

**MINUTES OF MEETING #3 (2010 - 2011) OF THE
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE
HELD ON FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26th, 2010 AT 1:00PM - 2:30PM
IN MC D350-L**

PRESENT: Professor Tamara El-Hoss (Chair), Professor Tansu Barker (Vice-Chair), Dr. Ian Brindle, Dr. Murray Knuttila, Professor Francine McCarthy, Professor Meri Jean Morrissey, Professor Steven Renzetti, Ms. Ellen Robb, Dean Marilyn Rose, Ms. Judy Maiden (Recorder)

REGRETS: Professor Cheri Bradish, Professor Charles Conteh, Dean Tom Dunk, Ms. Margaret Grove, Mr. Christopher Lindley, Professor James Mandigo, Professor Michelle McGinn

GUESTS: Ms. Lori Walker, Professor Jan Frijters, Mr. Pat Beard

Introductions / Welcome

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED (Morrissey/Brindle)

THAT the agenda be accepted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

MOVED (Brindle/Renzetti)

To clarify Dean Roses' reference to the differentiation document of HEQCO.

THAT the minutes of the #2 (2010 - 2011) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on October 29th, 2010 be approved with the above change.

CARRIED

3. Update/Information

a. Sub-Committee reformation/membership

i. TREMP

No report, but awaiting the delivery of the policy and further direction from the committee before commencing. Professor Renzetti has agreed to Chair the sub-committee.

ii. Nomenclature No report

iii. Intellectual Property No report

a. Policy on Surveys

Professor El-Hoss invited Mr. Beard to the meeting so the committee could ask him additional questions. He had previously attended a meeting on March 29th. Some concerns were raised; the committee wanted to understand the interpretation of the document and to what extent it applies to individual faculty members and how it impacts people at other universities. Mr. Beard said it would have no impact unless the surveys were managed by an outside agency but addressed to campus groups and surveys that are part of research projects. It is stated in the introduction that the policy *is intended to coordinate surveys administered by and through the University in order to maximize their benefits*. The purpose of this policy is to alleviate survey fatigue and to control the surveys administered to ensure the results are reliable, meaningful and effective.

Professor Renzetti expressed concern with respect to surveys that are part of research projects if faculty members can be blocked for research efforts that were approved at another university. He stated no one would want to have to modify their research project and any impingement on how a faculty member conducts his/her research is foreseen as a problem.

Dr. Brindle mentioned there is an ethical dimension as well. Ms. Walker questioned how the proposals would be routed and who would receive the surveys first, the Research Ethics Board (REB) or the Survey Management Committee (SMC). She felt some surveys should go first to the REB, if approved they should then go to the SMC. If they go first to the SMC and they are determined to need REB approval then the SMC would be responsible for forwarding them on to the REB. She wants to be sure the expertise is in place to evaluate the surveys appropriately.

A question was raised related to the language concerning the 'Scope'. Since thesis work and PhD work were not included here, it was questioned if they would be evaluated differently. After the policy is approved, Ms. Walker questioned how people would be educated in its use. It was also mentioned that the REB does not enforce policies. Mr. Beard admitted he was not sure how it will take place. A committee will be formed and they will make these decisions. Regarding the composition of the committee, it was thought there should be REB representation and it should be stated in the policy that a REB member would be on the committee.

Dr. Knuttila mentioned that surveys which are not approved by the REB would not be administered. It was thought there could be numerous challenges if faculty members need approval quickly since some research can be time sensitive and a quick turnaround can sometimes be necessary. Mr. Beard admitted they currently do not have the resources to handle this kind of work. The policy is based on Carleton University's policy where they handle about 25 surveys a year.

Urged to put in language where the demarcation lies.

MOVED (Brindle/Rose)

THAT the policy be passed to Dr. Knuttila and Mr. Beard so they can review it again and make the necessary updates.

CARRIED

It was suggested the policy be called the 'Policy on University Surveys' since it applies to university surveys. It was also recommended it be made more user friendly on faculty members.

b. Biosciences Research Ethics Board

Ms. Walker provided a quick review of what the Research Ethics Board (REB) proposed last year; in January 2009, they *released a report recommending the establishment of a second Research Ethics Board with specialization in physiological and biological research procedures and interventions (Bioscience Research Ethics Board or BREB)*. Ms. Walker stated that *this recommendation arose from the challenges faced by the current REB in providing competent and timely review for all research at Brock, a survey of practices used at other universities, and issues that emerged in a University-wide open forum on physiological research ethics*. They stated that *without the second board, Brock could be in a position of failing to meet the requirements of the Memorandum of Understanding with the federal granting agencies and therefore could lose our CIHR, NSERC and SSHRC funding*.

There is currently one board, but they are lacking expertise in bioscience projects and have had to seek external advice for physiological research on numerous occasions. There has been some difficulty and reluctance recruiting to the current board because some faculty members who have expertise in social science have expressed discomfort reviewing some bioscience research. In contrast, some faculty members who have the expertise in bioscience have expressed willingness to serve on a bioscience REB, but express reluctance to serve on the existing board due to the number of files outside their area.

With the creation of a second board, each board would be smaller and this would address some of the concerns expressed regarding REB Chair workload since there would be one Chair for each board. With two Chairs there will be more time for policy development, advocacy and education. Also, in order to provide consistency across boards, they would share some members (Research Ethics Manager, plus the Vice-Chair or another faculty member), application forms, guidelines and regular communication would take place between the Chairs.

The Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans is changing in December. The draft of TCPS is calling for someone who is knowledgeable in relevant law to stand on each board. An honorarium or other compensation could be required for the board members with this expertise who sit on each committee. It will be difficult to determine what this will amount to in costs. A BREB member who has medical expertise would be required for the

second board. This person would be essential, even without establishing the BREB. An additional course release will be required annually for the BREB Chair as well as professional development expenses.

The current system has an expedited review process, but if it came to a full board review it could go to both boards which would provide more flexibility. The workload may be reduced because it would be split between two REBS. There are currently 400 new applications a year and the Chair has to review them all. The volume of research has increased over the years and it is expected there will be ongoing significant growth in the near future, which will increase demand on people who volunteer their time.

The financial implications are reported to be modest, but it is difficult to determine the additional costs as these will fall under the jurisdiction of the Vice-President Research. An appendix was presented outlining proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook - 8.3 Mechanisms for Screening Research Involving Human Participants. The committee indicated they would like to see a neater, more refined document before it goes to Senate.

MOVED (Rose/ McCarthy)

THAT the committee accepted the report in principle, but asked the REB to resubmit a streamlined document separating policy from procedure.

CARRIED

It was decided that specific conversations regarding financial implications fall within the purview of the Vice-President Research who holds the budget for the REB and administrative support.

4. Report from Vice-President Research

(Brindle)

This year, the Canada Research Chairs Program celebrates its 10-year anniversary and on November 24th & 25th, at the Metro Toronto Convention Centre, a Public Policy Forum (PPF) was held in collaboration with the Council of Ontario Universities and Canada Research Chairs Secretariat. To mark this occasion, 'Canada Research Chairs: Thinking Ahead for a Strong Future' was held. This was an invitation only event. Canada Research Chairs were invited from across Canada. Other people invited were from government, industry and media.

ACTION Dr. Brindle asked that the two documents he presented to the committee be included with the minutes.

Dr. Brindle announced the renewal of four of our Canada Research Chairs: John Bonnett and Kevin Kee from the Faculty of Humanities; Tomas Hudlicky, Faculty of Mathematics and Sciences; and Jennifer Rowsell, Faculty of Education. Also announced at this event was Wendy Ward, Faculty of Applied Health Sciences. She is our newest 'Canada Research Chair in Bone and Muscle Development', Tier II who starts at Brock in February.

The Office of Research Services (ORS) submitted approximately 136 applications to various granting agencies between September and November. The ORS want to ensure there is an advanced date for submission of proposals because it is not easy for the Research Officers to do the necessary work to ensure the proposals are acceptable when the applications are brought in too late.

The ORS is close to signing a Government Relations Officer. Dr. Brindle considers this position to be pivotal in obtaining Tricouncil funding. Last years NSERC success rate was at 75% but now it is down to 55%. This number is believed to be firm, so we need to find other sources of revenue, which is what this person will be tasked to do. They will be expected to look for government funding, foundations and agencies outside the Tricouncil.

A shortlist has been compiled for the position of Director, Business Development and Commercialization. Interviews are expected to be conducted shortly. This person's position will articulate with the business incubator. Professor Barker questioned whether the title could be changed from business development. Dr. Brindle said this is a working title and that Human Resources has opinions on what this position should be named.

Brock received \$750,000 for the Applied Research and Commercialization Initiative (ARC) grant that brings together Small to Medium-Sized Enterprises (SME), which helps entrepreneurs to work with Brock University researchers to leverage each others strengths to benefit the economy. Through Brock's administration, FedDev will provide a maximum of \$50,000 with small to medium-sized enterprises contributing \$25,000 (cash or in-kind). This could include up to fifteen projects.

5. Other Business

None

Date of Next Meeting:

January 26th, 2011

There will most likely be an application for the Brock Environmental Sustainability Institute (BESI) on the agenda.

ACTION Ms. Maiden will send proposed dates for February and March to the committee. The above meetings will be held in the Research/Graduate Studies Boardroom (MC D350-L) from 3:30 – 5:00pm.

Adjournment

(Renzetti/Barker)

THAT the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 2:10pm