

**MINUTES OF MEETING #1 (2011 - 2012) OF THE
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20th, 2011 AT 9:00AM - 10:30AM
IN MC D350-L**

PRESENT: Professor Steven Renzetti (Chair), Professor Francine McCarthy (Vice-Chair), Professor David Gabriel, Ms. Margaret Grove, Dean Philip Kitchen, Dr. Murray Knuttila, Dr. Gary Libben, Professor James Mandigo, Professor Diane Miller, Dean Michael Plyley, Professor Lynn Rempel, Professor Dragos Simandan, Professor Elizabeth Vlossak, Mr. Chris Ventura, Ms. Judith Maiden (Recorder)

REGRETS: Mr. Daniel Anti-Amoa, Professor Jennifer Rowsell

Introductions / Welcome

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED (Ventura /Grove)

THAT the agenda be accepted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

MOVED (Grove/Mandigo)

THAT the minutes of the #6 (2010 - 2011) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on May 2nd, 2011 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. Update/Information

a. Sub-Committee Formation

- i. The Intellectual Property sub-committee was inactive last year. It was noted that the Intellectual Property policy sits as an appendix in the Faculty Handbook. There are currently two policies, but the goal is that the policy in the Faculty Handbook be made into an all-inclusive policy. The policy in the Collective Agreement cannot be touched.

MOTION To create a sub-committee on Intellectual Property to begin the policy review

MOVED (Plyley/Mandigo)

Dr. Libben agreed to chair the Intellectual Property sub-committee. Other members include; Professor McCarthy, Professor Renzetti and Dean Plyley agreed to serve if he is needed.

ii. Travel and Field Safety Policy Sub-committee

It was recognized there have been issues with faculty regarding travel and insurance. Two observations were noted; we provide insurance for individuals when they are going places where insurance is not possible; and faculty members are often expected to begin their research as soon as they arrive at their destinations when this can be considered a dangerous practice, if they have travelled long distances without proper rest before beginning their research. This policy issue will become more public since the university is in the process of ratifying the collective agreement. Dr. Knuttila suggested if nothing pertaining to this policy surfaces in the next couple of months the sub-committee should be reactivated.

ACTION Dr. Knuttila agreed to talk to Dr. Greg Finn regarding the state of the Travel & Field Safety Policy and report back to the committee

iii. Centres and Institutes (formerly Nomenclature) Sub-committee

Professor Renzetti stated that last year the issue of reviewing existing centres and institutes was discussed, but not acted upon because the main concern of the committee had been the nomenclature and policy surrounding it. In the FHB III:25:5 - Policy on the Establishment and Review of Research Centres and Institutes - Review and Renewal - *'Research Centres and Institutes will produce an annual report for submission to the relevant Faculty Dean (for Research Centres) or the Vice-President, Research (for Institutes).*

Six months prior to the expiration of the term of approval, the Chair of the Senate Research and Scholarship Policy Committee, through its secretary, shall invite a request for renewal, a self-study document, and copies of the annual reports from the Director of the Research Centre/Institute. The Chair after receiving these submissions and through consultation with the appropriate individuals, will report to the committee. Upon completing its review, the committee will then make its recommendations on whether the Research Centre/Institute will be extended or disbanded. Professor Renzetti asked if the committee wished to begin this process and they agreed to do it. A sub-committee will be formed to conduct the reviews.

4. Report from Vice-President Research

Dr. Libben gave an oral report on his activities since coming to Brock in August 2011. He has been engaged in campus-wide and community-wide consultations which have enabled him to engage in dialogue with community stakeholders, researchers and others.

Key themes in these dialogues have been:

- *the key role that Brock University is playing and can play as a partner in the development and enhancement of Niagara communities.*
- *how both Niagara and Brock are on the verge of transformative next steps.*
- *how the next step for Brock is the Development of a broadly entrenched culture of Research leadership.*

He stated he wants to learn from us, which in turn may change how he sees the office of the Vice-President Research evolving in the near future. Currently he sees the office developing best practice models in four domains and wants to determine the domains where Brock can serve as a great example to the community. He mentioned *Brock's development as a leading research intensive university will require sustained long-term prioritization on all levels.* The office strategic goal will be something new like, *'Look to Brock and Niagara for best practice models'*. He is looking for positive cases where Brock has made a difference internally and externally and then wants to highlight these examples and foreground Brock's research mission provincially, nationally and internationally.

He mentioned that with the creation of new transdisciplinary institutes, it would be good to have institutes external to Brock, 'Look to Brock' for examples of best practices, and for us to develop a culture of research mentorship. The Office of the Vice-President Research wants to help to facilitate and nurture this kind of culture. Discussion ensued regarding mentorship; it was stated that if researchers are not mentoring the next generation they are not doing their job; while people learn much through a career they need to learn earlier on that mentorship is important to enhancing this kind of culture; we have to find ways to ensure that teaching and research are not separate activities so students feel they are part of where knowledge is created. Dr. Libben stated that mentorship is an important part of research leadership and research intensiveness and this goal can be translated into doable things.

Dr. Libben envisions the offices of the VPR and Research Services as championing research within the institution; as fostering and developing research links, making connections and things happen easier, faster and better. Internally the office must be seen as providing the best practice for researchers. In order to facilitate these activities we need to learn about what the Office of Research Services is doing well and what needs to be improved upon. To learn this we would like to create and conduct a survey to better understand the needs of the Brock community and to develop best practice models. The office is expanding and the demands on research management are greater now.

Current activities that are being evaluated in the Office of Research Services are; the need for an integrated team and a different organizational structure that better serves the community and university. There is currently a flat structure in the office with everyone reporting to the VPR and without a director or office manager there is no middle administrative layer. We will seek input and have a different configuration in the office since we want to develop and amplify our presence in the community as much as possible to ensure Brock and the community are in partnership.

Throughout the last month, Dr. Libben has spent time meeting with Deans, Associate Deans, Chairs and Directors and has been trying to better determine how to open up new lines of communication; to find good ways to develop and track research activity and development as this would be an important contribution of the VPR/ORS offices.

Discussion was generated following the report from the VPR. Dr. Knuttila noted that at Senate as Vice-President Academic he gives a report, but there is not a place on the agenda for the Vice-President Research to give a report and this is a matter which needs to be considered; adding a report from the VPR to the Senate agenda. Dean Plyley mentioned this issue was discussed at Governance Committee last year, but it was felt that through the Research & Scholarship Policy Committee there could be a second report from the VPR when the committee Chair reports. Professor Mandigo inquired what the con issues had been. Dean Plyley stated this is a new position, but asked if all Vice-Presidents should report since they are not all on Senate, but given that research is important to what we do as faculty, staff and students we need to do it and find a way to do it. Professor Rempel suggested the VPR should report at Senate and given the joint mandate of the university all our work is divided up and should be presented at Senate.

Dean Kitchen asked Dr. Libben to define what was meant by research intensive, how it relates to faculties and international, is it engaging in research, or research output in the highest quality. The 40-40-20 rule was mentioned regarding how some people apply it appropriately while others do not. Defining what these areas mean and what is research intensive should be determined.

Dr. Libben responded to the questions stating that the 40-40-20 rule is the beginning and that it is about whether new ground is being broken. For a culture of research leadership to flourish we need to ask ourselves; are you publishing just to get published or are you making a difference in your publishing. The expectations are going to be different for everyone. Dean Kitchen felt there has to be a mechanism where these individuals can be addressed when they are not producing at all. Professor McCarthy reminded everyone that we are a unionized workforce. Any changes need to have community engagement instead of telling people what we want them to do. Concern was expressed about framing the questions properly.

Professor Mandigo referenced a 2011-12 government report stating we should not count on receiving Tri-Council funding alone to change the research landscape. He believes that ORS has traditionally been conditioned to find Tri-council funding and inquired what Dr. Libben's vision was for accessing funds outside of Tri-Council funding. Dr. Libben responded that even though the Tri-Council is under increasing pressure we still need this funding source, but it will never be enough so we also need to locate other sources of funding through industry partnership and other government funding in the form of contracts. John Wilson the Director of Business Development & Commercialization was hired for this purpose and is involved in innovation, applied research, finding new funding opportunities and partnerships. The Office of Research Services is still looking to hire a Government Relations person which will also assist in locating additional funding sources. While we did conduct interviews it

was felt that the right person has not been found. This is something that still needs to be worked out.

Professor Renzetti said there are action items for the committee on the table to make note of and asked what the committee sees as the highest priority this year. He suggested that metrics of research success was contingent on the collective agreement. Second notable was Dr. Knuttila's suggestion whether the VPR should be asked to address Senate independently. Since Brock is growing this matter may need to be addressed. He wants to see if there is motion at the next meeting regarding the establishment of graduate faculty membership.

ACTION Professor Mandigo to talk to Mr. Mike Farrell, University Secretariat about the logistics of the Vice-President Research providing a report at Senate

Also mentioned was the promotion of a culture of research formal mentoring schemes, how can we assist faculty who have not published much. Dean Kitchen suggested the committee follow up on this matter as it is a serious one.

Dr Libben wants to create a platform as interactive as possible, so to facilitate this he will submit and present an advance report of the VPR to send with agendas and minutes to the committee prior to meetings.

Discussions during the first meeting raised several issues that could potentially be solved by the establishment of a Graduate Faculty. We were informed by Dean Plyley that a motion to that effect had been taken to Senate last year but failed to pass by a small margin. We would like to encourage the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies to take a similar motion to Senate, noting the encouragement and support of our committee.

ACTION Professor McCarthy will discuss the matter with the chair of the Graduate Studies Committee to further see if we can exploit synergies in the mandates of the two committees where they overlap

5. Other Business

Professor Renzetti provided information for consideration of future actions; the external research implications regarding the paperwork which was sent through the Office of Research Services regarding the lack of consultation of the Office of Research Services. The letter that was sent to faculty members was not reviewed by the Research & Scholarship Policy Committee and is a matter that BUFA has expressed an opinion on. He suggested the committee may want to review this practice in the near future.

Second issue to consider is that centres and institutes be reviewed on a regular basis, which has not been done. Professor Renzetti reconfirmed the committees wish to begin this process. He suggested Ms. Maiden develop a catalogue and year when Centres and Institutes were established. He anticipates the committee may be quite busy in the coming year and expects more centres and institutes to come forward in the near future.

ACTION **Professor Renzetti requested Ms. Maiden develop a catalogue of existing Centres and Institutes; the year they were established and submit it to the committee for review at the October 18th meeting.**

Date of Next Meeting:

Tuesday, October 18th, 2011

Tuesday, November 29th, 2011

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

1. Adjournment

(Gabriel/Grove)

THAT the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 10:15am