
Peter Cohen – President
Meredith A. Curley – Provost
Andrea S. Diese – College Chair
Michelle L. Orzech – Campus College Chair
Eerica M. Flippin – Campus College Chair
Donald W. Johnson – Campus Director (Virginia Beach)
Michael McKinley – Campus Director (Arlington)
Kim Johnson – Interim Campus Director (Richmond)

School Mission Statement
The mission statement of University of Phoenix is as follows:

*University of Phoenix provides access to higher education opportunities that enable students to develop knowledge and skills necessary to achieve their professional goals, improve the performance of their organizations, and provide leadership and service to their communities.*

Proposed Educational Programs and Credentials Conferred
BS – Business
BS – Communication
BS – Criminal Justice Administration
BS – Environmental Science
BS – Health Administration
BS – Human Services
BS – Information Technology
BS – Management
BS – Nursing
BS – Psychology
MS – Nursing
Master of Business Administration
Master of Health Administration
Master of Information Systems
Master of Management
Master of Public Administration
Doctor of Business Administration
Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership
Doctor of Health Administration
**Proposed Location**
University of Phoenix will operate at the following locations:

1800 South Bell Street, Arlington, VA 22202
9750 West Broad Street, Glen Allen, VA 23060
4636 Columbus Street, Virginia Beach, VA 23462

**Financial Stability Indicator**
University of Phoenix submitted financial documentation for 2016 and SCHEV staff calculated the school’s financial composite score as 2.9 out of a possible 3.0, which indicates that the institution demonstrates overall financial health, as defined by the U.S. Department of Education.

**Guaranty Instrument**
University of Phoenix submitted a $356,623 surety instrument, which is adequate to provide refunds to students for the unearned non-Title IV portion of tuition and fees for any given enrollment period in the event of a school closure, pursuant to Virginia Administrative Code, section 8VAC40-31-160(I). The surety covers students enrolled at all three locations in Virginia.

**Evidence of Compliance**
University of Phoenix provided the appropriate evidence to demonstrate compliance with each of the following requirements of the Virginia Administrative Code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia Administrative Code Citation</th>
<th>Area of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 VAC 40-31-30</td>
<td>Advertising/Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 VAC 40-31-160 (E) (5)</td>
<td>Maintenance of Student Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 VAC 40-31-140 and 150</td>
<td>Faculty Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 VAC 40-31-160</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 VAC 40-31-160 (M)</td>
<td>Library Resources and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 VAC 40-31-160 (E)</td>
<td>Student Admissions Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Recommendation**
Based on a thorough review of the application, staff recommends that the Academic Affairs Committee adopt the following resolution and transmit it to Council:

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia certifies University of Phoenix to operate a degree-granting postsecondary institution with branches in Virginia Beach, Arlington, and Richmond in the Commonwealth of Virginia, effective May 16, 2017.
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Most Recent Review/Action:
☒ No previous Council review/action
☐ Previous review/action
  Date:

Background Information/Summary of Major Elements: At the September 2015 meeting Council approved six priority initiatives in support of goals of the The Virginia Plan. Staff will provide information and receive feedback from the Academic Affairs Committee on activities related to Initiatives 1 & 4:

Initiative 1: "Coordinate the development and implementation of programs that align resources from pre-K-12, colleges, universities and other public sources to ensure affordable, efficient and effective pathways for students in all parts of the state;” and

Initiative 4: "Collaborate with institutions to measure the quality of undergraduate education, including civic engagement of graduates and relevance to demand occupations across regions of the state.
Materials Provided:

- Update on Pathways Initiative 1
- Update on Quality Initiative 4

Financial Impact: N/A

Timetable for Further Review/Action: N/A

Resolution: N/A
Update on Pathways Initiative 1

I. Higher Ed. Partnership Building with PRE-K-12
Peter Blake presented to the Virginia State Board of Education in April regarding opportunities for further partnerships with Pre-K-12 and higher education. SCHEV staff members will continue to work through the High School to Postsecondary Transitions Taskforce to further refine strategies based on this input and other stakeholders discussions. The next taskforce meeting is scheduled for May 18th.

II. Outreach and Communications
In partnership with the Virginia Department of Education, SCHEV submitted a grant proposal to the Jameel – Poverty Action Lab North America (J-PAL) at MIT. The grant will support planning for a randomized evaluation study of low-cost college preparation interventions. Planning money will go towards development of a student and parent focused website for use in high schools along with informational videos.

III. Direct Outreach/Services from SCHEV to PRE-K-12
The 1-2-3 Go! to College Initiative--Virginia’s Three Steps to College completed its activities for the Class of 2017 this month. The final event (Go!) was the first state-recognized celebration of College Decision Day (#DecisionDayVA). Events related to College Decision Day celebrate life after high school decisions for seniors through social activities, assemblies, bulletin boards, t-shirts and community engagement. A sample of some events included over 2,000 high school seniors from the Tidewater and Eastern Shore areas celebrating their college decisions at an event hosted by Old Dominion University and community access provider, ACCESS Foundation. In addition, Governor McAuliffe participated in celebration events at Amelia County and Huguenot (City of Richmond) High Schools coordinated by Virginia’s College Advising Corps (University of Virginia and Virginia AmeriCorps). Step #1 (Preparation), has already started for the Class of 2018 through College Nights in Virginia. The events provide college planning information to students. Between February and April, 49 College Night events have occurred at high schools across the state and at Paul D. Camp and Virginia Highlands Community Colleges.
Update on Quality Initiative 4

I. Report on Wages and Debt of Graduates
As a follow up to discussion at Council’s April 12 Special Meeting, staff is designing a report on wage and debt outcomes of Virginia graduates, utilizing information from SCHEV's data warehouse and the Virginia Longitudinal Data System. A sample report will be presented for consideration by the Academic Affairs Committee at its July 2017 meeting, together with a proposed plan for integrating the report with SCHEV's publicly available information on academic quality.

II. Statewide meeting on civic engagement
In conjunction with the College of William and Mary, SCHEV staff is coordinating a state meeting on civic engagement, to take place on June 9 at CWM. The purpose of the meeting is to share best practices and help institutions build capacity in defining and measuring civic engagement.

III. Progress on Assessment Policy
The Task Force on Quality and Assessment was convened in May 2016, with representatives from 14 four-year institutions, Richard Bland College, three community colleges, and the Virginia Community College System office, as well as one representative from the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U). The task force was charged with developing a new policy to fulfill Council's Duty #10 in the Code of Virginia, § 23.1-203:

In cooperation with public institutions of higher education, develop guidelines for the assessment of student achievement. Each such institution shall use an approved program that complies with the guidelines of the Council and is consistent with the institution's mission and educational objectives in the development of such assessment.

The task force met six times over the course of one year. Early meetings were spent discussing the definition of “quality” and how the new policy could best promote quality improvement throughout Virginia. Several prominent themes emerged from these meetings: (1) the policy should serve as a vision statement for quality in undergraduate education; (2) in keeping with code’s emphasis on cooperation and consistency with institutional missions, the policy should provide structure but also respect the diversity of institutions and educational priorities; (3) expectations set forth in the policy should complement regional accreditation standards such that assessments conducted for one agency could also be useful for the other; and (4) the policy should promote effective communication about student achievement, both for the purpose of sharing information among themselves and to raise public awareness about the quality of Virginia’s colleges and universities.

Drafts of the proposed policy were distributed to task force members in advance of each meeting. At two points in the process, task force members were asked to
disseminate the draft to others at their institutions for broader feedback. In November 2016, members of SCHEV staff presented an early draft of the policy at the annual meeting of the Virginia Assessment Group and requested feedback from that body as well. The Instructional Programs Advisory Committee (IPAC), consisting of provosts of the public institutions, was briefed on the content of the policy several times as it developed.

The draft policy in its current form articulates a common vision of a high-quality undergraduate education. It establishes four core competencies common to the education of all Virginia students, regardless of major—critical thinking, written communication, quantitative reasoning, and civic engagement—and allows institutions to identify two additional competencies to reflect unique institutional priorities for student learning. Institutions will design and conduct rigorous assessments appropriate to the specific outcomes they expect students to achieve, and use the results of those assessments to enhance the quality of their educational programs. All institutions will be required to report assessment findings in a public format, using accessible language that can be understood by a layperson. These public reports must address the following questions for each of the six assessed competency areas:

1. What does an institution expect students to learn or do within this competency area?
2. What courses, experiences, or activities allow students to develop their knowledge and/or abilities in this competency?
3. How do faculty and staff know whether—and how well—students have learned?
4. Are the institution’s expectations being met?
5. How does the institution use this information to improve students’ educational experience and enhance future achievement?
6. Have changes made on the basis of previous assessment findings had the desired effect?

SCHEV will review institutional assessment plans and reports to ensure consistency and rigor and will provide feedback to institutions before dissemination. The policy is currently under review at institutions and will be subject to final discussion by IPAC at its next meeting on May 19, 2017. Following that meeting staff will incorporate final revisions and present the policy to Council for consideration at its July 2017 meeting.
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Item:  Academic Affairs Committee #C6 – Report of the Staff Liaison to the Committee

Date of Meeting:  May 15, 2017

Presenter:  Dr. Joseph G. DeFilippo
Director of Academic Affairs & Planning
JoeDeFilippo@schev.edu

Most Recent Review/Action:
☒ No previous Council review/action
☐ Previous review/action
   Date:
   Action:

Background Information/Summary of Major Elements:  N/A

Materials Provided:  “Report of the Staff Liaison to the Academic Affairs Committee,” by Dr. Joseph G. DeFilippo.

Financial Impact:  N/A

Timetable for Further Review/Action:  N/A

Resolution:  N/A
Career College Advisory Board (CCAB)
CCAB was convened on April 18 under the leadership of Sylvia Rosa-Casanova. CCAB is mandated in code, and was established by Council in 2004 to provide advisory services in matters relating to proprietary private postsecondary schools.

Civic Engagement and Assessment
A one-day gathering is being organized by Jodi Fisler, to be held at William and Mary on June 9, on Civic Engagement and Assessment. The purpose of the meeting is to assist campuses to define and measure civic engagement.

POPE Informational Summit
The 2017 POPE Informational Summit was held on March 23 at the Short Pump Hilton. Dr. Sharon Bob gave a keynote presentation on federal legislation and US Department of Education policies. Nearly 200 representatives from Virginia certified institutions attended.

Sexual Assault Advisory Committee
Beverly Covington and Ashley Lockhart convened a meeting of the Sexual Violence Advisory Committee at the University of Virginia on April 12 to discuss potential legislation regarding sexual misconduct procedures, employment dispute resolution, and gather institutional input on SB1389. A presentation was made by Gina Maistro-Smith, adjunct professor of law at Penn and author of The Regional Center for Investigation and Adjudication: A Proposed Solution to the Challenges of Title IX Investigations in Higher Education.

State Committee on Transfer (SCT)
The SCT met at John Tyler Community College on March 23, 2017. Former Senator Walter Stosch spoke about institutional dual admission agreements. Additional elements of the meeting included the approval of J. Sargeant Reynolds’ General Studies associate degree being recognized as a transfer associate degree, dual enrollment legislation, the work of the P-20 Council, and implementation of the State Policy on College Transfer.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Staff Activities and Recognition
Beverly Covington
• Attended conference on Higher Education and Social Mobility at William and Mary, April 21-22.
• Visited ODU with Peter Blake to hear about enrollment, the Online Virginia Network, distance learning improvements, and the Affordable Pathways grant project that connects ODU with TCC and the Virginia Beach public schools to provide a pathway to a textbook-free degree.

Joseph DeFilippo
• Served as a final session panelist at the Governor’s Data Analytics Summit, held at the University of Virginia, April 10, 2017.

Darlene Derricott
• Attended, with Ms. Angela Patterson, the annual meeting of the National Association of State Administrators and Supervisors of Private Schools held in Lexington Kentucky, April 2-4. As a member of the State Authorization Network, staff engaged in a roundtable discussion that focused on institutional resources and structures and the costs of offering distance education.
• Attended the Southern Regional Education Board’s annual meeting for state coordinators of the Academic Common Market and Electronic Campus, April 12-13 in Atlanta. Members were informed of the dissolution of SREB’s Electronic Campus Regional Reciprocity Agreement, effective June 30, 2017.

Jodi Fisler
• Attended “Breaking New Ground: The Role of Assessment in Higher Education Learning Improvement,” an invitation-only summit of national leaders in higher education assessment and educational development, co-hosted by the Center for Assessment and Research Studies at James Madison University and the Center for Inquiry at Wabash College April 2-4, in Washington DC.
• Participated in pre-summit work session on Data Science in Liberal Arts Education as part of the Governor’s Data Analytics Summit, held at UVA, April 10, 2017.
• Attended conference on Higher Education and Social Mobility at William and Mary, April 21-22.

Monica Osei
• Attended the Virginia Collegiate Honors Council spring 2017 conference, April 7-8 at ODU. Participating colleges are members of the Council and this year, 100 students from 6 private, four-year institutions, 8 public, four-year institutions, and 2 public, two-year institutions in the Commonwealth participated. A new platform was added this year which expanded participation to students in Art programs.
Sylvia Rosa-Casanova

- Attended the annual conference of the National Association of State Administrators and Supervisors of Private Schools (NASASPS) in Lexington, KY, April 2-4.
- **Ms. Rosa-Casanova completed a two-year term as president of NASAPS in April, simultaneously beginning a two-year term on the NASAPS Board of Directors.**

Academic Affairs Staff:
- Ms. Beverly Covington, Senior Associate for Academic & Legislative Affairs
- Dr. Joseph G. DeFilippo, Director, Academic Affairs & Planning
- Ms. Darlene Derricott, Senior Coordinator, Academic Services
- Dr. Jodi Fisler, Associate for Assessment Policy & Analysis
- Ms. Ashley Lockhart, Regional Center Study Project Manager
- Dr. Monica Osei, Associate Director for Academic Programs & Instructional Sites
- Ms. Angela Patterson, Specialist for Academic Programs & Services
- Ms. Sylvia Rosa-Casanova, Director, Private and Out of State Postsec. Education
- Dr. Paul Smith, Senior Associate for Student Mobility Policy & Research
Ms. Connelly called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m. in the New Market Room, Marshall Hall/Center for Leadership and Ethics, Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Virginia. Committee members present: Marge Connelly, Henry Light, Bill Murray and Minnis Ridenour. Chairman G. Gilmer Minor also was present.

Committee member absent: Stephen Moret and Tom Slater.

Staff members present: Lee Andes, Peter Blake, Alan Edwards, Dan Hix, Tod Massa, Jean Mottley, and Lee Ann Rung.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by Mr. Light and seconded by Mr. Ridenour the minutes from the January 10, 2017, meeting were approved unanimously.

UPDATE ON 2017 GENERAL ASSEMBLY BUDGET ACTIONS

Mr. Hix reviewed the summary of the Governor’s introduced budget amendments for the 2016-18 biennium as well as final details of the budget conference report. He explained that the Council’s recommendation related to faculty salary increases was advanced, with certain exceptions. The final budget included a 2% salary increase for teaching and research, administrative faculty, and appointed officials at public institutions. Also included was an additional 1% salary increase for teaching and research and administrative faculty and appointed officials at those selected institutions that did not provide faculty salary increases in FY2017. Classified state employees will receive a 3% increase. All salary increases will be effective July 2017.

Mr. Hix reviewed several charts in the agenda book and explained the outcomes as compared to the Council’s recommendations. Mr. Minor stated a need for Council to articulate The Virginia Plan successes prior to the next legislative session. Several members expressed an interest in SCHEV weighing in and Mr. Blake suggested that members begin thinking about what issues the Council would like to advance next session. Mr. Ridenour urged support for utilizing graduate students to move The Virginia Plan forward.

Dr. Murray reminded members of the importance of making a connection with the gubernatorial candidates prior to the fall elections.

DISCUSSION OF UPDATES TO THE VIRGINIA PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
Mr. Hix and Dr. Mottley provided updates on initiative #2 (sustainable funding options) and initiative #3 (options for further restructuring and shared services that enhance institutional and administrative flexibility and improve quality and efficiency). Dr. Mottley began the discussion by summarizing initiative #3 and informed the members of two projects currently underway as part of the new fund for excellence and innovation program: a study of the possible expansion of the VCCS shared services center to other non-VCCS institutions, and the plan to hold a conference or forum on innovation and efficiencies, with collaboration and best practices as the key themes. The tentative date is October 19 from 9 a.m. -12 p.m. at VCU’s Siegel Center. Dr. Mottley also reviewed additional action steps recommended by staff for the Committee’s consideration related to further restructuring and efficiencies. The four options appear on page 74 of the agenda book. The members provided approval for staff to work on all four options. With regard to option 4, which was “Recommend additional incentives for institutions to promote further restructuring and efficiencies,” members suggested these incentives could include allowing certain institutions the ability to rely on self-generated revenues (not just tuition); allowing institutions to be more entrepreneurial; and emphasizing the institutions’ commitment to serve students with financial need.

Mr. Hix discussed the pros and cons of the options provided for pursuing sustainable funding and received comments from members. Ms. Connelly requested the Committee’s general sentiment on pursuing a constitutional amendment to address sustained funding. Dr. Murray noted that higher education funding will likely not return to past levels, so he suggested a blending of a constitutional amendment, with the realization that support for Virginia higher education funding will continue to be limited. Mr. Ridenour indicated that a constitutional amendment could pass if it was approached like the bond package.

Ms. Connelly requested that staff provide a catalog of other states that have successfully implemented a constitutional amendment related to higher education funding.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia  
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Item: Resources and Planning #D3 – Discussion of Updates to The Virginia Plan for Higher Education  

Date of Meeting: May 15, 2017  

Presenters: Peter Blake, Director  
(peterblake@schev.edu) 

Dan Hix, Finance Policy Director  
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Yan Zheng, Assistant Director for Finance Policy  
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Jean Mottley, Senior Associate for Finance Policy  
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Alan Edwards, Policy Studies Director  
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Most Recent Review/Action:  
☐ No previous Council review/action  
☒ Previous review/action  
  Date: April 12, 2017  
  Action: Council discussed activities for the assigned initiatives  

Background Information/Summary of Major Elements: At its September 2015 meeting Council approved six priority initiatives in support of goals of The Virginia Plan. Staff provides information here on initiatives 2, 3 and 6 for discussion and direction from the Resources and Planning Committee:  

Initiative 2: Seek legislative changes that support stable and sustainable public funding for higher education, such as a constitutional amendment, a dedicated funding source, and a revenue stabilization fund.  

Initiative 3: Review and recommend potential initiatives for further restructuring and shared services that enhance institutional and administrative flexibility and improve quality and efficiency.
Initiative 6: Promote economic development for the Commonwealth by implementing a long-term plan that supports recruitment and retention of research faculty, provides matches to federal and private research grants and enhances commercialization of higher education research.

**Materials Provided:** Summary of Initiatives.

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:** Staff and committee members will continue to work together to monitor progress on these initiatives.

**Resolution:** N/A
**Update on Funding Initiative #2**

*Seek legislative changes that support stable and sustainable public funding for higher education, such as a constitutional amendment, a dedicated funding source, and a revenue stabilization fund.*

At the March 21 Council meeting, members reviewed options for consideration related to stable and sustainable funding. Members asked for information on constitutional provisions in other states, which staff provided at the April 12 special meeting. Members also asked for variations on provisions to provide targeted funding for institutions by sector.

The Governor and the General Assembly may wish to direct limited state general fund appropriations to selected sectors and institutions based on state priorities and on an institution’s capacity to generate revenue on its own. For example, to preserve lower-cost options, the Governor and the General Assembly could direct more state general fund support to community colleges and simultaneously authorize institutions to maximize their own revenue-generating capacity. Below are some options SCHEV could consider recommending to the Governor and the General Assembly that would result in variable funding based on policy choices.

- Institutions could be authorized to increase out-of-state undergraduate enrollment. Current Appropriation Act language restricts institutions that enroll more than 25% out-of-state institutions from enrolling a larger percentage of out-of-state students than they currently enroll. Additional out-of-state enrollment would result in additional tuition revenue. It also could result in having some institutions enrolling fewer Virginia students, as a percentage of total, than they currently enroll. The following table monitors compliance with the Appropriation Act language and shows the percentage of undergraduate in-state and out-of-state headcount enrollment in Fall 2016.
The state could establish different funding assumptions among institutions. Currently, state policy says that the state will pay for 67 percent of the cost of education for an in-state student and the student will pay 33 percent of the cost. (The current split is 47/53). The Governor and the General Assembly could change the mix according to institution, whereby students would receive a greater subsidy at one institution than they would at another.

State policy currently supports in-state undergraduate and graduate students at the same level (67 percent from the state and 33 percent from the student). The Governor and the General Assembly could consider a funding policy that sets different levels of support for undergraduate and graduate students, thereby redirecting general fund support according to the policy change.

“Free” community college tuition:

One extreme option of changing the fund split policy for designated institutional sectors would be to make community colleges “free.” Community colleges currently receive approximately $500 million in tuition revenue. Provisions for “free” community college in other states severely reduce the availability of the benefit by specifying eligibility requirements. If such requirements were applied to a program in Virginia, the cost would be less than $500 million.
The Code of Virginia authorizes individual boards to set appropriate tuition and fees:

The governing board of each public institution of higher education shall continue to fix, revise, charge, and collect tuition, fees, rates, rentals, and other charges for the services, goods, or facilities furnished by or on behalf of such institution and may adopt policies regarding any such service rendered or the use, occupancy, or operation of any such facility (§ 23.1-307, Code of Virginia).

Some institutions have the capacity to increase tuition beyond their current levels. The Governor and the General Assembly could enable these institutions to increase tuition at greater levels than they have historically, within the willingness of the governing boards, and direct limited general fund support to other institutions that do not have the same capacity.

Appropriation Act (Item 4-2.01.b.2) language currently requires institutions to set tuition for out-of-state students at a level that meets at least 100 percent of the cost of education. The Governor and the General Assembly could direct institutions (or selected institutions) to require out-of-state institutions pay more than 100% of cost, thereby redirecting general fund support to other institutions.
### 2016-17 Average Nonresident Tuition
As a Percent of Average Cost of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Average Per Student Cost&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Average Nonresident Tuition&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>% of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMU</td>
<td>$16,383</td>
<td>$29,426</td>
<td>180%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODU</td>
<td>$14,131</td>
<td>$24,209</td>
<td>171%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA</td>
<td>$24,429</td>
<td>$35,385</td>
<td>145%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCU</td>
<td>$17,840</td>
<td>$27,363</td>
<td>153%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>$17,918</td>
<td>$27,371</td>
<td>153%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWM</td>
<td>$22,297</td>
<td>$32,544</td>
<td>146%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNU</td>
<td>$13,582</td>
<td>$19,325</td>
<td>142%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVAW</td>
<td>$15,308</td>
<td>$22,079</td>
<td>144%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMU</td>
<td>$14,027</td>
<td>$22,072</td>
<td>157%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>$13,927</td>
<td>$21,816</td>
<td>157%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMW</td>
<td>$17,081</td>
<td>$22,453</td>
<td>131%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>$17,094</td>
<td>$17,774</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU</td>
<td>$13,098</td>
<td>$18,681</td>
<td>143%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMI</td>
<td>$19,804</td>
<td>$32,770</td>
<td>165%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSU</td>
<td>$15,263</td>
<td>$15,960</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBC</td>
<td>$8,858</td>
<td>$14,304</td>
<td>161%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCS</td>
<td>$8,175</td>
<td>$10,271</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL&lt;sup&gt;(3)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$13,945</td>
<td>$25,981</td>
<td>159%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>(1)</sup> Derived by dividing 2016-17 appropriations by 2016-17 projected enrollment approved by SCHEV in 2015.

<sup>(2)</sup> Enrollment-weighted tuition averages of both undergraduate and graduate students.

<sup>(3)</sup> Total percent of cost calculation has been weighted by level-specific (doctoral, comprehensive, and two-year) enrollments.

---

- Most institutions have assumed greater control over their operational and administrative decisions such that they do not require the same level of oversight from central administrative units of government. This results in cost savings for institutions. The Governor and the General Assembly could implement other changes for some or all of the institutions that would result in greater savings.
Update on Restructuring Initiative #3

Review and recommend potential initiatives for further restructuring and shared services that enhance institutional and administrative flexibility and improve quality and efficiency.

Since the April 12 Council meeting, staff has continued to work on the action steps for this initiative. That work included a visit to the Virginia Community College System Shared Services Center (SSC) in Daleville. The SSC is governed and directed by the colleges and the System Office. The Center currently has 37 employees. The goal of the SSC is to provide administrative services better, faster and cheaper to allow the VCCS to focus as many resources as possible on supporting student success. The SSC started providing the first service on July 26, 2016. Initially, the SSC is focusing on these four service areas:

- Time, Labor and Absence Management: This service area, for all 23 colleges and the System Office, has been moved to the SSC.
- Travel and Expense Reimbursement: The transfer of this service area for all locations should be completed by the end of the June.
- Procurement and Accounts Payable: This service area has been moved to the SSC for eight of the colleges and a ninth college will come aboard by the end of June. They project that the process of adding all locations will take another 12 to 15 months.
- Collection Services: The SSC is just beginning to work with the colleges on transferring this service area.

Additional information may be found on the SSC’s website: www.ssc.vccs.edu.

The VCCS obtained a $30,000 grant from the SCHEV Efficiency and Innovation Fund to support a study to evaluate the feasibility of other public higher education institutions receiving services from the SSC. That report is due June 15. The VCCS has been asked to present on the SSC and the study at the July Council Meeting.
Promote economic development in the Commonwealth by implementing a long-term plan that supports recruitment and retention of research faculty, provides matches to federal and private research grants and enhances commercialization of higher-education research.

At the Special Council meeting on April 12, the Ad Hoc Committee on Research reviewed and offered feedback to staff on a first draft of the Call for Proposals for Round 1 of the Virginia Research Investment Fund (VRIF). Staff has prepared a new draft, which the Committee and Council will review for action on May 16. Staff will then present the document to the Virginia Research Investment Committee (VRIC) on May 19 and will seek authorization to issue the Call at VRIC’s May 24 meeting.

On April 18, staff issued a Request for Information (RFI) to solicit input from potential consultants on a Request for Proposals (RFP) that SCHEV will issue on behalf of VRIC for a study to assess the Commonwealth’s research assets, as required in Item 255.C of Chapter 836 of the 2017 Acts of Assembly. The RFI closed on May 2; six responses were received. Staff will use these responses in preparing an RFP for consideration by VRIC on May 19 and, if accepted, for action on May 24.

Also on May 24, VRIC will consider whether to release the $8 million in general funds and $20 million in bond funds for the Global Genomics and Bioinformatics Institute being developed by INOVA Health and partnering public research universities, as specified in Budget Item 478.20.

Regarding the academic-research enterprise generally, staff is pleased to report that the federal budget deal reached in late April increases overall federal spending on R&D by 5%, which some observers are taking as a good omen for the future. Federal spending on basic research will grow by 4.1%; on applied research, by 6.3%.

- The budget of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which is the largest single source of funding for academic R&D, is increased by $2 billion, or 6.2% (from $31.7B to $33.7B).

- The budgets of the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Department of Energy (DoE) receive slight increases. The DoE, which is the largest funder of physical-science research, will receive a 0.8% increase to its $5.4B budget. NSF’s budget of $7.5B will hold steady, with an increase of only $9 million.

- For the federal fiscal year that begins on October 1, the Trump Administration has proposed cutting the NIH budget by 18% (5.8B), in large part by reducing or eliminating funding of universities’ indirect costs on their NIH grants. Also, the Administration’s proposed 9.8% cut to most federal agencies would reduce the NSF budget by about $750 million.
Dr. Murray called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. in the New Market Room in Marshall Hall at Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Virginia.

Committee members present: Ken Ampy, William Murray, Minnis E. Ridenour

Committee member absent: H. Eugene Lockhart

Council members present: Heywood Fralin, Henry Light, Gil Minor, Katherine Webb

Staff present: Peter Blake, Alan Edwards, Lynn Seuffert, Joseph DeFilippo, Tod Massa, Lee Ann Rung. Al Wilson, SCHEV counsel from the Office of the Attorney General, also was in attendance.

WELCOME

Dr. Murray welcomed committee members, attending Council members, and staff.

General J.H. Binford Peay III, Superintendent of Virginia Military Institute, welcomed SCHEV to VMI.

Dr. Murray suspended the meeting for lunch to be served.

The meeting reconvened at 12:40 pm.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Ridenour motioned to approve the minutes of the January 10, 2017, February 23, 2017, and March 8, 2017, meetings. Mr. Ampy seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

UPDATE ON VIRGINIA RESEARCH INVESTMENT FUND AND COMMITTEE

Dr. Murray called on Dr. Edwards to provide an update.

Dr. Edwards informed the committee that VRIC met on Tuesday, March 14, 2017. He highlighted three parts of the VRIC meeting: (1) an update from staff on amendments to VRIF legislation; (2) new language in the Conference Report for Budget Item 255; and (3) advice from VRIC to the ad hoc committee on research regarding the organizing principles and Round 1.
Regarding advice from VRIC on the organizing principles, Dr. Edwards stated that discussion centered on Items 3 and 8 of that document and asked the Chair, who had attended the VRIC meeting, for his perspective on the discussion.

Dr. Murray said the VRIC discussion was correctly focused on discretionary items in that document. He reported that VRIC members appeared comfortable with the minimum dollar amount for awards that the ad hoc committee had recommended in Item 8, but there was not as much agreement regarding the higher end of range. Dr. Murray stated that having a range could be helpful to applicants to signal the scope and scale of projects that were of interest to VRIC. For example, a researcher with a project costing less than $100,000 would know that this funding mechanism was not a good match and, at the other end of the range, there is not enough funding to start a new national center so those mega-scale projects might also not be the best matches.

Dr. Murray offered an amendment to remove the dollar figure at the higher end of the range. He stated his preference that the ad hoc committee be responsive to key stakeholders.

As for Item 3 of that document, Dr. Murray confirmed his support of limited submissions because that approach helps to ensure an “institutional screen” on applications, rather than a departmental-level or school-level filter.

**ACTION ON PROPOSED ORGANIZING PRINCIPLES**

Dr. Murray formally offered an amendment to strike the maximum amount from the dollar range in Item 8 of the organizing principles document.

Mr. Ridenour seconded the motion. The amendment was approved unanimously.

Dr. Murray asked whether any members had additional discussion items before further action on the organizing principles.

Mr. Ridenour expressed his support of the organizing principles, but requested an amendment that would formally prioritize using VRIF funding for the recruitment of researchers over the funding of research projects. He stated his belief that this approach was most likely to lead to the achievement of the VRIF objective to increase overall funding coming into the Commonwealth and improve the Commonwealth’s national academic research ranking.

Mr. Ridenour further offered his perspective either that VRIF funds be used for projects at the proof of concept stage or that VRIC work with other state-funded research programs to identify a strictly dedicated pool of funding for proof of concept projects. As the discussion evolved, it became clear that speakers were using the phrase “proof of concept” differently.

Dr. Murray stated that proof of concept projects are less expensive and generally fall below the minimum dollar range of awards expressed in Item 8 of the document.
Ms. Seuffert suggested that proof of concept is very near the beginning of the research and development continuum and that VRIC was leaning toward funding applied research that had already passed the proof of concept stage because a high percentage of projects that enter that stage never result in a product that makes it to market. Projects that have been through proof of concept are de-risked just a bit more and therefore more attractive to VRIC.

Mr. Ridenour stated his belief that proof of concept signals the end of research and that there is no further research to be done once the concept has been proven. He would like VRIF to fund the stage of research and development at which industry is brought in to look at the design of the product and partner on its commercialization.

Dr. Murray suggested that the decision whether to segregate amounts of VRIF funds for different purposes fell under the VRIC’s purview. Mr. Blake stated his understanding that VRIC had chosen not to earmark funds for certain categories. He recalled that VRIC is aware of universities' interest in access to funding for proof of concept projects and that VRIC had discussed that option.

Dr. Murray then asked whether there was additional discussion on the organizing principles.

Mr. Fralin, member of Council and of VRIC, but not a member of the ad hoc committee, said that VRIC has a lot of members and they have differing opinions. He stated that this applies to researcher recruitment, too. He stated his belief that VRIC does not want to prioritize recruitment. However, his opinion is that recruitment is critical because 10% of the researchers get 90% of results.

Hearing no further requests to speak, Dr. Murray offered two amendments.

Regarding Mr. Ridenour's interest in researcher recruitment, Dr. Murray offered an amendment to Item 5 by inserting the phrase, “recognizing the importance of” to indicate that the guidelines and application formats should indicate the relative importance that VRIC chooses to place on the two kinds of projects.

Regarding Mr. Ridenour's interest in ensuring funding for proof of concept projects and/or the stage at which industry partners join researchers for commercialization, Dr. Murray offered an additional Item 14 be added to the organizing principles:

14. Nothing herein is intended to limit the Virginia Research Investment Committee’s discretion to reserve or otherwise identify funding for proof of concept proposals below the minimum and apart from the limited submission concepts expressed herein. It is recommended that all proposals, including but not limited to proof of concept proposals, speak to the entire research and development cycle, including commercialization.

Dr. Murray then moved to approve the two amendments. Mr. Ridenour seconded the motion. The two amendments were approved unanimously.
With the understanding that staff would add the amendments to the document for the full Council meeting on Tuesday, Mr. Ridenour moved to approve the amended organizing principles. Mr. Ampy seconded the motion. The amended organizing principles were approved unanimously.

The resolution that had been included in the agenda for action was held in abeyance until the full Council meeting on Tuesday.

**DISCUSSION OF DEVELOPMENT OF VRIF ROUND 1**

Dr. Murray called on Dr. Edwards to discuss the potential timeline for Round 1.

Dr. Edwards stated that the draft timeline would allow VRIC to make awards by the end of the calendar year, if they choose. He stated that VRIC members were not all necessarily in agreement that awards should be made by end of year.

He reminded members that SCHEV has a duty to create guidelines regardless of whether VRIC chooses to issue the resulting Call for Proposals.

Dr. Edwards then highlighted the upcoming April 12 ad hoc committee meeting where the draft guidelines would be discussed and the May meeting at which the committee could choose to approve the Call for Proposals. If that happens, the Call for Proposals could be issued in late May, if VRIC decides to do that.

Mr. Blake asked Dr. Murray to allow Dr. Edwards to walk through the strategic opportunities document, which had been revised in response to comments by the ad hoc committee members at the last meeting. Dr. Edwards highlighted the three opportunities described in that document.

Regarding the third opportunity, “a bridging of the gaps in research and commercialization infrastructure and expertise,” Mr. Fralin expressed his concerns that there is a difference between which research is the best research and which is most likely to get to the marketplace. Academic researchers do not always understand how the venture capitalists analyze the commercial potential of research. Mr. Fralin does not want VRIC to rely on academic researchers’ assessment of the commercial viability of their own research.

Dr. Murray suggested that Virginia universities have excellent MBA programs and perhaps that expertise can be leveraged.

Ms. Seuffert suggested that the Virginia Bioscience Health Research Corporation had convened a diverse panel of experts to review applications to that fund. The panel includes academic researchers, venture capitalists or angel investors, and people with small business start-up expertise. She stated that the review panels that would be convened for VRIC would also include these kinds of experts.
Dr. Murray suggested the addition of a representative from an established company, given that any new spin-off companies that might be created by researchers would want to become established companies at some point in the future.

**DISCUSSION OF TIMELINE AND NEXT STEPS**

Dr. Murray and Mr. Minor conferred on actions that would need to be taken at Tuesday’s meeting of the full Council.

It was agreed that, after staff added the amendments, the action item would be approval of the organizing principles.

Dr. Murray stated that he was not available to attend the Council meeting. Mr. Ampy offered to present the committee report.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Dr. Murray adjourned the meeting at 1:45 p.m.

William Murray  
Chair, SCHEV Ad Hoc Committee on Research

Lynn Seuffert  
Associate for Research Investment
Dr. Murray called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. in the offices of Owens and Minor, 9120 Lockwood Blvd, Mechanicsville, Virginia.

Committee members present: H. Eugene Lockhart, William Murray, Minnis E. Ridenour

Committee member absent: Ken Ampy

Council members present: Heywood Fralin, Henry Light

Council members present for part of the meeting: Marge Connelly, G. Gilmer Minor III, and Stephen Moret

Staff present: Peter Blake, Alan Edwards, Lynn Seuffert. Al Wilson, SCHEV counsel from the Office of the Attorney General, also was in attendance.

WELCOME

Dr. Murray welcomed committee members, attending Council members, and staff.

He recognized Mr. Blake to frame the meeting.

Mr. Blake informed members that, after the staff update, the draft Call for Proposals for the Round 1 competition of the Virginia Research Investment Fund would be discussed and feedback gathered. Staff would then bring a final version to the May 15-16 committee and Council meetings for approval of the guidelines for Round 1. Mr. Blake reminded members that the statute confers upon Council the responsibility to create the guidelines and VRIC then makes the final approval for awards.

UPDATES FROM STAFF

Mr. Blake informed members that VRIC asked staff to develop a Request for Proposals (RFP) to procure consultants to conduct an assessment of assets or situational analysis. That assessment would be coordinated with other ongoing efforts, such as the GO VA regional plans, the VEDP strategic plan, and the Research and Technology Strategic Roadmap (the Roadmap). The pieces could all come together near the end of the year.
Mr. Blake asked Dr. Edwards to provide an update on the General Assembly reconvened session.

Dr. Edwards stated that the Governor had amended the bill (HB2245/SB1371), the amendments were accepted by the General Assembly, and it appeared the bill would be signed by the Governor. He provided an overview of changes to the role of VRIC, changes to the role of SCHEV, and changes to the budget language. Dr. Edwards mentioned three changes to the duties assigned to SCHEV by the statute and budget language. First, the development of the Roadmap, after January 1, 2018, will become the responsibility of SCHEV. Second, after establishment by SCHEV of the initial guidelines for application, review, and award of grants, the responsibility for maintaining and updating the guidelines will transition to VRIC. Third, SCHEV will serve as the coordinating body on behalf of VRIC for the study of research assets to be conducted. Dr. Edwards also offered a handout related to that study as described in the budget language.

Dr. Edwards stated that the April 6 VRIC meeting focused on the RFP for the study and the coordination between entities.

He turned to Mr. Blake (Chair of VRIC) and Mr. Fralin (VRIC member) to add their thoughts about the April 6 VRIC meeting. Mr. Blake highlighted the overlap between the Roadmap and the assessment. Mr. Fralin commented that the composition of VRIC members brought the needed skills to the table. He believes that the primary issue is getting research from the laboratory to the marketplace in a way that creates significant high-paying jobs for the Commonwealth.

Mr. Lockhart asked whether the anticipated mapping of assets would rely only on responses from the institutions. He expressed concern that a central research office might not be aware of all the projects underway throughout the enterprise.

Mr. Ridenour suggested that asking the Vice Presidents of Research at each institution to encourage participation throughout their university would ensure results.

Ms. Seuffert suggested that there were ways to double check for gaps in the responses received from institutions, perhaps by reviewing articles published in peer-reviewed journals that, in the aggregate, reveal areas of expertise and then ensuring that information was already reflected in university responses.

Dr. Edwards concluded that staff had reviewed studies from other states to identify consultants that had conducted those studies. Staff also has begun to gather additional information about potential vendors. He stated that a revised version of the RFP would be introduced at the May 19 VRIC meeting, with approval to issue the RFP occurring at the May 24 VRIC meeting.
Dr. Murray asked Ms. Seuffert to walk through the draft Call for Proposals. He requested that the focus remain on the content that was discretionary (not required by statute) and for which members could provide guidance.

Ms. Seuffert highlighted salient points in each section and fielded questions.

Mr. Lockhart asked whether staff, Council, or VRIC needed to involve themselves in the issue of intellectual property (IP). Ms. Seuffert stated that each institution has its own standards for IP and it was expected that these would be sufficient.

Mr. Ridenour asked for clarification about the stage or phase of research and commercialization that would be funded. He wanted to ensure that the guidelines were soliciting projects for which the research was well underway and ready to be commercialized. Ms. Seuffert confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Fralin raised the issue of the measures of success. He believes that the Governor and General Assembly are looking to measure the results of these investments. He understands that it could be years before final measures of success would be available.

Mr. Light suggested that, while the General Assembly might have a short-term focus, setting up a new research program such as VRIF is a long-term endeavor.

Ms. Seuffert responded that the measures that would be tracked included both progress metrics and outcome metrics for each funded grant, as well as state-level trends such as ranking. She also stated that some measures would be reported by grantees for five years after the end of the grant period.

Mr. Ridenour asked whether institutions could offer Education & General Program (E&G) funds as part of the match requirement. (E&G revenues are derived mainly from state appropriations and student tuition and fees.) Discussion of potential scenarios followed, such as release time for faculty at comprehensive institutions to conduct research versus using E&G funds as a cash match. Dr. Murray suggested that staff accept comments from institutions about this issue and return at the May meeting with a recommendation.

Mr. Ridenour asked whether there was anything in the Call for Proposals to incentivize growth in external funding. He reminded members of the goal in the Virginia Plan for Higher Education to position the Commonwealth higher in the national rankings for research expenditures.
Mr. Lockhart commented that, in addition to state ranking, VRIF had goals for commercialization of research and economic impact. He asked which entity had responsibility for determining the prioritization of areas of research.

General discussion followed. VRIF areas of research focus are those included in the Roadmap. While the Roadmap is currently administered by CIT, it will transition to Council for development in January 2018, with approval by VRIC and then the Governor.

Mr. Lockhart noted that the VRIF program does not satisfy all of what Council anticipated for Initiative #6 in the Virginia Plan for Higher Education. If Council decides to recommend research priorities beyond VRIF, it might prefer a wider range.

Mr. Lockhart raised a concern whether proposals for researcher recruitment and retention would be at a scoring disadvantage because the sections relating to the commercialization of research and economic development might be less specific or have a longer timeline. Ms. Seuffert responded that the scoring does not offer more points for projects that are closer to commercialization or for projects that have higher estimates of job creation. Instead, the scoring is based on whether the plans described in those sections are realistic and achievable.

Mr. Lockhart asked about responsibility for ensuring that grant funds were spent in accordance with the proposals and according to state rules, as well as whether audits would be conducted. Ms. Seuffert responded that grantees agree to terms and conditions that include these aspects and so they share responsibility. The Auditor of Public Accounts would determine whether a specific project should have a full audit. As staff to VRIC, Ms. Seuffert will be reviewing the financial and narrative progress reports, looking first to assist grantees if it appears they are getting off-track, but also keeping an eye out for red flags. Finally, at some point in the future, Council and VRIC should expect a review by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC).

Mr. Fralin suggested that staff not wait for JLARC. Instead, staff should design a methodology to conduct an internal evaluation of VRIF grant-making on an ongoing basis. In addition to tracking grantee progress, staff should assess the whole concept of using public funds to support research to spur economic development.

**DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS**

Dr. Murray summed up the meeting by agreeing that conducting program evaluation on an ongoing basis was a wise approach. He also reminded staff that institutions should be informed that the Call for Proposals is available online and that staff welcome feedback before the next meeting.
The next meeting is May 15-16, in conjunction with the regular Council meeting. Action by full Council on the Call for Proposals will be requested May 16.

**ADJOURNMENT**
Dr. Murray adjourned the meeting at 10:35 a.m.

William Murray  
Chair, SCHEV Ad Hoc Committee on Research

Lynn Seuffert  
Associate for Research Investment
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
Agenda Item

Item: Ad Hoc Committee on Research #3 – Action on Proposed Call for
Proposals (Round 1 of the Virginia Research Investment Fund)

Date of Meeting: May 16, 2017

Presenters: Alan Edwards, Director of Policy Studies
alanedwards@schev.edu
Lynn Seuffert
Associate for Research Investment
lynnseuffert@schev.edu

Most Recent Review/Action:
☐ No previous Council review/action
☒ Previous review/action
  Date: April 12, 2017
  Action: Review of draft Call for Proposals document

Background Information/Summary of Major Elements:
On March 21, Council approved a set of 14 organizing principles, as amended and
recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee on Research, to guide its development of
the Call for Proposals for the Virginia Research Investment Fund (VRIF). During the
prior five months, staff had fleshed out the principles in consultation with the Virginia
Research Investment Committee (VRIC), representatives of the public institutions of
higher education, and representatives of related grantmaking bodies. The Committee
spent much of its February 23 meeting in discussion with institutional representatives
regarding the principles, and on March 14, Committee Chairman Murray presented
the principles to VRIC and received valuable consultative guidance.

On April 12, staff presented to the Committee a draft Call for Proposals for the award
process for Round 1 of the VRIF. The document reflected best practices in academic
grantmaking as evidenced by related grant competitions in Virginia and other states,
as well as at the federal level. It reflected input from VRIC members, administrators
of similar programs, institutional personnel and staff’s own expertise and experience.
The draft also was consistent with other grant-proposal requests and programs
administered by SCHEV.

In advance of potential action in May on the Call for Proposals, Committee members
directed staff to clarify whether and how institutions could use general funds in their
match to VRIF funds and to reconsider the scoring weights of various components of
the researcher-recruitment and applied-research competitions. Staff noted that the
section on the Virginia Freedom of Information Act would be revised in consultation
with Mr. Wilson from the Office of the Attorney General and agreed to notify relevant constituents that the draft was a public document and feedback was welcome.

**Materials Provided:**

Proposed “VRIF Call for Proposals – Round 1”  

**Financial Impact:** None

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:**

If the Committee and the Council approve the Call for Proposals as presented or amended on May 16, then staff will submit the document to VRIC for review at its meeting(s) on May 19 (and May 24, if necessary) and approval to issue. Following any technical corrections or clarifications approved by the VRIC chair (SCHEV agency director), the Call for Proposals will be submitted to the legislative money committees, as required by statute. Staff’s goal is to issue the Call for Proposals before the end of May; staff also intends to seek approval from VRIC of the terms and conditions for VRIF Round 1 awards in the same timeframe.

If the Committee and the Council do not approve the proposed Call for Proposals on May 16, then staff requests that a meeting of the Committee be scheduled as soon as possible thereafter to review and act on a revised document that addresses the concerns and/or perceived deficiencies that caused members to table or disapprove the enclosed version.

**Resolution:**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, in fulfillment of its responsibility in § 23.1-3133, approves the Call for Proposals for Round 1 of the Virginia Research Investment Fund grant competition, as presented or amended on May 16, 2017; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Council delegates to the agency director, who also is chairman of the Virginia Research Investment Committee, authority to approve technical corrections and clarifications to the Call for Proposals throughout the application process.
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Fast Facts

Overview: The Virginia Research Investment Fund was created by the Virginia General Assembly in 2016 to foster economic development and job creation through innovative and collaborative research, development, and commercialization efforts and the recruitment and retention of eminent researchers. The Fund encourages cooperation and collaboration among public institutions of higher education and with the private sector. Grants from the Fund are intended to position the Commonwealth as a national leader in science-based and technology-based research, development, and commercialization.

Limited Submission: Each public institution of higher education may submit two proposals as lead applicant. Institutions can participate as a partner in unlimited additional applications.

Binding Letters of Intent Due:

Full Proposals Due:

Estimated Start Date:

Length of Award: One to five years

Award Amount: Grant awards will start at $1 million. No maximum dollar amount has been set.

Match: A 1:1 match is required.

Number of Grants: The Virginia Research Investment Committee has discretion to award all or none of the available funding.

Website:

Questions:
Lynn Seuffert
Associate for Research Investment
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
lynnseuffert@schev.edu

Documents for Download
Call for Proposals (pdf)

Cover Sheet – Applied Research, Development, and Commercialization (Word)
Application Template – Applied Research, Development, and Commercialization (Word)

Cover Sheet – Researcher Recruitment or Retention (Word)
Application Template – Researcher Recruitment or Retention (Word)

Signature Page (Word)

Budget Spreadsheet – Optional (Excel)
Virginia Research Investment Fund

Commercialization of Academic Research; Economic Development

In recent years, several Virginia governmental entities have focused on the relationship between the commercialization of academic research and economic development. The Governor issued Executive Orders #23 and #26, regarding the establishment of the New Virginia Economy workforce initiative, strategic plan, and steering committee. The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia issued The Virginia Plan for Higher Education. The General Assembly created the Virginia Initiative for Growth and Opportunity in Each Region (GO Virginia), the Virginia Research Investment Fund (VRIF), and the Virginia Research Investment Committee (VRIC).

