

**MINUTES OF MEETING #5 (2010 - 2011) OF THE
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16th, 2010 AT 3:30PM - 5:00PM
IN MC D350-L**

PRESENT: Professor Tamara El-Hoss (Chair), Professor Tansu Barker (Vice-Chair), Professor Cheri Bradish, Dr. Ian Brindle, Dean Tom Dunk, Professor James Mandigo, Professor Francine McCarthy, Professor MeriJean Morrissey, Professor Steven Renzetti, Ms. Ellen Robb, Dean Marilyn Rose, Ms. Judith Maiden (Recorder)

REGRETS: Professor Charles Conteh, Ms. Margaret Grove, Dr. Murray Knuttila, Mr. Christopher Lindley, Professor Michelle McGinn

Introductions / Welcome

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED (Renzetti/Brindle)

THAT the agenda be accepted with the following reverse in order to 3.a. ii;

1. Report
2. Process FHB 3.25 - Policy on the Establishment and Review of Research Units, Centres and Institutes.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

MOVED (Rose/Morrissey)

THAT the minutes of the #4 (2010 - 2011) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on January 26th, 2010 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. Update/Information

- a. Sub-Committee reformation/membership
 - i. TREMP

No report is available as nothing new was received.

- ii. Nomenclature
 1. Report

The subcommittee met and presented a draft proposal to the committee. Last years' nomenclature document was complicated, but it has now been simplified. It was proposed to move forward with the recommendation of two entities, 'Institutes' and 'Centres' instead of the previously proposed, 'Institutes', two kinds of 'Centres', and 'Schools'. This is a radical change, but necessary as there are some inconsistencies that need to be

addressed and corrected regarding FHB: 25 - Policy on the Establishment and Review of the Research Units, Centres and Institutes. By creating only two categories to be recognized by the university, it was felt these changes would be more straightforward and create a less complicated landscape. The revised policy would only address these two types of research entities.

In regard to the definition for 'Institutes', it was suggested that a similar definition to what was previously proposed be retained. Regarding Centres, it was recommended that the earlier two definitions be collapsed. This would create *one definition that encompasses the potential for Centres to focus on only collaborative research activities or on both research and teaching. Centres could offer academic programs and would report to a Faculty Dean, but Institutes could not themselves offer academic programs, though programs existing in Faculty-based academic units might establish affiliations with them. Institutes would report to the Vice-President, Research.* Through much discussion it was agreed to add the words 'research, teaching and/or scholarship' in the newly created definition for Centres. This addition conveyed the committee's assent.

The subcommittee concluded there was no need to define 'Schools' as no new initiatives regarding these seem to be forthcoming. The proposal mentioned that if a request to establish a new school were to be introduced, complicated governance issues might emerge due to the relationship and possible definitional overlap between a School and a Faculty. *This would have been the case with the proposal on Indigenous Studies that had been spoken of in earlier years. Had there been a new definition proposed, the one School that currently exists would have been grandfathered anyway and it functions well enough as is, at least for the present.*

Other concerns regarding the review of these entities and the possibility of renaming them to have them conform to the new definitions were expressed. It was stated that centres exist as centres, but sometimes change to become more interdisciplinary. It was felt that centres are like small departments and are created for both research and teaching and their prime reason to exist is to promote and facilitate research and bring together people from different departments. The review of these entities has to be determined. Further discussion ensued.

Concerns were articulated regarding how the Integrated Plan will be implemented concerning spaces since centres, units and institutions are all mentioned in it. *It was concluded that this issue needs to be moved forward quickly with the two categories specified, since the University is eager to encourage new initiatives related to the Senate approved Integrated Plan and it is likely that whatever comes forward will need to be indentified as one of these two kinds of research entities.*

Dean Rose brought the committees' attention to the added points at the end of the proposal that she thought of *subsequent to several discussions with faculty members over the last week or so about what our committee was thinking of proposing.* She mentioned *the inclusion of two categories only, Centres and Institutes, leaves out other kinds of*

collectives that may wish to identify themselves as research clusters but without either of these titles. She acknowledged that the use of the term 'Unit' seems to have become active once again since the to-be-revised policy governing research entities is silent on the procedures for formation of research entities, and this is proving to be an impediment to moving forward expeditiously for some of the more poised research hubs.

