

**MINUTES OF MEETING #1 (2010 - 2011) OF THE
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE
HELD ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1st, 2010 AT 1:00PM - 2:30PM
IN MC D350-L**

PRESENT: Professor Tamara El-Hoss (Chair), Professor Tansu Barker (Vice-Chair), Professor Cheri Bradish, Dr. Ian Brindle, Professor Charles Conteh, Dean Tom Dunk, Ms. Margaret Grove, Professor James Mandigo, Professor MeriJean Morrissey, Professor Steven Renzetti, Dean Marilyn Rose, Ms. Judy Maiden (Recorder)

REGRETS: Dr. Murray Knuttila, Mr. Christopher Lindley, Professor Francine McCarthy, Professor Michelle McGinn, Ms. Ellen Robb

Introductions / Welcome

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED (Brindle/Rose)

THAT the agenda be accepted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

MOVED (Brindle/Rose)

THAT the minutes of the #5 (2009 - 2010) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on June 8th, 2010 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. Update/Information

a. Centres and Institutes

Professor El-Hoss submitted to Senate a report on proposed new definitions for Institutes, Schools, Centres and Research Centres stating the committee recognizes that the new definitions do not correspond to the current names of many existing entities. The committee endorses the principle of grandfathering these existing names, with the understanding that the possibility of changing the name will be considered at the time of the next review. A response has not been received from Senators as of yet.

Many people are concerned how this report will affect existing entities. It was mentioned that Carol Merriam would like to speak to the sub-committee Chair in her capacity as director of Humanities Research Institute (HRI) regarding these definitions. Dean Kneale approached Professor El-Hoss regarding the definition of 'school' in regard to the Marilyn Walker Fine Arts School. The term school already existed, so this is why the term 'school' was picked. Both these entities report to the Dean of Humanities.

Professor Morrissey felt the title should not be changed at this point as she was part of the group who chose it and they chose it for a reason. Ms. Grove reminded the committee of the reference to grandfathering in the document which would cover this situation.

Discussion ensued regarding lines of reporting and that some entities can have multiple reporting lines. It was mentioned that academic programs would report to their faculties or homes. Centres would not be responsible for the programs, but the existing faculties would.

Dean Dunk felt the logic is not clear regarding multiple lines of reporting with the notion that an institute is meant to represent a flagship research outfit that is engaged in something that represents a university program or goal. He thought we should not be absorbed by the names centre, institute, unit, or school. Dr. Brindle cited CCOVI as a good example of an institute with their OEVI program where students are taken in from biology. This works well and is interdisciplinary.

Professor Barker stated hierarchy is always important in business. He had no difficulty with 'school' per se but with 'institute', the director of an institute reports to the VPR and hierarchy is very important. He spoke on functional leaders and project leaders and the need to be cognizant in business of 'functional authority' or functional authority without direct reporting.

It was observed that with the line versus staff divisions an institute is a research body - a collection of researchers with ties to the university who share a particular research focus of strategic importance to the university and may link up with other bodies across the university. Academic programs cannot really be housed in this type of setting.

In the old definitions, centres report to a single dean, but with the new definition it can be multiple deans. The teaching function is linked to faculties, an institute reports to the VPR. It was noted students should be managed by the faculty to which they belong. It was mentioned that a lot more courses are being offered across the university including Co-op. At the undergraduate level, more courses are being offered outside a particular faculty or unit as well.

b. Sub-Committee reformation/membership
i. TREMP

A final policy was not received prior to the end of last year. Professors Bradish and Renzetti volunteered to serve on the sub-committee. Professor McCarthy will be asked if she will serve as well.

4. Centres and Institutes

Professor El-Hoss suggested renaming the sub-committee 'Nomenclature' as this was viewed as being more descriptive of the issues the committee faces. There were no objections.

New members who volunteered to serve on the sub-committee are Professors Morrissey and Mandigo. Returning members are Dean Rose and Ms. Grove.

i. Intellectual Property

Dr. Brindle recounted that the current IP policy sits as an appendix to the agreement and creates issues which need to be addressed. There is an entity in the agreement which creates some difficult issues. There is a common language issue which needs to be sorted out. He is willing to sit on this sub-committee again this year. Dean Dunk has elected to be a new member on the sub-committee. It was suggested that Ms. Robb be asked to join.

ii. Budget

It was weighed whether the sub-committee should be kept or replaced since the BRAM was never received last year and it is not expected to be received this year. A suggestion was made to have a sub-committee to look at issues that may arise throughout the year. A taskforce will be set in place to replace the Budget Sub-committee. Professor Renzetti has agreed to be a member.

ACTION Professor El-Hoss will send a request to members who were not in attendance at today's meeting asking that they choose a sub-committee to join

Professor El-Hoss will be available to participate in any sub-committee that needs her presence but cannot chair a sub-committee this year. Professor Barker is representing the Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee on the Senate Budget Advisory committee this year so will be excused from participating on all other sub-committees.

iii. Policy on Surveys

Professor Michelle McGinn sent an email to Professor El-Hoss on September 29th stating she thought *'it will be important for the survey policy to be much clearer about what does and does not constitute a survey requiring approval from this committee'*. She also felt *it is essential to clarify the overlap and the timing between the review and REB review*. She believes *it is critically important that this new mechanism does not cause confusion regarding the boundaries and emphases of REB review, given that so many projects will require review by both bodies*. Dr. Brindle suggested Professor McGinn, REB Chair and Ms. Lori Walker, Research Ethics Manager be invited to speak to the committee on surveys and how they relate to ethics.

It was acknowledged that at Senate there were a few questions regarding who would have the final say on surveys, especially surveys on research. When it has to do with surveys for research purposes it comes to this committee. Professor Barker recalled hearing that we were receiving a lot of requests from outside the university, last year's discussion seemed to cover what he might do as an academic in terms of what he might do in regard to research. It is not clearly understood how this becomes an issue for an academic going out to do research with his students. Survey exhaustion was mentioned, as there were too many surveys for the university survey office to administer even though this is considered part of their scope. Professor Renzetti wondered if it would not be related to 'if an academic at another university was surveying and wanted to use

Brocks' email lists is it appropriate for an administrator to allow this'. It is not clear why this is relevant to us. Dr. Brindle surmised some difficulty can come from informal surveys as inappropriate questions may be asked and ethically it can become difficult.

Enquiry was made as to why this policy came to Senate in the first place. Professor El-Hoss mentioned that Pat Beard came one of the last meetings of last year to respond to questions. He stated *this policy was intended to co-ordinate surveys administered by and through the university in order to maximize their benefits*. He had explained that no one can canvass a class unless a form is filled out first which caused some concern.

Professor Renzetti inquired if this may be a policy on external surveys as he did not see where in the document it indicated that it is relevant to an internally conducted survey. He felt internal would be a different case. Some concern was expressed about policies coming to Senate. It was perceived that if it impacts on the Faculty Handbook (FHB) it would be copacetic to bring it to Senate.

Pat Beard will be invited to attend another meeting since there are concerns and there is a desire to understand the interpretation of the document. Dr. Brindle will invite the REB Chair and Ethics Research Manager as well. They will all be invited to attend the November 26th meeting. We received a copy of the Provost's strategic plan and this will be a priority at the October 29th meeting as it will require extra time to review and discuss.

ACTION Professor El-Hoss will invite Pat Beard to the November 26th meeting to address our concerns.

ACTION Dr. Brindle will ask Professor Michelle McGinn and Ms. Lori Walker what the ethical issues are regarding surveys and report back to the committee.

ACTION Dr. Brindle will ask Professor Michelle McGinn and Ms. Lori Walker to attend the November 26th meeting

5. Report from Vice-President Research

Dr. Brindle apprised the committee of the current situation in the Office of Research Services. Due to the departure of Robert Eagle, Director and Hitesh Jain, Technology Transfer Officer we have slowly been trying to rebuild the offices. The office is skeletal, but the Research Officers are still in place and moving forward. Ads have gone out for the positions of Government Relations Officer and Director of Business Development and Commercialization. These new positions are critical to the office. The Government Relations position is crucial because of the need to expand outside of the traditional Tri-Council to secure funding from other sources such as CIDA, IDRC and Citizenship and Immigration Canada where we have not appeared in a number of years. It is considered important to regain this capacity and accessing government requires great skills; introductions to government ministries, agencies and knowledge of various acts of lobbying.

It was deduced that the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada's (AUCC) voice has

become weaker and questioned how a Government Relations Officer can play a role with government at a federal level. Dr. Brindle feels the benefit of this position is enormous as Ms. Meaghan Rusnell, University Advancement Government Relations Advisor has been instrumental in helping with the funding of the \$38 million for the Cairns Family Health and Bioscience Complex (former NHBRC). He stated Government Relations Officers learn about opportunities before they appear on the websites. This is considered a priceless benefit to the university. They also understand how government works and its policies. Someone in this position can help locate contracts with government agencies and this can be very useful in helping to obtain funding. It is recognized that we now have to actively look for new opportunities outside the Tri-Council as competition for available funding is becoming fierce and the scope with who we deal with has to be broadened. Ideally a Government Relations Officer should be able to help people look for money outside the usual agencies. It is becoming extra important to be more independent.

Business development is equally important because we need to build up our economic capabilities by taking the ideas out of Brock and into the community and we need to understand the landscape in order to move ahead. A third position, Executive Office Manager is crucial to understanding all the workings of the internal and external communities, which makes this position also important. It is anticipated these positions will be hired soon, although the Government Relations interviews did not go well, but other options are currently being explored.

The Research Officers have provided a sketch of what they believe will happen during this granting cycle. There will be approximately 129 applications going out to the various agencies including, CFI, MRI, CRC, NSERC and SSHRC. There is clearly a benefit to coming to the RO's with applications as grant writing is becoming increasingly professionalized. The office has recently employed freelance consultants to help write applications when needed.

6. Other Business

Three agencies, Canada Research Chairs (CRC), Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) are concerned with addressing the needs of people in Humanities. Chad Gaffield, president of SSHRC has stated he is prepared to play hardball with the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) because there is money in CIHR that they are not spending. He is putting pressure on them to help Humanities.

A motion was passed by Senate on September 22nd asking that Dr. Knuttila provide a draft copy of the Strategic Plan to the various Senate committees. A meeting of Chairs, Vice-Chairs and Secretaries will be convened in early November to further discuss the document and the responses from the various committees.

ACTION Professor El-Hoss will forward to the committee a copy of the draft Strategic Plan for review and discussion at the next meeting

Date of next Meetings:

October 29, 2010 from 1:00-2:30pm

November 26, 2010 from 1:00-2:30pm

The above meetings will be held in the Research/Graduate Studies Boardroom (MC D350-L)

7. Adjournment

(Barker/Dunk)

THAT the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 2:15pm