The New Virginia Economy, GO Virginia, and VRIF

- Accelerate innovation and entrepreneurs by pursuing policies and public-private partnerships which attract talent, encourage entrepreneurship, promote business development and investment, and champion the creation and commercialization of cutting-edge products and services (New Virginia Economy)
- Propel the diversification of the economy through collaborative regional opportunities and activities (Virginia Growth and Opportunity Board)
- Invest research funding to leverage private investment and collaboration among universities to commercialize their activities (John O. “Dubby” Wynne and Thomas F. Farrell II, Op-Ed, Richmond Times Dispatch, Nov. 12, 2016)
- Channel the impact of higher education to state and regional economic development (Virginia Plan for Higher Education)
- Capitalize on opportunities identified by the Commonwealth Research and Technology (R&T) Strategic Roadmap
- Improve the trends measured by Virginia’s Innovation Dashboard, the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Measurement System (IEMS)

The Virginia Plan: Higher Education’s Mission and Vision and SCHEV’s Priority Initiatives

**Mission:** Higher education in Virginia will advance postsecondary learning, research and public service that enhance the civic and financial health of the Commonwealth and the well-being of all its people.

**Vision:** Higher education will transform the lives of Virginians, our communities and our Commonwealth.

**SCHEV Initiative #6:** Promote economic development for the Commonwealth by implementing a long-term plan that supports recruitment and retention of research faculty, provides matches to federal and private research grants, and enhances commercialization of higher education research.

**Target:** By 2030, Virginia’s share of the national academic research and development expenditure total will have increased from 2.12% to 2.75% (a 30% increase), potentially representing an additional economic impact of $1 billion or more.

Statutory Purpose and Goals

The 2016 Virginia General Assembly passed, and Governor Terry R. McAuliffe signed, legislation to support the academic research enterprise in the Commonwealth. Enacted as Article 8 of Chapter 31 of Title 23.1 (§23.1-3130 through §23.1-3133) of the Code of Virginia,
the legislation created the Virginia Research Investment Fund (VRIF) and an awarding body, the Virginia Research Investment Committee (VRIC). The statutes directed the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV), in consultation with VRIC, to establish the guidelines contained in this Call for Proposals. The statutes also directed SCHEV to provide staff support to VRIC for the administration of the Virginia Research Investment Fund.

In 2017, the General Assembly amended the authorizing statutes and added §23.1-3134.

Prospective applicants are encouraged to review the statutes in full. Briefly, the purpose of the Fund and the four primary goals are outlined in §23.1-3131, below.

§23.1-3131. Virginia Research Investment Fund
C.1. Moneys in the Fund shall be used primarily for grants and loans to (i) foster innovative and collaborative research, development, and commercialization efforts in the Commonwealth in projects and programs with a high potential for economic development and job creation opportunities; (ii) position the Commonwealth as a national leader in science-based and technology-based research, development, and commercialization; (iii) attract and effectively recruit and retain eminent researchers to enhance research superiority at public institutions of higher education; and (iv) encourage cooperation and collaboration among public institutions of higher education, and with the private sector, in areas and with activities that foster economic development and job creation in the Commonwealth.

The statutes further indicate that grants from the Fund shall be awarded in areas of focus identified in the Commonwealth Research and Technology Strategic Roadmap (R&T Roadmap) and shall include the biosciences, cybersecurity, and data analytics.

Measures and Key Indicators of Progress Toward Goals
Because the statutes align grant awards with the R&T Roadmap, VRIF investments are expected to contribute to the improvement of the key indicators tracked on Virginia’s Innovation Dashboard, the Commonwealth Innovation and Entrepreneurship Measurement System (IEMS). Available here: http://www.cit.org/initiatives/iems/measurement-system/

In addition to these indicators that measure the vitality of Virginia’s innovation ecosystem, the Center for Innovative Technology chose a group of six technology benchmark states, based on economic similarities to Virginia and success in stimulating innovation and entrepreneurship. They include: California, Maryland, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Texas. It can be expected that, over time, VRIF investments will contribute to Virginia’s standing in relation to these benchmark states.

Additional measures will be tracked to document progress toward the ultimate goal to position Virginia as a national leader. Appendix E enumerates each statutory goal and the potential measures that will be used to track progress toward that goal. Because the return on R&D investment may occur many years in the future and may be difficult to attribute to a specific project, some measures will be tracked both in relation to specific VRIF projects and overall state ranking or achievement. Finally, long-range indicators related to individual projects will be tracked for five years after the end of the grant period.
Virginia Research Investment Committee

The Virginia Research Investment Committee (VRIC) is charged by statute to evaluate applications, taking into account the review, scoring, or prioritization by a panel of peer reviewers, and then to decide whether to approve an application for an award of a grant from the Fund (§23.1-3133 E & F). The peer review scoring criteria and the additional evaluation elements to be applied by VRIC are explained in the Application Processing, Review, and Award section below and in Appendices C & D.

Membership on VRIC is established by §23.1-3132. The Committee consists of five ex officio members and four non-legislative citizen members who are also members of the Virginia Growth and Opportunity (GO Virginia) Board.

Ex officio members:
- Director of the Council – Peter Blake (Chair)
- Secretary of Technology – Karen Jackson
- Secretary of Finance – Ric Brown
- Staff Director of the House Appropriations Committee – Robert Vaughn
- Staff Director of the Senate Finance Committee – Betsey Daley

Citizen members from GO Virginia:
- John “Dubby” Wynne (appointed by the House of Delegates)
- Heywood Fralin (appointed by the Senate)
- James “Jim” Dyke (appointed by the Governor)
- Vacant (to be appointed by the Governor)

Committee members’ terms on VRIC are coincident with their terms in office and their terms on the GO Virginia Board, respectively.

Best Practices and Shared Values in Principled Grantmaking

To maintain public trust, these shared values drive VRIC best practices in principled grantmaking and form the foundation for the guidelines that govern the VRIF proposal, peer review, and award processes. These shared values closely follow the core values of the National Institutes of Health.

**Expert Assessment:** Expertise on peer review panels will be suitable for evaluating the potential impact of the proposed work. No proposals will be funded that were not favorably evaluated by a peer review panel.

**Transparency:** Decisions for awards will be made solely using published review criteria.

**Impartiality:** Inappropriate influences will be removed from the review process. Award decisions will be rendered without the influence of conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest. Awards will be made without bias or predisposition, either personal or professional. Awards will not be made based on predetermination.

**Fairness:** All applications will be evaluated using the same review processes. Decisions will be rendered based on information included in the proposal. **After a call for proposals is issued**
for a round of funding, all conversations between institutions/researchers and VRIC members about specific projects will cease.

Privacy Protection for Applicants and Peer Review Panel Members: Peer review panel members and VRIC members will honor the spirit of the FOIA exclusions and closed meeting allowances for VRIF processes to ensure the privacy protection of applicants and peer reviewers.

Description of Funding Opportunity

Eligible Applicants
Eligible lead applicants are public institutions of higher education in Virginia.

Limited Submission
Each public institution of higher education may submit only two proposals as lead applicant. Institutions can participate as a partner in unlimited additional applications.

Type of Proposals
VRIC will accept proposals (1) for the recruitment or retention of researchers and (2) for applied research and development of commercial products and services. As lead applicant, an institution will be awarded a maximum of one grant in each category.

Collaboration
Collaboration is required. Collaborative proposals may involve:
1. Cross-institutional (public-public or public-private) collaboration;
2. Collaboration between one or more public institutions and one or more private non-institutional entities; e.g., health systems, research and development companies, companies formed to commercialize the product(s) of the research, industry partners, etc.);
3. Multidisciplinary collaboration within a single public institution; or
4. Any combination of the above.

Targeted Research Areas
By statute, grants shall be awarded in areas of focus chosen from those listed in the Commonwealth’s Research and Technology Strategic Roadmap, which shall include, but not be limited to, the biosciences, cybersecurity, and data analytics.

Researcher Recruitment and Retention Proposals
Applicant institutions must propose to recruit (from outside Virginia) or retain researchers who are serial innovators and entrepreneurs and are recognized nationally.

The candidate should be named in the proposal. However, proposals will be accepted that instead describe the profile and characteristics of the type of researcher the applicant hopes to recruit or retain. An applicant institution must describe the researcher’s expertise and the key role that she/he will fill in the institution’s plan to develop or enhance a complementary (rather than competitive) applied research program (in one of the targeted areas listed above) in relation to existing programs across the state at other universities and make a compelling case that the researcher and the institution are uniquely qualified or in a unique position to attain national recognition in this area of focus.
An applicant institution must estimate the impact that the researcher (and associated research team) will have on Virginia's overall reputation for excellence in research, describe why the researcher's area of expertise will attract national recognition, and discuss the expected significance to the specific focus area.

**Applied Research, Development, and Commercialization Proposals**

Proposals will be accepted for applied research and development and related commercialization of the product(s) of research. (No funding will be awarded for exploratory studies, basic research, or theoretical development.) Applicants are encouraged to define the scope of the project in a manner that encompasses the full range of support that will be needed to bring a product to market.

Proposals will be accepted for research that has reached approximately the stage of development described below (See also, Appendix F representing the research-innovation continuum and a depiction of which stages are funded by other Virginia programs and Appendix G: Technology Readiness Levels):

1. Investigators should have begun the process of protecting their intellectual property (filed a disclosure or provisional patent).
2. Projects should have completed or nearly completed the proof of concept or initial invention/technical feasibility stage, technology readiness or maturity level of 5 or higher, or preclinical stage of development.
3. For drug development, applicants should be finished or almost finished with dose range and toxicity testing in animals; if an Investigational New Drug (IND) application to the FDA has not been submitted, applicants must propose to submit an IND application within one year of award and complete Phase I clinical protocols.
4. For medical devices, if an investigational device exemption (IDE) application has not been submitted to the FDA (if project requires it), applicants must propose to submit an IND application within one year of award and complete Phase I clinical protocols.
5. At the time of application, investigators will not be required to have formed a company or an industry partnership; applicants should propose to achieve this stage during the grant period.
6. At the time of application, the product of research will not be required to be licensed or optioned.
7. At the time of application, a non-provisional patent will not be required to have been issued (applicants must include intellectual property protection milestones on the required timelines in the application).

**Award Type and Amount**

The Virginia General Assembly appropriated $12 million from the general fund and authorized an additional $29 million in bond funds. The General Assembly did not specify the period of time over which these funds should be awarded. Therefore, VRIC has discretion to award all or none of this funding in Round 1.

The minimum grant award will be approximately $1 million. No maximum dollar amount has been set for awards. However, applicants should be aware that VRIC is unlikely to award one grant that encumbers the full $41 million available.

VRIC also possesses discretion to award grants less than the minimum mentioned above, in accordance with item 14 of the Organizing Principles document [add link], which states: "Nothing herein is intended to limit the Virginia Research Investment Committee’s discretion to reserve or otherwise identify funding for proof of concept proposals below the minimum and apart from the limited submission concepts expressed herein. It is recommended that all proposals, including but not limited to proof of concept proposals, speak to the entire research
and development cycle, including commercialization.” However, as of the publication date of this Call for Proposals, VRIC has not exercised its discretion to reserve funding for proof of concept proposals.

Funds will be awarded in the form of a grant, with a Memorandum of Understanding between the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia and the lead institution (Appendix H). Bond funds will be distributed through the Virginia College Building Authority 21st Century College and Equipment Program and will require an additional agreement in conjunction with the bond closing.

**Matching Funds Required**
A 1:1 match is required, as detailed in Application and Submission Information, below.

**Period of Performance**
Grant periods may be proposed ranging from one year to five years.

The grant period will begin on or about Month Day, Year.

**Virginia’s Freedom of Information Act and Open Meetings Law**

**Introduction**
The Virginia Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) does not provide the same protection from exposure as federal Sunshine Laws for unfunded or funded grant proposals. Applicants should consult with their institution's counselor from the Office of the Attorney General.

**Required Action:** Applicants must make a written request for protection, identifying with specificity the data, information, or other materials for which protection is sought and stating the reason why protection is necessary. Please follow the directions below.

**Description of FOIA Exclusion for VRIF**
The Virginia Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) as codified at Va. Code §2.2-3705.6 Item 28 addresses protection for proposals submitted to VRIC. Please read the entirety of Item 28, available here. [add link]

The statute allows only the following information contained in a public record to be excluded from the mandatory disclosure provisions: Information relating to a grant application, or accompanying a grant application, submitted to the Virginia Research Investment Committee, to the extent that such records would reveal:

1. Trade secrets as defined in the Uniform Trade Secrets Act (§59.1-336 et seq.), disclosure of which would be harmful to the competitive position of a party to the grant application.
2. Financial information of a party to the grant application that is not a public body, including balance sheets and financial statements, that are not generally available to the public through regulatory disclosure or otherwise, disclosure of which would be harmful to the competitive position of a party to the grant application.
3. Research-related information produced or collected by a party to the grant application in the conduct of or as a result of study or research on medical, rehabilitative, scientific, technical, technological, or scholarly issues, when such information has not been
publicly released, published, copyrighted, or patented, disclosure of which would be harmful to the competitive position of a party to the grant application.

The statute requires that the request for protection by applicants occur at the time the materials are submitted to VRIC.

Item 28 also gives VRIC the authority to approve or deny the request for protection.

**Directions for Requesting Protection from Mandatory Disclosure**

Applicants should submit two versions of their application packet. In one version, applicants should redact the information for which protection is sought. For each redaction, applicants should indicate (in the margin, via comments added to a pdf, or on a separate cover sheet) the reason why protection is necessary, keeping in mind that the statute allows three types of information to be protected when disclosure would be harmful to the competitive position of a party to the grant application.

SCHEV staff will notify applicants within two weeks of submission whether their request has been approved. If the request was not approved, SCHEV staff will work with applicants to navigate a path to protection or withdraw the application.

**SCHEV Response to FOIA Request**

In the event that SCHEV receives a FOIA request, the decision regarding what, if any, information is to be withheld from disclosure pursuant to the Virginia Freedom of Information Act rests within the sole discretion of the SCHEV FOIA officer, SCHEV staff, the VRIC Chair, and SCHEV’s Attorney General representative. It is anticipated that the redacted version of the application would be released, without regard to whether the proposal was funded or not. SCHEV staff will inform the PI and lead institution the extent of the information released in response to the FOIA request.

**Description of Open Meetings Law Exclusion for VRIF**

Virginia’s open meetings law is codified at Va. Code §2.2-3711, “Closed meetings authorized for certain limited purposes.” Item A.48 addresses the requirements for closed meetings of the Virginia Research Investment Committee. The full text is available here. [add link]

**Application and Submission Information**

**Limited Submission; Binding Letter of Intent**

Round 1 is a limited submission competition. At the completion of the institution’s internal selection process, a binding letter of intent for each selected proposal is required.

Simultaneously, the teams can begin developing the proposals for the selected projects.

The LOI should fit on one page, single spaced, and include:

- Name of lead institution
- Type of proposal (research project or recruitment/retention)
- Expected partner entities
- Names and departments of PI and any known Co-PIs and Co-Investigators, including at partner institutions
- If recruitment/retention proposal, do not name the candidate but do specify the department to which a candidate will be recruited or retained
• Any relevant institutes/centers with which the research team or candidate will be affiliated
• Area of research focus (for project) or research expertise (recruitment/retention)
• Any other information about the proposal relevant to the convening of review panels, such as a synopsis that describes the work in sufficient detail to permit an appropriate selection of reviewers

The purpose of the LOI is to ensure that (1) peer review panels include the expertise required to score the proposal and (2) conflicts of interest are avoided.

For Round 1, the LOI is binding. An institution cannot submit a full proposal that does not align with the LOI.

Each LOI should be submitted separately from the office of sponsored programs via email to the SCHEV Associate for Research Investment, lynnseuffert@schev.edu. The text of the email should confirm that the proposal was selected through the limited submission process.

**Due date for LOIs:**

**Full Proposal (if selected by institution)**

Please use the appropriate full proposal template in either Appendix A or Appendix B. Refer to the scoring criteria included in either Appendix C or Appendix D.

• Proposals may be single spaced.
• Font must be either Times New Roman 12 pt. or Arial 11 pt.
• Font for figures, tables, formulas, and diagrams can be reduced no smaller than Times New Roman 10 pt. or Arial 9 pt.
• Margins, in all directions, must be at least an inch; margins for illustrations, graphics, diagrams, tables or figures that take up a full page may be reduced no smaller than half an inch.
• Pages should be numbered on the bottom right.
• Inclusion of other information in headers or footers is at the discretion of the applicant.

The full proposal, the corresponding redacted proposal (see FOIA section, above), and the Excel budget spreadsheet (if used) should be submitted from the office of sponsored programs via a single email to the SCHEV Associate for Research Investment, lynnseuffert@schev.edu. One pdf containing the full proposal and one pdf containing the redacted proposal is preferred. However, the Associate will accept submissions with multiple attachments for each version of the proposal. Please name the attachments so that the Associate can readily distinguish the redacted proposal and also determine that the application packet is complete.

**Due date for full proposals:**

**Budget and Budget Narrative**

Please provide a detailed budget for each year of the grant period and cumulatively. The detailed budget should reflect planned expenditures of general fund amounts, bond funds, and the required 1:1 matching funds.

Please consider using the template Excel budget spreadsheet posted on the VRIF website here: [add link]. Please contact the SCHEV Associate for Research Investment for assistance with the formulas or to resolve issues with the spreadsheet.
Budgets will also be accepted in alternate formats (for example, a format published by an institution’s office of sponsored programs or a budget extracted from an institution’s electronic research administration portal).

Alternate budget formats should include all the usual direct cost budget categories: salaries/wages, benefits, travel, supplies, equipment, renovations/enhancements, rent, other direct costs, subrecipients (subawards or contracts to collaborating entities or vendors), etc. Alternate formats should also include planned expenditures of general fund amounts, bond funds, and the required 1:1 matching funds.

Any amounts requested from VRIF (i.e., included in the “VRIF Request” columns in the template budget) for equipment and renovations/enhancements are assumed to constitute a request for bond funding.

Amounts in the “VRIF Request” columns for all other budget categories are assumed to be requests for general fund monies.

VRIF funds cannot be used for indirect costs.

Below are examples of items of cost and the budget category in which each should be included:

- Fee-for-service research and computing core resources (other direct costs)
- Payments to or incentives for human study subjects (other direct costs)
- Patent and FDA application preparation costs (if work done by research team or other university personnel: salary and benefits; if external: consultants or subrecipients; fees: other direct costs)
- Effort to design protocol for Phase I clinical trial (personnel: salary, benefits)
- CEO to run spin-off company (personnel category of subrecipient budget)
- Funding for visiting scholars, lecture series, and faculty exchange (travel; other direct costs)
- Expenditures for the dissemination of research findings (i.e., nationally prominent publications and presentations at conferences, symposiums, seminars, or workshops) (travel; supplies (posters, etc.); other direct costs (conference registration fees))
- Enhanced expertise or capacity for supportive services to the research team, such as tech transfer, IP protection, mentoring by experienced entrepreneurs (if internal, personnel, salary, benefits; if external, consultants or subrecipients)

The amounts for each budget line item must be documented and justified in the budget narrative. For proposals that contain a subaward(s), each subaward must include a separate budget narrative.

**Matching Funds Guidelines**

The budget narrative should include an explanation of the source(s) of matching funds.

Match requirements that apply BOTH to applied research, development, and commercialization proposals and to recruitment or retention proposals:

- Commitment of a 1:1 match is a criteria for eligibility, rather than a review criteria (i.e., additional points will not be awarded for commitments of greater than a 1:1 match; however, applicants can note in their proposals or budget narratives an estimate of the
total cost of the project and an indication of the total match that might be expended, during the grant period and/or throughout the innovation lifecycle).

- Grantees cannot count Higher Education Equipment Trust Fund dollars toward the match.
- Use of Education & General Program (E&G) funds to satisfy the match, while not prohibited, should be rare. (E&G revenues are derived mainly from state appropriations and student tuition and fees.) Please consider the following possibilities: (1) correlating the costs in the project budget to which E&G funds will be applied to a benefit for undergraduate students; (2) offering E&G funds only as a placeholder in Year 4 or 5 with the realistic expectation for replacement with additional grant funding to be secured during the earlier years.
- The matching funds must be in-hand at time of award (or committed as documented by a legally binding grant award or pledge; applicants must identify which funds are in-hand and which are pledged).
- Documentation of pledges or grant awards should be kept at the institution (not included in the grant application package) and must include a payment or estimated drawdown schedule aligned with the requested grant period. Pledge payment schedules showing receipts to date and scheduled future payments are to be included in progress reports.
- If pledged funds are not received on the expected schedule within the grant period, the university must replace the funds not received with another eligible match or the unmatched portion of the grant award will be rescinded.
- The grantee institution must notify SCHEV staff of unpaid pledges immediately when a gift or grant has been revoked.
- The funds proposed as matching funds cannot be the same funds that have already been committed as a match to another project. However, three-way or circular matches are allowable. For example, dollars are used as the match for a non-VRIF grant, then that grant is used as a match for VRIF.
- If the match is another grant, that grantmaker’s terms and conditions or authorizing legislation must not prohibit use of those funds as a match.
- If the match is another grant, the nexus between the two projects must be clear (as determined by the VRIF peer review panel).
- Grantees cannot match one VRIF grant award (or subaward) with another VRIF grant award (or subaward).
- Expenditure of matching funds must be tracked and reported in progress reports.
- The commitment of matching funds is legally binding and is subject to audit.
- The signature of the applicant’s authorized signer indicates that the Vice President/Provost for Research (or equivalent, or designee) has conducted due diligence to ensure the offered match complies with these guidelines.

Match requirements that apply ONLY to researcher recruitment or retention proposals:
- The match must be cash only. Unrecovered indirecTs and in-kind time and effort cannot be counted toward the match.

Match requirements that apply ONLY to applied research, development, and commercialization proposals:
- Waived costs of fee-for-service research and computing core resources, at the member rate, can be counted toward the match.
- Unrecovered indirecTs can be counted toward the match (as calculated using the basis in the institution’s negotiated indirect agreement).
- Time and effort of personnel who will be paid by the institution (i.e., in-kind effort) usually cannot be counted toward the match (see also, bullet above regarding E&G funds). However, in unusual circumstances, and with prior notification to SCHEV staff,
significant percentages of in-kind time and effort for personnel (~20% or more) can be offered toward the match requirement, with the understanding that VRIC members will consider the source of matching funds when making award decisions.

Application Processing, Review, and Award

Upon receipt via email of an application package, SCHEV staff will respond by return email within 24 hours to confirm receipt.

Review of applications is a three-stage process. The statutes that created VRIF state the criteria to be considered. These criteria have been translated into the peer review scoring criteria and the additional evaluation elements to be applied by VRIC, which are explained below and in Appendices C & D. The statute is quoted below.

§23.1-3133. Award from Virginia Research Investment Fund.

B. The guidelines, procedures, and criteria shall include, but not be limited to, requirements that applicants demonstrate and that the reviewers and the Committee consider:

1. Other grants, awards, loans, or funds awarded to the proposed program or project by the Commonwealth;

2. Other applications from the applicant for state grants, awards, loans, or funds currently pending at the time of the application; and

3. The potential of the program or project for which a grant or loan is sought to (i) culminate in the commercialization of research; (ii) culminate in the formation or spin-off of viable bioscience, biotechnology, cybersecurity, genomics, or similar companies; (iii) promote the build-out of scientific areas of expertise in science and technology; (iv) promote applied research and development in the areas of focus identified in the Roadmap; (v) provide modern facilities or infrastructure for research and development; (vi) result in significant capital investment and job creation; or (vii) promote collaboration among the public institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth.

The first stage is an administrative review by SCHEV staff to ensure that proposal packets are complete and conform to administrative requirements in this Call for Proposals.

The statute requires that conforming applications be assigned to an external peer review panel with recognized science and technology expertise. The panel(s) will score and comment on the application as described in Appendices C and D. The statute further states: “Such entities include, but are not limited to, the Virginia Biosciences Health Research Corporation, the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Investment Authority, the Virginia Academy of Science, Engineering and Medicine, or any other entity deemed appropriate by the Council, including a scientific advisory committee created by the Council for the sole purpose of reviewing one or more applications received pursuant to this article.”

At the time of publication of this Call for Proposals, the peer review panel(s) are expected to comprise members of the Virginia Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; venture
capitalists and/or angel investors; and experienced entrepreneurs with expertise in start-ups created to commercialize the products of research.

Following peer review and in preparation for the third stage of review, SCHEV staff may conduct additional due diligence and/or ask applicants for clarifying information.

SCHEV staff will prepare a summary statement for each proposal that includes information such as the reviewers’ scores, written comments, a summary of strengths and weaknesses, or other summary highlights of the peer review panel discussion.

An application may be designated Not Recommended for Further Consideration (NRFC) if it lacks significant and substantial merit; presents serious ethical problems in the protection of human subjects from research risks; or presents serious ethical problems in the use of vertebrate animals, biohazards, and/or select agents. Applications designated as NRFC will not proceed to VRIC because such proposals cannot be funded.

After the scores and comments have been summarized and the proposals ranked, and SCHEV staff have added a Yes/No indication of whether the proposal is recommended for funding, in compliance with Va. Code §23.1-3133 E, SCHEV staff will forward to VRIC any proposal receiving a favorable evaluation, along with the scoring or prioritization.

The third stage is review by VRIC. During this final review, VRIC might request a presentation from the applicants. In compliance with Va. Code §2.2-3711, “Closed meetings authorized for certain limited purposes,” these meetings will be closed to the public.

VRIC members will review the proposals, starting with the prioritization, scores, and comments of the peer review panel and then adding their expertise and knowledge of the statewide impact and contribution the projects might have, including criteria such as:

- Whether the projected impact of the project merits the investment of state funds
- Members’ prioritization, on a case-by-case basis, of the criteria (i.e., two proposals receive similar overall scores, but one scores more highly on collaboration and another scores more highly on economic impact)
- The connection of the project to GO Virginia, if any, including the distribution of grant funding across GO Virginia regions
- The previous and pending state funding for the project and VRIC's interpretation of the merits of continuing to use state funding to further the progress of the project
- The source of matching funds, with E&G funds and/or in-kind effort viewed least favorably
- The length of the timeline to manufacture and sale of the product and/or job creation
- The results or preliminary results of the study authorized by the General Assembly (an assessment of the Commonwealth’s research assets and recommendations regarding areas where Virginia may wish to direct its resources) that might be provided to VRIC in Fall 2017

VRIC will then hold a public meeting where a formal vote will be taken to determine which proposals will be funded. This meeting might occur directly following the closed meeting or on a different date.

SCHEV staff will forward reviewer scores and comments to the PI of unfunded projects.

Finally, per statute, all decisions by VRIC shall be final and not subject to further review or appeal. The Governor may announce any award approved by the Committee.
Reporting Requirements

Reports are required at intervals during the grant period. A final cumulative report is also required. Grantees also will be required to continue to report progress on some measures for five years after the end of the grant period. Adjustments might be made to the due dates below, depending on the date of award for each round of competition as well as the timeline and milestones in each proposal.

Annual General Audience Progress Report
VRIC is required to submit a report to the General Assembly each Nov. 1. In preparation for the submission of that report, grantees will submit a general audience progress report by Sept. 30 of each year.

The format for this report is still under development. SCHEV staff anticipate that information of interest to Virginia’s elected representatives, members of the House Appropriations Committee and Senate Finance Committee, and taxpayers will be requested.

Semi-Annual Financial Reports
Semi-annual financial reports are required. These reports will be due on July 31 and January 31, documenting the financial status of the project through June 30 and December 31, respectively.

The format for these reports is still under development. SCHEV staff anticipate that reports generated from an institution’s research dashboard or other accounting system reporting function that allows for the extraction of easily digestible statements will be accepted.

The reports will include information regarding the total amount awarded, the amount forwarded to the lead institution, the amount encumbered to date, the amount spent to date, and the amounts remaining (from the disbursement and total) for each budget category and for the same budget categories for each subaward.

Reports showing the same information for matching funds are required, if possible on the same report or a separate parallel report. For matching funds that were based on a pledge, pledge payment schedules showing receipts to date and scheduled future payments are to be included in progress reports.

Semi-Annual Technical Narrative Progress Reports
On July 31 and Jan. 31, technical progress reports in narrative form will be due, describing achievements through June 30 and Dec. 31, respectively.

The format for these reports is still under development. Grantees can expect the requested information to include data related to some of the measures listed in Appendix E: Measures and Indicators of Progress Toward Statutory Goals.

Reports Due Upon Request for Disbursement of Funds at Milestones
When a grantee reaches a milestone on their timeline that triggers the disbursement of funds, both a narrative report documenting the achievement of the milestone and a financial report documenting the expenditure of the already-disbursed funds is required.

If the grantee anticipates achieving a milestone within 30 days of the due date of the reports above, a request can be made to SCHEV staff to delay or accelerate reporting to coincide with the achievement of the milestone and reduce the need for additional reporting.
Reports Due Upon Request for No-Cost Extension
Requests for no-cost extensions should be made at least sixty (60) days prior to the desired effective date of the requested change. Preferably, grantees should anticipate the need to request a no-cost extension and make that request in concert with a scheduled progress report.

If more than 30 days have passed since the submission of the reports above, grantees will be required to submit reports at the time of a no-cost extension request. In addition to the reports, the request should provide a brief narrative justification for the extension, length of requested extension (maximum one year), amount of unexpended balance, and a timeline for activities and expenditure of the remaining funds.

Final Cumulative Narrative and Financial Reports
Final, cumulative narrative and financial reports are due 60 days after the end of the grant period.

Reports Due on Some Measures for Five Years After End of Grant Period
Annually, for five years after the end of the grant period, grantees are required to submit reports documenting continuing progress on some of the indicators listed in Appendix E: Measures and Indicators of Progress Toward Statutory Goals. Potential indicators to be tracked include:

- Licenses, copyrights, patents, inventions, or income-producing processes discovered or arising from research supported in whole or in part by the VRIF
- FDA filings and approvals arising from research supported in whole or in part by the VRIF
- Follow-on grant awards or other funds received as a result of research supported in whole or in part by the VRIF
- Publications in peer-reviewed journals: impact factor of journal, number of times publications are “Cited By” other researchers
- Presentations at national conferences, both peer-reviewed and invited
- Awards bestowed on researchers who were supported by VRIF (National Academy membership, etc.)
- Start-ups and spin-off companies created
- Jobs created
- Salary of jobs created
- Sectors or occupations of created jobs

More information will be provided to grantees near the end of the grant period.

Award Administration

Information about post-award administration of grants will be under development throughout the first year after Round 1 awards are made.

SCHEV staff would like to build a relationship with grantees and foster a collaborative approach to addressing issues and removing any roadblocks that arise.

For details regarding post-award revisions that require prior approval, along with other conditions of award, please see Appendix H: Terms and Conditions of Award, specifically Attachment 1. Special Terms and Conditions.
Appendix A: Application Template – Applied Research, Development, and Commercialization

An applied research, development, and commercialization proposal must contain the following sections:

1. Cover Sheet
2. Assurances and Certifications (Appendix H)
3. Signature of AOR
4. Table of Contents
5. Scientific Summary
6. General Audience Summary
7. Results from Prior State Funding
8. Description of Pending Proposals for State Funding
9. Proposal Narrative
10. References Cited
11. Biographical Sketch(es)
12. Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources (if requesting bond funds for equipment or facilities)
13. Budget and Budget Justification
14. Current and Pending Support

1. **Cover Sheet (See website)**

2. **Assurances and Certifications (Appendix H)**

3. **Signature Page for Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) (See website)**

4. **Table of Contents**

5. **Scientific Summary (1 point)**

   Provide a one-page summary of the proposed project suitable for the peer review panel, which will include scientists, venture capitalists, and small business start-up entrepreneurs who have familiarity with research and commercialization of the products of research, but perhaps not deep knowledge of your field. This summary will be posted on the VRIF website if the project is funded.

6. **General Audience Summary (1 point)**

   Provide a one- to two-page summary for a general audience. This summary will be used to craft the press release issued by the Governor’s Office if your proposal is funded. This summary might be posted on the VRIF website if the project is funded.