It was agreed that the term 'Unit' be taken out of the definitions and only the two entities be included. The definitions can be expanded at a later date if it is deemed to be needed.

Because of the policy problem, people who want to come together can be thwarted, so *there may be a need for such nascent bodies to form, try out ideas, see whether they can attract funding, see whether they need to re-form as Centres or Institutes over time, and so on - without having to go through the somewhat complex process of obtaining approval through FHB protocols.* Institutes and Centres are thought to be high-level university initiatives and for some groups it may not be necessary to take the step of defining themselves in this way in their initial phases.

It was recommended that committee members be present at Senate for this issue.

Motion was made for the amendments that were recorded (FHB 25.3 - definitions) to go to Senate for the April 13th meeting.

MOVED (Rose/Brindle)

THAT the following be amended as outlined below;

~~25.3.2 Research Centre~~

~~A formal collective of faculty, scholars, librarians, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students and other researchers, approved at the Faculty level, and created to explore research issues of importance to the collective and to the University, to facilitate the submission of external, individual and team research applications, contractual research, and inter-institutional research programs. A Research Centre typically has a "management team", representing the interests of the researchers, the Department(s), the Faculty and may have "adjunct" (that is, non-university) members. A research centre may use Faculty/University letterhead with the name of the Centre visibly profiled.~~

~~A Research Centre reports to the Chair and/or Dean.~~

25.3.2 CENTRES

Centres are Faculty-based collectives with a defined mission, created to explore areas of research, teaching and/or scholarship of importance to the collective and to the

University. They may include faculty, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, librarians, and other researchers. Centres are managed by an advisory committee and report to a Faculty Dean. They may choose to offer academic programs under the direction of the Faculty Dean, and in such cases faculty may be directly appointed to them.

~~25.3.3 Research Institute-~~

~~A formal collective of faculty, scholars, librarians, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students and other researchers, approved at the University level, governed by a "management board", and created to explore research issues of strategic importance to the Faculty and University. A Research Institute typically has "adjunct" (that is non-university) members and is permitted to use University letterhead with a distinct image for the Institute prominently displayed. "Research Institute" designation is reserved for a limited number of high-profile, strategic initiatives.~~

25.3.3 INSTITUTES

Institutes are cross-Faculty research collectives with a defined mission. They may include faculty, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, librarians and other researchers (including adjuncts appointed from other research institutions) who share a particular research focus of strategic importance to the University. Institutes are non-teaching units. Faculty are associated with Institutes but are not directly appointed to them. Institutes are administered by an academic Director and an advisory committee, and report to the Vice-President, Research.

The committee unanimously agreed to the above amendments.

CARRIED

Further discussion ensued and the overall committee agreed that when seeking approval for the different entities, Senate will need to know and be guided by criteria in the policy. Dean Dunk concluded that clarity is needed in the terminology of the policy and that transparency with respect to the development of new Centres and Institutes is essential. He thought in general that the process would be improved if Senate sub-committees announced to Senate what policies or documents are being worked on at one meeting, and then bring forth an actual refined proposal for voting on at a later meeting. In this way Senate would know about upcoming developments and would be able to feed

into the sub-committee's discussion of it prior to the sub-committee's already having discussed it and brought forth a fully-formed motion.

The overall committee agreed.

ACTION The Nomenclature sub-committee was tasked with ensuring that there is openness about the process -- so that Senate and the larger community will know what groups are being formed and are applying for official status before the proposal comes to Senate for a vote.

2. Process FHB 3.25 – Policy on the Establishment and Review of Research Units, Centres and Institutes.

The committee will not look at the process for the policy at this time since the above changes have been made and are to be submitted to Senate for approval.

iii. Intellectual Property

No report

4. Report from Vice-President Research

(Brindle)

John Wilson accepted the position of Director, Business Development and Commercialization in the Office of Research Services. ORS had been waiting for his Labour Market Assessment and it has now been approved. He is expected to arrive in May. There are 49 applications for the Government Relations position. These have been shortlisted to six, but still need to be pared down to three or four. The two candidates for VPR have come and presented their credentials. The VPR Search Committee will meet next Tuesday. Everyone is invited to submit their comments to the president.

5. Other Business

None

Date of Next Meeting:
Wednesday, May 18, 2011 (TBD)

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

1. Adjournment

(Renzetti/McCarthy)

THAT the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm