

**MINUTES OF MEETING #2 (2010 - 2011) OF THE
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE
HELD ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29th, 2010 AT 1:00PM - 2:30PM
IN MC D350-L**

PRESENT: Professor Tamara El-Hoss (Chair), Professor Tansu Barker (Vice-Chair), Dr. Ian Brindle, Professor Charles Conteh, Dean Tom Dunk, Ms. Margaret Grove, Dr. Murray Knuttila, Professor Francine McCarthy, Professor Michelle McGinn, Professor James Mandigo, Professor Merijeane Morrissey, Professor Steven Renzetti, Ms. Ellen Robb, Dean Marilyn Rose, Ms. Judith Maiden (Recorder)

REGRETS: Professor Cheri Bradish, Mr. Christopher Lindley, Professor James Mandigo

Introductions / Welcome

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED (Morrissey/McGinn)

THAT the agenda be accepted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

MOVED (Dunk/Renzetti)

THAT the minutes of the #1 (2010 - 2011) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on October 1st, 2010 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. Update/Information

a. Sub-Committee reformation/membership

i. TREMP

Members of the sub-committee are Professors Bradish, Renzetti and McCarthy.

ii. Nomenclature

Members of the sub-committee are Dean Rose, Ms. Grove, Professors Morrissey and Mandigo.

iii. Intellectual Property

Members of the sub-committee are Dr. Brindle, Dean Dunk, Ms. Robb and Professor McGinn.

Professor El-Hoss requested that when the sub-committees meet and select a chair they inform her of their choice. If necessary she has agreed to participate on any of the sub-committees.

b. University's Strategic Plan

Senate and Governance have asked that the sub-committees look at the Provosts' September 23 Draft Strategic Plan prior to the meeting of the Chairs, Vice-Chairs and Secretaries with Governance on November 3rd. At the meeting, the Governance Committee will be looking for the input and the collective thoughts of the committees.

Professor Barker submitted two documents to the Research, Scholarship and Policy committee outlining his thoughts on what makes good mission, vision and values statements in Strategic Plans. He felt a good Mission Statement should be succinct and gave Kodak's as a prime example. He spoke of SWOT analysis and how a mission statement *should be based on internal and external analyses of opportunities, threats, strengths and weaknesses*. He mentioned that if it has been done, *he would like to see a summary of the crucial dimensions that have been identified*.

He felt we had to ask ourselves questions pertaining to *raison d'être (what is our business) as it is a good concept and should be answered by asking the following three questions:*

- 1) *WHO is being satisfied?*
- 2) *What needs are being satisfied?*
- 3) *How are they satisfied? What skills, knowledge and DISTINCTIVE competencies are needed?*

Other questions asked were related to *Vision: What Brock would like to achieve? What is the desired future state? Values: Indicates how members should conduct themselves and forms the foundation of the 'organizational culture'*.

Finally as it related to BAC, strategic plans are used to shape resource allocation within the organization. Hence, let's be very careful how we state all of the above and the FOCI.

Reference: Hill and Jones, Strategic Management, Southwestern, 9. Ed. Chapter One.

Dr. Knuttila mentioned that since September 23rd what he has heard from the other Senate committees and various stakeholders regarding the Strategic Plan will necessitate a redesign in its role. The document is the outcome of a set of thirty-two consultations since May, some with the Board of Trustees, faculty and staff groups and Senate committees. The Board of Trustees questioned where the universities bond rating would come in and felt this document should be restructured to make it clear. Historical context may be thrown out. Other committees worried about how a plan works and did not cause much grief with the vision, mission, and values pieces. Some references in the document are generic because they apply to 'universities'. What was liked was the process notion. What emerged out of the consultations is that Brock has always had cross disciplinary faculties and cross faculty programs; to set up processes to encourage scholars from various faculties to work together in a form of graduate or undergraduate programs to look at issues outside their disciplines. Dr. Knuttila initially received instruction from the Board to begin this plan. A Brock University integrated plan document would envision an integrated plan

and articulate an academic and then a faculty plan for future planning, then establish a Presidential Integration Planning Committee. A special meeting of Senate is called for November 23rd to discuss the Strategic Plan. Will suggest to chairs of Senate and Governance committees that it has been pointed out what this document does and does not do. Dr. Knuttila explained what the thought processes were in this document.

The first line in the document---*how Brock is part of one of the world's best and most complex university systems* caused some concern for one professor who felt we could be open to attack if we make this overt statement. Professor Renzetti felt throughout the document there is something stated without evidence. It's not evident what this document excludes. He noted the absence of target, choices, and timelines. He felt these were missing and wondered if they will be included in the next edition of the document and what the balance with teaching and research is.

Professor Barker stated he teaches this information over twelve weeks and cited the Siemens example. Dr. Knuttila honestly admitted that we are going through a learning process and are trying to do the best we can. Questions were asked;

- What's missing - the section that outlines Strengths (Weakness) opportunities and threats;
- Where do we see this going;
- Opportunities and threats analysis – what are the opportunities we see for the future; not to define in terms of departments or degree programs, but what needs are we going to satisfy.

The answers should emerge from our collective sense of priorities. It was felt it does not need to be a lengthy document because some of the best documents are three pages.

Professor McCarthy felt the document should be an honest look at us and how we see Brock and how it differs from other universities. There are things that make us unique, so we want it to be an honest look at who we are and what we want to achieve.

Dr. Knuttila doesn't think the time is right to make that specific a differentiation. The differentiation is how we are going to do things, should come at a later date. There are things that we can talk about that are not divisive.

Professor Barker is interested in thinking of threats and opportunities; the first threat that we miss addressing is the in construable eLearning. There are more customized ways of putting things together. There are many new programs emerging. Second threat; government deny us research and graduate status, will we be allowed to have research spaces that support graduates? We have to create a plan not to be pigeonholed by them, but need to remain on track. Third threat; that we cheat our students by responding to the government's strategies. We need to think three to five to ten years about what is absolutely necessary to us. We want excellent learning experiences for our students and we want research and graduate studies not to fall off the agenda. Fourth threat; to be a transdisciplinary campus; what we do in the future, how we do things in cross disciplinary ways.

Professor Barker agrees not to get into departments. A university should not define its future on the basis of its departments. Defining the process and how we do things needs to spell out the balance how we put together services, teaching, research etc.

Dean Dunk recently met and had a discussion with the Chairs and Director's in the Faculty of Social Sciences regarding that there is not enough emphasis on undergraduate and how these things reinforce each other. Concern about the discussion of silos, forgets about things that happen across the faculties. The timing and significance of the document is it really going to be government policy. Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) document entitled, *The Benefits of Greater Differentiation of Ontario's University Sector Final Report*.

Dean Rose referenced the Differentiation document produced by HEQCO, and noted that the document was produced at the invitation of MTCU. This is the direction the government has been pushing.

Ms. Grove spoke on relationships with multi-year agreements and specificity for five to ten years. She said the Library uses scenario thinking to develop their strategic planning. Dr. Knuttila thought the accountability needed to be made more specific.

Professor Renzetti referenced SWOT analysis when he stated he would not underestimate the 'threat' of the government's fiscal situation; large demands by the health sector, declining revenues across the board, which could last for five, ten, fifteen years or longer. He liked the idea of peeking out of silos and getting together with other people and felt it takes time to put ideas together, but we still need some type of broadly defined criteria or goals.

4. Report from Vice-President Research

(Brindle)

On October 28th Dr. Brindle attended an Ontario Council on University Research (OCUR) meeting in Ottawa along with other Vice-President, Research from various universities. The OCUR meeting was held in conjunction with the CRC-10 Year Anniversary Event on October 27th. The upcoming CRC event will be held in Toronto for two days on November 24th & 25th and is meant to highlight the successes of the Canada Research Chairs and its programs to government, industry and media. Two of our CRC's were selected to participate on panels.

There were presentations made to OCUR by the Ministry of Research and Innovation (MRI) and the head of Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI). It has been noted that government is tightening their hand on funding. Speculation abounds about what happened at CFI a year ago and no one says anything about it. Flexibility is getting tighter and tighter. The innovation and entrepreneurial agenda is central to what is going on. When NSERC was reviewed 3 years ago it was stated the success rate should continue to 75 % but it is now at 50% and still falling. It was speculated that it could be that government is giving more to bigger universities, not the smaller ones. There may be no money received from CFI next year.

5. Other Business

None

Date of Next Meeting:
November 26, 2010 from 1:00-2:30pm

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

1. Adjournment

(Brindle /Conteh)

THAT the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 2:20pm