7. **Results from Prior State Funding (unscored, but considered by VRIC)**

   List appropriations by the General Assembly and grants awarded through state-funded competitions to any members of the project team for prior projects within the last five years. Briefly describe the results. Describe the relationship to this proposed project (if none, please state that). You must include information related to the following competitions: VBHRC, CHRB, CIT, Tobacco Commission, GO Virginia, Virginia Economic Development Partnership.
8. Description of Pending Proposals for State Funding (unscored, but considered by VRIC)
List pending proposals to state-funded grant competitions or for appropriations from the General Assembly and describe their relationship to this proposed project. You must include information related to the following competitions: VBHRC, CHRB, CIT, Tobacco Commission, GO Virginia, Virginia Economic Development Partnership.

9. Proposal Narrative (78 points total; 15 single-spaced pages maximum)

Background and Significance (15 points)
Briefly discuss the background and present state of knowledge in the field nationally; include information on where Virginia currently ranks on this topic and explain why your institution is uniquely qualified or in a unique position to attain national recognition in this area of focus. Discuss the current standard of care or existing scientific/technology/engineering approaches; the gaps, unmet need, limitations of existing approaches, weaknesses in previous research, or unanswered research questions relevant to your proposed project; your solution, technology, product, or service to be commercialized; your team’s relevant prior studies, work in progress, and current stage of development (including disclosures, patent applications, issued patents, licensing, etc.); and the significance of your solution, technology, product, or service.

Project Description (30 points)
Thoroughly describe your plan of work and the design of the activities to be undertaken during the grant period; roles of collaborators; expected progress in the development of your solution, technology, product, or service to be commercialized (referencing the timelines detailed below). This description should clearly show the alignment between the size, scale, or complexity of the project and the requested length of the grant period and total cost (requested amount plus match).

Economic Impact (10 points)
Briefly describe your discussion(s) with representative(s) of the relevant GO Virginia Regional Council(s). Describe the connection your proposed project has, if any, to the Regional Council plans for diversifying the economy. Using the timelines below, please estimate the number of jobs that your project and eventual commercialization will create (for example, number of jobs in 1 to 3 years, 4 to 6 years, 6 to 10 years). State whether the workforce in your region has the skills needed to fill those jobs and, if not, describe your plan to ensure your timeline won’t be delayed by inability to recruit skilled workers. In this section, also consider describing economic impact in terms of the market size (dollars) for your product, number of customers or patients in Virginia, the US, and abroad, current cost of the disease or problem and cost-savings or efficiencies generated by your solution, etc.

Overall Impact (8 points)
Describe the impact that your successfully completed project will have, such as the competitive advantage over competing solutions under development by other research teams, impact on human health, patient outcomes, the current standard of care, or healthcare costs; impact on or displacement of earlier technology; etc. Include your plans for dissemination of results.

Milestones, Timelines, and Costs (5 points)
- List the milestones and timeline for the project proposed in this application; estimate the cost of achieving each milestone. Upon grant award, SCHEV will release the funds needed to achieve the first milestone; during the grant period, as milestones are achieved, additional funds will be released sufficient to achieve the next milestone, continuing throughout the grant period. Include milestones related to the progress of commercialization during the grant period (intellectual property protection milestones [patent applications and approvals], market need & proof-of-relevance analysis,
business development, licensing, clinical trials, regulatory filings and approvals, reimbursement strategy, marketing, sales, customer support, manufacturing and distribution, etc.).

- List the milestones and timeline for continued commercialization of your solution after the grant period ends.
- Provide amount raised to date; amount expended to date.
- Provide an estimate of total cost to get your solution to market, including amount expended to date, the requested amount and match described in this application, and future costs.

Potential Sources of Follow-On Funding (5 points)
Briefly describe your plan to secure the follow-on funding required to get your solution to market in relation to the timelines above.

Collaboration and Project Management (5 points)
Briefly describe the management structure, communication plan, and accountabilities of each of the collaborators; the collaborative synergies and relevant background/experience of the management and scientific team members, including any experience commercializing technology, products, or services; the current and future collaboration between the team and the involved institutions’ technology transfer offices; and any other relevant collaboration and project management practices.

Conclusion (unscored)
Key reasons why your proposal should be funded. State your case in a few sentences.

10. References Cited (unscored)
Each reference must include the names of all authors, the article and journal title, book title, volume number, page numbers, and year of publication. Inclusion of a website address is optional.

11. Biographical Sketch(es) (10 points)
A biographical sketch is required for the Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator(s), and Co-Investigator(s). Biosketches are welcome for other senior or key personnel, including partner-company management personnel. Researchers can choose to use either NIH-style or NSF-style biosketch format. Non-scientist key personnel can submit a resume. Documents are limited to five pages each.

Do not submit any personal information in the biographical sketch. This includes items such as: home address; home telephone, or cell phone numbers; home e-mail address; marital status; personal hobbies; etc. Biosketches are subject to release through a FOIA request, even if the proposal is not funded.

12. Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources (if requesting funds for equipment or facilities) (Score = Yes, No, or Need More Information)
If applicants are requesting funds for equipment and/or facilities, a description of the current state of the resources available to the project should be provided. Identify gaps and describe the proposed equipment purchases or facilities renovations. If the space or equipment will not be used by the proposed project 100% of the time, briefly describe the other projects that will share these resources and state affirmatively that the VRIF-funded project will have first priority for access.
13. Budget and Budget Justification (10 points)
Budget and justification must include line items for both VRIF funds and matching funds. Please consider using the template Excel budget spreadsheet posted on the VRIF website here: [add link].

14. Current and Pending Support (unscored)
Current and pending support information is required for the Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator(s), and Co-Investigator(s). Applicants can choose to use either NIH-style (PHS 398 Other Support) or NSF-style (Current and Pending Support) format.
Appendix B: Application Template – Researcher Recruitment or Retention

A researcher recruitment or retention proposal must contain the following sections:

1. Cover Sheet
2. Assurances and Certifications (Appendix H)
3. Signature of AOR
4. Table of Contents
5. Scientific Summary
6. General Audience Summary
7. Results from Prior State Funding
8. Description of Pending Proposals for State Funding
9. Proposal Narrative
10. References Cited
11. Full CV of Candidate(s)
12. Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources (if requesting funds for equipment or facilities)
13. Budget and Budget Justification

1. Cover Sheet (See website)

2. Assurances and Certifications (Appendix H)

3. Signature Page for Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) (See website)

4. Table of Contents

5. Scientific Summary (1 point)
Provide a one-page summary of the proposed project suitable for the peer review panel, which will include scientists, venture capitalists, and small business start-up entrepreneurs who have familiarity with research and commercialization of the products of research, but perhaps not deep knowledge of the candidate’s field of expertise. This summary will be posted on the VRIF website if the project is funded.

6. General Audience Summary (1 point)
Provide a one- to two-page summary for a general audience. This summary will be used to craft the press release issued by the Governor’s Office if your proposal is funded. This summary might be posted on the VRIF website if the project is funded.

7. Results from Prior State Funding (unscored, but considered by VRIC)
List General Assembly appropriations and state-funded grants awarded to recruit this same candidate or General Assembly appropriations and state-funded grants awarded over the last five years to the incumbent researcher who is the target for retention. Briefly describe the results. You must include information related to the following competitions: VBHRC, CHRB, CIT, Tobacco Commission, GO Virginia, Virginia Economic Development Partnership.

8. Description of Pending Proposals for State Funding (unscored, but considered by VRIC)
List proposals pending to recruit this same candidate or pending research proposals naming as PI, Co-PI or Co-Investigator the incumbent researcher who is the target for retention. You must include information related to both appropriations by the General Assembly and the following competitions: VBHRC, CHRB, CIT, Tobacco Commission, GO Virginia, Virginia Economic Development Partnership.
9. Proposal Narrative (98 points total; 15 single-spaced pages maximum)

Background and Significance (20 points)
Briefly discuss the background and present state of the candidate’s field of expertise nationally. Include information on where Virginia currently ranks on this topic. Thoroughly describe the current environment and recent activity at your institution in this field of study. Describe the expertise and activities at other Virginia institutions in this field. Briefly describe the candidate’s research, commercialization, and educational initiatives. Discuss the gaps, unmet need, or weaknesses this candidate will address if recruited or retained. Explain why your institution is uniquely qualified or in a unique position to attain national recognition in this area of focus. Describe the significance to the applicant institution and to Virginia if the selected candidate is successfully recruited or retained.

Project Description (45 points)
Thoroughly describe your plan to recruit or retain this candidate, as well as your expectations of them for the first five years after hire or retention. Describe the qualifications and successes, including experience as an independent and collaborative investigator, current and past external funding, intellectual property creation, commercialization efforts, company creation and/or other private sector leadership experience, publications, national recognition, and ability to attract funding and other researchers. Briefly discuss ongoing projects and grant funding that will be transferred to or retained at your institution with this candidate. Describe past and expected future collaborations.

The project description should clearly show the alignment between the scale of the recruitment or retention package and the outcomes you expect from the candidate.

Economic Impact (18 points)
Briefly describe discussion(s) with representative(s) of the relevant GO Virginia Regional Council(s). Describe the connection your proposed project has, if any, to the Regional Council plans for diversifying the economy. Using the timelines below, please estimate the number of jobs that your candidate’s research and eventual commercialization will create (for example, number of jobs in 1 to 3 years, 4 to 6 years, 6 to 10 years). State whether the workforce in your region has the skills needed to fill those jobs and, if not, describe your plan to ensure your timeline won’t be delayed by inability to recruit skilled workers. In this section, also consider describing other economic impacts to which this candidate will contribute.

Overall Impact (10 points)
Describe the impact that your successfully hired or retained candidate will have, such as the competitive advantage; impact on human health, patient outcomes, the current standard of care, or healthcare costs; impact on or displacement of earlier technology; etc.

Milestones, Timelines, and Costs (5 points)
- List the milestones and timeline for the retention or recruitment, hire, and early activities of the candidate during the grant period. Upon grant award, SCHEV will release the funds needed to achieve the first milestone; during the grant period, as milestones are achieved, additional funds will be released sufficient to achieve the next milestone, continuing throughout the grant period.
- List the milestones and timeline for expected activities for longer-term research and commercialization.
- Provide estimate of total cost to recruit or retain this candidate over five years.

Conclusion (unscored)
Key reasons why your proposal should be funded. State your case in a few sentences.
10. References Cited, if any (unscored)
Each reference must include the names of all authors, the article and journal title, book title, volume number, page numbers, and year of publication. Inclusion of a website address is optional.

11. Full CV of Candidate (points will be scored under Project Description, above)
A full CV is required for the candidate, if the candidate is named in the proposal.

12. Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources (if requesting funds for equipment or facilities) (Score = Yes, No, or Need More Information)
If applicants are requesting funds for equipment and/or facilities, a description of the current state of the resources available to the candidate should be provided. Identify gaps and describe the proposed equipment purchases or facilities renovations. If the space or equipment will not be used by the proposed candidate 100% of the time, briefly describe the other researchers who will share these resources and their projects.

13. Budget and Budget Justification (points will be scored under Project Description, above, related to the alignment between the scale of the recruitment package and the outcomes expected from the candidate)
Budget and justification must include line items for both VRIF funds and matching funds. Please consider using the template Excel budget spreadsheet posted on the VRIF website here: [add link].
Appendix C: Scoring – Applied Research, Development, and Commercialization

Scientific Summary (1 point)
Reviewers will score based on whether the summary, which will be posted on the VRIF website if the project is funded, accurately describes the project and its intended impact.

General Audience Summary (1 point)
Reviewers will score based on whether the summary, which will be used to craft the Governor’s press release if the project is funded, renders the project comprehensible to a general audience and contains information of interest to tax payers and General Assembly members as they form opinions about the project, the impact of VRIF as a whole, and the wisdom of continuing appropriations in future budget cycles.

Results from Prior State Funding (unscored, but considered by VRIC)
Pursuant to Va. Code §23.1-3133 B.1., VRIC will consider this information when determining the merits of continuing to use state funding to further the progress of the project.

Description of Pending Proposals for State Funding (unscored, but considered by VRIC)
Pursuant to Va. Code §23.1-3133 B.2., VRIC will consider this information when determining the merits of continuing to use state funding to further the progress of the project.

Proposal Narrative (78 points total)
Background and Significance (15 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Where Virginia currently ranks in this field of research and whether the applicant institution(s) are uniquely qualified or in a unique position to attain national recognition in this area of focus
- Whether the project addresses an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field
- Scientific premise and rigor of the research that is used to form the basis for the proposed project
- Applicant’s description of the gap or need and the likelihood that, if successful, the proposed solution, technology, product, or service will meet the unmet need

Project Description (30 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Whether overall strategy is well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the goals and objectives of the project
- Scientific rigor (robust and unbiased experimental design, methodology, analysis, interpretation, and reporting of results)
- Technical feasibility
- Activities are aligned appropriately across collaborators
- Significant progress toward commercialization will be made during the grant period
- Size, scale, or complexity of the project is aligned with the requested length of the grant period
- Size, scale, or complexity of the project is aligned with the total amount to be expended
- The commercialization value proposition is clear, robust, and compelling
- The technical solution is significantly scalable to achieve the commercialization objectives
Economic Impact (10 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Whether the proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of who is the targeted customer and the size of the market (i.e., patients, dollars)
- Current cost of the disease or problem and cost-savings or efficiencies generated by applicant’s solution
- Economic impact and job creation for Virginia

Overall Impact (8 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Whether the project’s solution, technology, product, or service is likely to achieve the impact described in the proposal
- Whether the project’s solution, technology, product, or service is superior to competing approaches
- Whether the successful completion of the project will exert a sustained, powerful influence in Virginia and nationally (i.e., contribute to national recognition for Virginia; improve scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice; change the field of research, etc.)

Milestones, Timelines, and Costs (5 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Scientific and product development milestones and timelines are clearly defined over the entire requested grant period
- Both timelines are realistic given the current stage of research and development
- There is a clear understanding of what the pathway to commercialization is
- There is a clear collaborative pathway to transfer know-how and technology from inventors to the commercialization or industry partner
- Whether the project has progressed appropriately given the amount raised and amount spent to date
- Total estimated cost to get solution to market is realistic

Potential Sources of Follow-On Funding (5 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factor:
- The project is well positioned to attract follow-on funding for the next stage of development and ultimately funding for commercialization

Collaboration and Project Management (5 points)
Reviewers will score based on their confidence that your proposed collaboration:
- Is substantive, with true synergies that will ensure creative debate and innovation
- Includes investigators with complementary and integrated expertise
- Includes the skill sets needed for successful commercialization
- If there is a gap in the business management or scientific team, there is a milestone and plan to recruit the talent needed
- Includes a defined process to manage the collaboration including clear accountabilities, an internal communication plan, and a methodology to declare and solve breakdowns
- Includes appropriate written agreements between partner organizations
- Includes appropriate distribution of funds and resources across partners

Conclusion (unscored)

References Cited (unscored)
Biographical Sketch(es) (10 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Scientific and technical expertise/credibility
- Whether the management and scientific team have the expertise to achieve the goals

Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources (if requesting funds for equipment or facilities) (Score = Yes, No, or Need More Information)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Whether the current scientific environment in which the work will be done is inadequate or presents an impediment to the probability of success
- Whether the project will benefit directly from the facilities and equipment purchased with grant funds
- If the facilities and/or equipment will not be used 100% for this project, whether there is a plan to ensure that full use is made of the investment by other projects
- If the facilities and/or equipment will not be used 100% for this project, whether there are mechanisms in place to ensure that the VRIF-funded project will have first priority for access

Budget and Budget Justification (10 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Investigators will allocate the necessary time to achieve the goals
- Costs are reasonable and allocable to this project (except equipment and facilities, which can be used by other projects)
- Applicant commits a 1:1 match
- If E&G funds are committed in the out-years of the project as a placeholder, with expectation of future funding becoming available, the plan for securing additional funding to replace that commitment has a realistic chance of succeeding.

Current and Pending Support (unscored)
Appendix D: Scoring – Researcher Recruitment or Retention

Scientific Summary (1 point)
Reviewers will score based on whether the scientific summary, which will be posted on the VRIF website if the project is funded, accurately describes the project and its intended impact.

General Audience Summary (1 point)
Reviewers will score based on whether the summary, which will be used to craft the Governor’s press release if the project is funded, renders the project comprehensible to a general audience and contains information of interest to taxpayers and General Assembly members as they form opinions about the project, the impact of VRIF as a whole, and the wisdom of continuing appropriations in future budget cycles.

Results from Prior State Funding (unscored, but considered by VRIC)
VRIC will consider this information when determining the merits of continuing to use state funding to further the progress of the project.

Description of Pending Proposals for State Funding (unscored, but considered by VRIC)
VRIC will consider this information when determining the merits of continuing to use state funding to further the progress of the project.

Proposal Narrative (98 points total)

Background and Significance (20 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Whether the candidate’s field of expertise aligns with the priority areas for that year’s competition
- Whether the proposed program contributes to the university’s overall mission and strategic plan
- Whether the applicant institution’s description of the current environment and recent activity at the institution in this field of study, along with the expertise and activities at other Virginia institutions, clearly defines a gap or risk if candidate is not retained
- Whether the applicant institution’s plan is to develop a complementary (rather than competitive) applied research program in relation to existing programs across the state at other universities
- Whether the research produced by the proposed candidate would be unique within Virginia
- Whether the applicant institution makes a compelling case that it is uniquely qualified or in a unique position to attain national recognition in this area of focus

Project Description (45 points)
Reviewers will consider both the project description and the candidate’s full CV (if provided) to evaluate the following factors:
- Whether the overall recruitment strategy is well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the goals and objectives
- Whether the institution’s expectations of the candidate for the first five years are realistic and achievable
- Whether the candidate is well respected in their field and broadly cited in the literature over a sustained period
- Whether the candidate has demonstrated potential for developing a large-scale, comprehensive, well-funded applied research program
Whether the research produced by the candidate offers potential for innovation and commercialization
Whether the candidate exhibits characteristics that suggest they can interact at a high level with not only academics but with industry and government as well
Whether the candidate has an interest in entrepreneurship, which can mean being entrepreneurial in terms of creating his or her own company or willing to work with entrepreneurs or companies interested in commercializing a new technology or discovery
Whether the candidate has demonstrated ability to build teams and collaborate successfully on applied research, development, and commercialization projects
Reviewers’ confidence that the institution’s plan for future collaboration is substantive, complementary to other efforts in the state, and that true synergies will ensure creative debate and innovation statewide
Whether the amount and type of grant funding that will be transferred with the candidate, along with the amount and type of funding that the institution expects the candidate to generate during the first five years, is commensurate to the expected stature of the program and to the amount of funding requested from VRIF

Economic Impact (18 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factor:
- Overall economic impact and job creation for Virginia

Overall Impact (10 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Whether the successful recruitment or retention of the candidate is likely to achieve the impact described in the proposal
- Whether the successful recruitment or retention of the candidate, and their work in Virginia during the first five years, will exert a sustained, powerful influence in Virginia and nationally (i.e., contribute to national recognition for Virginia; improve scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice; change the field of research, etc.)

Milestones, Timelines, and Costs (5 points)
Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Milestones and timeline for recruitment, hire, and early activities of the candidate are clearly defined over the entire requested grant period
- Milestones and timeline for expected longer-term research and commercialization are realistic given the current stage of the candidate’s research and development

Conclusion (unscored)

References Cited, if any (unscored)

Full CV of Candidate (if named; points will be scored under Project Description, above)

Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources (if requesting funds for equipment or facilities) (Score = Yes, No, or Need More Information)

Reviewers will consider the following factors:
- Whether the current scientific environment in which the candidate will work is inadequate or presents an impediment to the probability of success
• Whether the candidate’s research and commercialization efforts will benefit directly from the facilities and equipment purchased with grant funds
• If the facilities and/or equipment will not be used 100% by this candidate, whether there is a plan to ensure that full use is made of the investment by other investigators and projects
• If the facilities and/or equipment will not be used 100% by this candidate, whether there are mechanisms in place to ensure that the VRIF-funded candidate has first priority for access

Budget and Budget Justification (unscored)
Appendix E: Measures and Indicators of Progress Toward Statutory Goals

1. **Attract and effectively recruit and retain eminent researchers to enhance research superiority at public institutions of higher education**

**VRIF Grant-Specific Metrics**
- Number of universities winning VRIF grants to recruit or retain researchers
- Number of researchers recruited or retained using VRIF monies
- Research funding transferred to Virginia by recruited researchers (or maintained in Virginia by retained researchers)
- Number of post-docs, research faculty, or other personnel who move to Virginia with the recruited researcher
- New research funding awarded to recruited researchers after transfer or retained researchers after VRIF award
- Amount of matching funds
- Publications in peer-reviewed journals by recruited or retained researchers; impact factor of journal
- Number of times publications are "Cited By" other researchers
- Presentations at national conferences, both peer-reviewed and invited, by recruited or retained researchers
- Amount invested in facilities, infrastructure, and equipment

**Statewide and VRIF Grant-Specific Metrics**
- National Academy Membership (as reported by Measuring University Performance (MUP) and within researchers recruited or retained via VRIF awards)
- Faculty Awards (MUP state rankings and for researchers recruited or retained via VRIF awards)
- Eminent researchers attract outstanding graduate students. VRIC will develop an indicator to track this.

2. **Encourage cooperation and collaboration among public institutions of higher education and with the private sector, in areas and with activities that foster economic development and job creation in the Commonwealth**

**VRIF Grant-Specific Metrics**
- Number of awards to collaborative projects
- Total funding awarded to collaborative projects
- Total number of institutions funded
- Average number of institutions funded per project
- Number of private sector entities partnering on funded projects
- Comparison of metrics listed under #3 between collaborative-institution and individual-institution projects

3. **Foster innovative and collaborative research, development, and commercialization efforts in the Commonwealth in projects and programs with a high potential for economic development and job creation opportunities**

**VRIF Grant-Specific Metrics**
- Trademarks and copyrights registered by VRIF grantees
- FDA filings by investigators on VRIF projects
• FDA approvals to investigators on VRIF projects
• Additional funding leveraged by grantees (matching during the grant period; follow-on)
• Number of private sector entities partnering on funded projects
• Jobs created by grantees and partner entities
• Salary of jobs created, reported by grantees (to be averaged by VRIC staff)
• Sectors or occupations of created jobs, reported by grantees
• Publications in peer-reviewed journals by investigators on VRIF projects; impact factor of journal
• Number of times publications are “Cited By” other researchers
• Presentations at national conferences, both peer-reviewed and invited, by investigators on VRIF projects
• Number of interdisciplinary, cross-institute, cross-center VRIF projects
• Amount invested in facilities, infrastructure, and equipment

Statewide and VRIF Grant-Specific Metrics
• Invention disclosures (Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM) ranking and reporting by VRIF grantees)
• Patents filed (AUTM ranking and reporting by VRIF grantees)
• Patents awarded (IEMS and reporting by VRIF grantees)
• University licenses (IEMS and reporting by VRIF grantees)
• University start-ups (IEMS and reporting by VRIF grantees regarding formation or spin-off of bioscience, biotechnology, cybersecurity, genomics, or similar companies)

4. Position the Commonwealth as a national leader in science-based and technology-based research, development, and commercialization

Statewide Metrics
• Overall State R&D Intensity (IEMS; measures spending attributable to federal and state government, businesses, higher education institutions, non-profit organizations, and other entities as a percentage of state gross domestic product (GDP)).
• Virginia Plan for Higher Education initiative to “Promote economic development through research” with a goal to increase institutional research expenditures as a percent of national totals by 30 percent by 2030 (SCHEV)
• University Academic Science and Engineering R&D Expenditures (IEMS)
• Federal R&D Spending (IEMS, using NSF data tool)
• Federal Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) awards (IEMS)
• Federal Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) awards (IEMS)
• Corporate R&D Intensity (IEMS; measures research and development activities conducted by private businesses, including corporate R&D expenses and expenditures as a percentage of private industry output)
• Private Investment (IEMS; angel and venture capital investment)
• State Government Investment (IEMS tracks public sector investment in CIT’s Growth Acceleration Program (GAP) Funds, the Commonwealth Research Commercialization Fund (CRCF), and the Virginia Tobacco Region Revitalization Commission R&D grants; VRIC will add investment by CHRB, VBHRC, and VRIF to this measure)
• R&D Tax Credits (IEMS)
• Ranking of Public American Research Universities (MUP)
• Rank and Score on State Tech and Science index (Milken Institute)
• Rank on State New Economy Index (Information Technology and Innovation Foundation; uses 25 indicators to measure the extent to which state economies are knowledge-based, globalized, entrepreneurial, IT-driven and innovation-based)
Grant Administration Metrics
VRIC will also include in annual reports to the General Assembly metrics related to administration of the VRIF program, including the grant application and award process and post-award monitoring and compliance, such as:

- Number of applications
- Number of awards
- Success ratio (of applicants)
- Total funding requested
- Total funding awarded
- Average award amount
- Total amount invested in facilities, infrastructure, and equipment
- Total amount of matching funds
- Geographic distribution of awarded funds across GO Virginia regions
- Distribution of funds across areas of focus in the R&T Roadmap
- Distribution of funds between researcher recruitment/retention and research projects
- Distribution of funds across eligible institutions
- Number of grantees who received support from other state-funded research competitions (both pre- and post-VRIF funding)
- Post-award no cost extensions
- Post-award budget revisions
- Post-award changes in scope
### Appendix G: Technology Readiness Levels

**Technical Readiness Level (TRL)**

*Developed by NASA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TRL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic principles observed and reported</td>
<td>TRL-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology concept and/or application formulated</td>
<td>TRL-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical and experimental critical function and/or characteristic</td>
<td>TRL-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component and/or breadboard validation in laboratory environment</td>
<td>TRL-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component and/or breadboard validation in relevant environment</td>
<td>TRL-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System/subsystem model or prototype demonstration in a relevant environment</td>
<td>TRL-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System prototype demonstration in a operational environment</td>
<td>TRL-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual system completed and ‘flight qualified’ through test and demonstration</td>
<td>TRL-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual system ‘flight proven’ through successful mission operations</td>
<td>TRL-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRLs are used extensively by Homeland Security, DoE, FAA, and DoD (DARPA, Naval Research Laboratory, AFRL).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Readiness Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supporting Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic principles observed and reported</td>
<td>Lowest level of technology readiness. Scientific research begins to be translated into applied research and development (R&amp;D). Examples might include paper studies of a technology's basic properties.</td>
<td>Published research that identifies the principles that underlie this technology. References to who, where, when.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technology concept and/or application formulated</td>
<td>Invention begins. Once basic principles are observed, practical applications can be invented. Applications are speculative, and there may be no proof or detailed analysis to support the assumptions. Examples are limited to analytic studies.</td>
<td>Publications or other references that outline the application being considered and that provide analysis to support the concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Analytical and experimental critical function and/or characteristic proof of concept</td>
<td>Active R&amp;D is initiated. This includes analytical studies and laboratory studies to physically validate the analytical predictions of separate elements of the technology. Examples include components that are not yet integrated or representative.</td>
<td>Results of laboratory tests performed to measure parameters of interest and comparison to analytical predictions for critical subsystems. References to who, where, and when these tests and comparisons were performed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Component and/or breadboard validation in laboratory environment</td>
<td>Basic technological components are integrated to establish that they will work together. This is relatively &quot;low fidelity&quot; compared with the eventual system. Examples include integration of &quot;ad hoc&quot; hardware in the laboratory.</td>
<td>System concepts that have been considered and results from testing laboratory-scale breadboard(s). References to who did this work and when. Provide an estimate of how breadboard hardware and test results differ from the expected system goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Component and/or breadboard validation in relevant environment</td>
<td>Fidelity of breadboard technology increases significantly. The basic technological components are integrated with reasonably realistic supporting elements so they can be tested in a simulated environment. Examples include &quot;high-fidelity&quot; laboratory integration of components.</td>
<td>Results from testing laboratory breadboard system are integrated with other supporting elements in a simulated operational environment. How does the &quot;relevant environment&quot; differ from the expected operational environment? How do the test results compare with expectations? What problems, if any, were encountered? Was the breadboard system refined to more nearly match the expected system goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Readiness Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Supporting Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. System/subsystem model or prototype demonstration in a relevant environment</td>
<td>Representative model or prototype system, which is well beyond that of TRL 5, is tested in a relevant environment. Represents a major step up in a technology's demonstrated readiness. Examples include testing a prototype in a high-fidelity laboratory environment or in a simulated operational environment.</td>
<td>Results from laboratory testing of a prototype system that is near the desired configuration in terms of performance, weight, and volume. How did the test environment differ from the operational environment? Who performed the tests? How did the test compare with expectations? What problems, if any, were encountered? What are/were the plans, options, or actions to resolve problems before moving to the next level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. System prototype demonstration in an operational environment.</td>
<td>Prototype near or at planned operational system. Represents a major step up from TRL 6 by requiring demonstration of an actual system prototype in an operational environment (e.g., in an aircraft, in a vehicle, or in space).</td>
<td>Results from testing a prototype system in an operational environment. Who performed the tests? How did the test compare with expectations? What problems, if any, were encountered? What are/were the plans, options, or actions to resolve problems before moving to the next level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Actual system completed and qualified through test and demonstration.</td>
<td>Technology has been proven to work in its final form and under expected conditions. In almost all cases, this TRL represents the end of true system development. Examples include developmental test and evaluation (DT&amp;E) of the system in its intended weapon system to determine if it meets design specifications.</td>
<td>Results of testing the system in its final configuration under the expected range of environmental conditions in which it will be expected to operate. Assessment of whether it will meet its operational requirements. What problems, if any, were encountered? What are/were the plans, options, or actions to resolve problems before finalizing the design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Actual system proven through successful mission operations.</td>
<td>Actual application of the technology in its final form and under mission conditions, such as those encountered in operational test and evaluation (OT&amp;E). Examples include using the system under operational mission conditions.</td>
<td>OT&amp;E (operational test and evaluation) reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Assurances and Certifications – Terms and Conditions of Award

Assurances and Certifications

The Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) signing the signature page is assuring and certifying the following:

Assurance Regarding Freedom of Information Act Exclusion: The Virginia Freedom of Information Act does NOT completely protect unfunded or funded grant proposals from exposure. The AOR is assuring that the applicant institution has consulted with the project team and the attorney general representative, if necessary, regarding whether a written request for protection is being made to the Virginia Research Investment Committee in accordance with Va. Code §2.2-3705.6, item 28. If the applicant is invoking the exclusion contained in item 28, the AOR is assuring that a redacted version of the application packet is being submitted that identifies with specificity the data, information, or other materials for which protection is sought and states the reason why protection is necessary. The Committee shall determine whether the requested exclusions from disclosure are necessary to protect the trade secrets, financial information, or research-related information of the applicant. The Committee shall make a written determination of the nature and scope of the protection to be afforded by it under the Va. Code.

Certification Regarding Organizational Support: The AOR is certifying that there is organizational support for this proposal, that this proposal was nominated for submission as a result of an internal selection process, that matching funds will be secured as described in the proposal, and that the Vice President for Research (or equivalent, or designee) has conducted due diligence to ensure the offered match complies with the guidelines in the Call for Proposals. Further, if the proposed plan for matching funds does not materialize, the AOR is certifying that the institution will submit a revised plan to comply with the required 1:1 match.

Certification Regarding Collaborating Entity AOR Approval: The applicant AOR is certifying that the AORs (or equivalent) of all collaborating entities have made the same assurances and certifications and that documentation of such exists.

Certification Regarding State Funds: The AOR is certifying that the organization understands that VRIF is awarding state funds. The organization will comply with all rules and regulations regarding state funds, including but not limited to the Commonwealth Accounting Policies and Procedures Manual, the Virginia Public Procurement Act (when applicable), and the Library of Virginia’s Virginia Public Records Management Manual.

Certification Regarding Involvement of University Technology Transfer Offices (or equivalent): The AOR is certifying that the organization’s office of technology transfer (or equivalent) is advising the research team about the market potential, target customers, commercialization strategy, etc., and otherwise supporting the commercialization of the technology or service being proposed.

Certification Regarding Conflict of Interest: The AOR is certifying that the organization has implemented and is enforcing a written policy on conflicts of interest in research and that, to the best of his/her knowledge, all financial disclosures required by the conflict of interest policy were made; and that conflicts of interest, if any, were, or prior to the organization’s expenditure of any funds under the award, will be, satisfactorily managed, reduced or eliminated in accordance with the organization’s conflict of interest policy.
Certification Regarding Compliance with the Animal Welfare Act. The AOR is certifying that proposed projects involving use of any vertebrate animal for research or education will be approved by the submitting organization's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) before or substantially concurrent with an award. If the involvement of animals is indefinite at the time of award, the AOR is certifying that, prior to conducting any animal activities, and prior to expending any grant funds for those animal activities, IACUC approval will be obtained. It is an institutional responsibility to ensure that the research described in the application is congruent with any corresponding protocols approved by the IACUC.

Certification Regarding Compliance with the Common Rule. The AOR is certifying that proposed projects involving research with human subjects will ensure that subjects are protected from research risks in conformance with the relevant federal policy known as the Common Rule (Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects). All projects involving human subjects must either (1) have approval from the organization's Institutional Review Board (IRB) before or substantially concurrent with issuance of a VRIF award or (2) maintain documentation that the IRB has declared the research exempt from IRB review, in accordance with the applicable subsection, as established in section 101(b) of the Common Rule.

If human subjects research is anticipated within the period of the award but definite plans for involvement of human subjects cannot be described in the application, then the AOR is certifying that, prior to the involvement of human subjects, the project will obtain IRB approval or exemption. It is an institutional responsibility to ensure that the human subjects research described in the application is congruent with any corresponding protocols approved by the IRB.

Certification Regarding Education in the Protection of Human Research Participants. The AOR is certifying that, if the proposed project involves research with human subjects, all senior/key personnel involved in human subjects research have received training in the protection of human subjects. Senior/key personnel include all individuals responsible for the design or conduct of the study, including senior/key personnel of collaborating partner entities or alternate performance sites if they are participating in research that involves human subjects.

Certification Regarding Responsible Conduct of Research: The AOR is certifying that the institution has a plan to provide appropriate training and oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research to undergraduates, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers who will be supported by VRIF to conduct research.
Terms and Conditions

The Virginia Research Investment Committee has not yet approved the terms and conditions for awards from the Virginia Research Investment Fund. Below are the draft terms and conditions currently under review. DO NOT SIGN AND SUBMIT AT TIME OF APPLICATION

Grantor and grantee agree that this MOU will be performed in accordance with the following:

1. The statement of work and budget for this award are as specified in the grantee’s proposal submitted ______ (date)______________ and incorporated herein by reference. In its performance of the statement of work, grantee shall be an independent entity and not an employee or agent of grantor.

2. Matters concerning the performance of this award should be directed to the appropriate party’s contact, as shown in Attachments 3A & 3B.

3. Matters concerning the request or negotiation of any changes in the terms, conditions, or amounts cited in this award agreement, and any changes requiring prior approval, should be directed to the appropriate party’s Contact, as shown in Attachments 3A & 3B. Any such changes made to this MOU require the written approval of each party's Authorized Official as shown in Attachments 3A & 3B.

4. Incorporated into this MOU by reference are the VRIF Call for Proposals, the entirety of the grantee’s application packet including the assurances and certifications, the special terms and conditions in Attachment 1, and the general terms and conditions in Attachment 2.

By an Authorized Official of Grantor

____________________________
Signature

____________________________
Printed Name

____________________________
Title

Date: _______________________

By an Authorized Official of Grantee

____________________________
Signature

____________________________
Printed Name

____________________________
Title

Date: _______________________
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Attachment 1: Special Terms and Conditions

Applicability
The terms and conditions in the MOU and all attachments apply directly to the grantee and also apply to collaborating entities, subrecipients, and contractors. The grantee is accountable for the performance of the project, program, or activity; the appropriate expenditure of funds under the award by all parties; and all other obligations of the grantee, as cited in the MOU and all attachments.

Site Visits
VRIC members and/or staff may conduct site visits during the course of the grant period.

Changes
Funds may not be transferred between the budget detailing the planned expenditure of general fund amounts and the budget detailing the planned expenditure of bond funds.

The changes listed below require the prior approval of the grantor. Requests should be directed to the grantor’s Contact, as shown in Attachments 3A & 3B.

- Changes to the scope of the project
- Changes to milestones and timelines that impact the schedule for disbursement of funds
- Changes to collaborating entities
- Changes to key personnel named in the approved proposal
- Reduction of effort of PI or any Co-PI of 10% or more from the level in the approved proposal
- Plans for continued progress during extended absence of PI or any Co-PI
- Changes to the budget detailing the planned expenditure of general fund amounts resulting in a deviation of 20% or more in any budget category; the request must include the current allocation of resources along with specific detail and justification for the reallocation

No-cost extensions require the approval of the grantor. Requests for a no-cost extension should be addressed to and received by the Contact, as shown in Attachments 3A & 3B, not less than sixty (60) days prior to the desired effective date of the requested change. See “Reporting Requirements” section of the Call for Proposals.

Disbursement of Funds, Accounting, and Audit
After receiving a written request from the Virginia Research Investment Committee, grantor will authorize the State Comptroller and the Virginia Department of Planning and Budget to release the first payment to the grantee. The first payment will be sufficient for the grantee to achieve the first milestone on the timeline included in the grantee’s proposal.

After initial disbursement, subsequent payments will be contingent upon successful performance against key milestones and other performance standards outlined in the proposal. Non-compliance with the terms and conditions of this award, including reporting requirements, and/or failure to achieve milestones on the approved timeline could result in a hold on disbursement of additional funds until the grantee is in compliance.

All payments shall be considered provisional and subject to adjustment within the total estimated cost in the event such adjustment is necessary as a result of an adverse audit finding against the grantee.

Award monies not expended by the end of the period of performance must be returned.
The grantee will oversee the expenditure of all grant funds by all parties and ensure that all funds are expended in strict compliance with state rules, regulations, and guidelines, the terms and conditions of this MOU, professional accounting standards, and all applicable state laws and requirements.

The grantee will maintain systematic accounting records of all expenditures relating to this award, including the supporting source documentation. Records will be retained by the grantee in accordance with Library of Virginia Record Retention Policy.

Records will be available for inspection and/or audit by SCHEV or the Virginia Auditor of Public Accounts.

**Transfer of Award or Change of Principal Investigator**
If the Principal Investigator leaves the grantee institution during the grant period, the grant will not be transferred to a new institution. The grantee institution will have the opportunity to propose a new Principal Investigator, subject to approval of SCHEV staff and the Chair of the VRIC. If an agreement cannot be reached regarding assignment of a new Principal Investigator, a collaborating institution, if any, could propose to become the lead grantee. If no agreement can be reached, the award will be terminated and unexpended and unobligated funds must be returned.

**Reporting**
Report type and due dates are required as detailed in the Call for Proposals.

**Future Applications to VRIF**
Award recipients and their partners who are delinquent in any VRIF obligation are not eligible to apply for or receive future VRIF funding until obligations are resolved.

**Termination of Award**
SCHEV may terminate this award in the event of non-compliance with the terms and conditions of this MOU, significant lack of progress including failure to achieve milestones on the timeline set forth in the proposal, or other extenuating conditions. In the case of termination, the grantee will return any unexpended and unobligated funds.

**Acknowledgments**
Professional publications or presentations resulting from activities supported by this award must acknowledge the Virginia Research Investment Fund.

Acknowledgments of the Virginia Research Investment Fund are appreciated on poster presentations, printed programs, news releases, web news, e-mail alerts, or announcements regarding grant-funded activities.
Attachment 2: General Terms and Conditions

A. **VENDORS MANUAL:** NA

B. **APPLICABLE LAWS AND COURTS:** This contract shall be governed in all respects by the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia and any litigation with respect thereto shall be brought in the courts of the Commonwealth. The agency and the grantee are encouraged to resolve any issues in controversy arising from the award of the contract or any contractual dispute using Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) procedures (Code of Virginia, §2.2-4366). ADR procedures are described in Chapter 9 of the Vendors Manual. The grantee shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, rules and regulations.

C. **ANTI-DISCRIMINATION:** By signing this contract, the grantee certifies to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia that they will conform to the provisions of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, as well as the Virginia Fair Employment Contracting Act of 1975, as amended, where applicable, the Virginians With Disabilities Act, the Americans With Disabilities Act and §2.2-4311 of the Virginia Public Procurement Act (VPPA). The grantee shall not discriminate against any recipient of goods, services, or disbursements made pursuant to the contract on the basis of the recipient's religion, religious belief, refusal to participate in a religious practice, or on the basis of race, age, color, gender or national origin and shall be subject to the same rules as other organizations that contract with public bodies to account for the use of the funds provided; however, if the faith-based organization segregates public funds into separate accounts, only the accounts and programs funded with public funds shall be subject to audit by the public body. (Code of Virginia, §2.2-4343 1.E.).

1. During the performance of this contract, the grantee agrees as follows:

   a. The grantee will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, age, disability, or any other basis prohibited by state law relating to discrimination in employment, except where there is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of the grantee. The grantee agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notices setting forth the provisions of this nondiscrimination clause.

   b. The grantee, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the grantee, will state that such grantee is an equal opportunity employer.

   c. Notices, advertisements and solicitations placed in accordance with federal law, rule or regulation shall be deemed sufficient for the purpose of meeting these requirements.

2. The grantee will include the provisions of 1. above in every subcontract or purchase order over $10,000, so that the provisions will be binding upon each subcontractor or vendor.

D. **ETHICS IN PUBLIC CONTRACTING:** By signing this contract with the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, the grantee certifies that their offer is made without collusion or fraud and that they have not offered or received any kickbacks or inducements from any other contractor, supplier, manufacturer or subcontractor in connection with their offer and that they have not conferred on any public employee having official responsibility for this transaction any payment, loan, subscription, advance, deposit of money, services or
anything of more than nominal value, present or promised, unless consideration of substantially equal or greater value was exchanged.

E. **IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT OF 1986:** By signing this contract with the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, the grantee certifies that the grantee does not, and shall not during the performance of the contract, knowingly employ an unauthorized alien as defined in the federal Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986.

F. **DEBARMENT STATUS:** By signing this contract, grantee shall certify that they are not currently debarred by the Commonwealth of Virginia from contracts for the type of activities covered by the Scope of Work/proposal, nor are they an agent of any person or entity that is currently so debarred.

G. **ANTITRUST:** By entering into this contract, the grantee conveys, sells, assigns, and transfers to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia all rights, title and interest in and to all causes of action it may now have or hereafter acquire under the antitrust laws of the United States and the Commonwealth of Virginia, relating to the particular goods or services purchased or acquired by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia under said contract.

H. **MANDATORY USE OF STATE FORM AND TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR IFBs AND RFPs:** NA

I. **CLARIFICATION OF TERMS:** NA

J. **PAYMENT:** NA

I. **TESTING AND INSPECTION:** The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia reserves the right to conduct any test/inspection it may deem advisable to assure goods and services conform to the specifications in the Scope of Work.

J. **ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACT:** A contract shall not be assignable by the grantee in whole or in part without the written consent of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.

K. **PRECEDENCE OF TERMS:** The following General Terms and Conditions VENDORS MANUAL (NA), APPLICABLE LAWS AND COURTS, ANTI-DISCRIMINATION, ETHICS IN PUBLIC CONTRACTING, IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT OF 1986, DEBARMENT STATUS, ANTITRUST, MANDATORY USE OF STATE FORM AND TERMS AND CONDITIONS (NA), CLARIFICATION OF TERMS (NA), PAYMENT (NA) shall apply in all instances. In the event there is a conflict between any of the other General Terms and Conditions and any Special Terms and Conditions, the Special Terms and Conditions shall apply.

L. **QUALIFICATIONS OF (BIDDERS/OFFERORS):** NA

M. **TESTING AND INSPECTION:** NA (duplicate of I. above)

N. **ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACT:** NA (duplicate of J. above)

O. **CHANGES TO THE CONTRACT:** See Attachment 1: Special Terms and Conditions.

P. **DEFAULT:** See Attachment 1: Special Terms and Conditions.
Q. **Taxes**: Sales to the Commonwealth of Virginia are normally exempt from state sales tax. State sales and use tax certificates of exemption, Form ST-12, will be issued upon request.

R. **Use of Brand Names**: NA

S. **Transportation and Packaging**: NA

T. **Insurance**: NA

U. **Announcement of Award**: NA

V. **Drug-Free Workplace**: During the performance of this contract, the grantee and subcontractors agree to provide a drug-free workplace for the grantee’s employees. Grantee will inform employees that the unlawful manufacture, sale, distribution, dispensation, possession, or use of a controlled substance or marijuana is prohibited in the grantee’s workplace.

W. **Nondiscrimination of Grantees**: Grantee shall not be discriminated against because of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, age, disability, faith-based organizational status, any other basis prohibited by state law relating to discrimination in employment or because grantee employs ex-offenders unless the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia has made a written determination that employing ex-offenders on the specific contract is not in its best interest. If the award of this contract is made to a faith-based organization and an individual, who applies for or receives goods, services, or disbursements provided pursuant to this contract, objects to the religious character of the faith-based organization from which the individual receives or would receive the goods, services, or disbursements, the public body shall offer the individual, within a reasonable period of time after the date of his objection, access to equivalent goods, services, or disbursements from an alternative provider.

X. **eVA Business-to-Government Vendor Registration, Contracts, and Orders**: NA

Y. **Availability of Funds**: The parties herein understand and agree that the agency shall be bound hereunder only to the extent of the funds available or which may hereafter become available for the purpose of this agreement.

Z. **Set-Asides**: NA

AA. **Bid Price Currency**: NA

BB. **Authorization to Conduct Business in the Commonwealth**: NA

**Additional Terms and Conditions**

A. **Renewal of Contract**: NA

B. **Additional Information**: NA

C. **Delivery Point**: N/A

D. **eVA Business-to-Government Contracts and Orders**: NA
E. **PRIME GRANTEE RESPONSIBILITIES:** The grantee shall be responsible for completely supervising and directing the work under this contract and all subcontractors that he may utilize, using his best skill and attention.

Subcontractors who perform work under this contract shall be responsible to the prime grantee. The grantee agrees that he is as fully responsible for the acts and omissions of his subcontractors and of persons employed by them as he is for the acts and omissions of his own employees.

F. **PROPOSAL ACCEPTANCE PERIOD:** NA

G. **WARRANTY:** NA

H. **SUBCONTRACTS:** No portion of the work shall be subcontracted without prior written consent of the purchasing agency. In the event that the grantee desires to subcontract some part of the work specified herein, the grantee shall furnish the purchasing agency the names, qualifications and experience of their proposed subcontractors. The grantee shall, however, remain fully liable and responsible for the work to be done by its subcontractor(s) and shall assure compliance with all requirements of the contract.
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
Agenda Item

Item: Ad Hoc Committee on Research #4 – Updates from Staff

Date of Meeting: May 16, 2017

Presenters: Alan Edwards
Director of Policy Studies
alanedwards@schev.edu

Lynn Seuffert
Associate for Research Investment
lynnseuffert@schev.edu

Most Recent Review/Action:
☑ No previous Council review/action
☑ Previous review/action
   Date: March 20 and April 12, 2017
   Action: Discussion

Background Information/Summary of Major Elements:
Since the April 12 Committee meeting, staff has spent the majority of its time refining
the Call for Proposals document. In addition, staff has been preparing for the May 19
meeting of the Virginia Research Investment Committee (VRIC), which will center on
the Call document and on a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the study required in
Item 255.C of Chapter 836, 2017 Acts of Assembly for an assessment of the
Commonwealth’s research assets. For the study, SCHEV is designated as the
coordinating body on behalf of the VRIC.

In response to guidance provided by VRIC members at their April 6 meeting, SCHEV
staff developed a Request for Information (RFI), which alerts potential consultants that
an RFP may be forthcoming and solicits feedback on consultants’ capabilities and
potential strategies for responding to an RFP. Staff issued the RFI on April 18; it
closed on May 2. On May 16, staff will brief the Committee regarding RFI responses,
which staff will use to develop a draft RFP for review and, ideally, action by the VRIC
at its meetings on May 19 and May 24.

Materials Provided: None

Financial Impact: None

Timetable for Further Review/Action: None

Resolution: None