

**MINUTES OF MEETING #5 (2011 - 2012) OF THE  
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE  
HELD ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY, 27th, 2011 AT 9:00AM - 10:30AM  
IN MC D350-L**

**PRESENT:** Professor Steven Renzetti (Chair), Professor Francine McCarthy (Vice-Chair), Professor Kimberly Cote, Interim Dean Don Cyr, Professor David Gabriel, Ms. Margaret Grove, Dr. Gary Libben, Professor Diane Miller, Dean Michael Plyley, Professor Lynn Rempel, Professor Elizabeth Vlossak, Ms. Judith Maiden (Recorder)

**REGRETS:** Mr. Daniel Anti-Amoa, Professor James Mandigo, Professor Jennifer Rowsell, Professor Dragos Simandan, Mr. Chris Ventura

**Introductions / Welcome**

**1. Approval of Agenda**

**MOVED** (Plyley/Rempel)

**THAT** the agenda be accepted as circulated.

**CARRIED**

**2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**MOVED** ( / )

Additional wording is to be added to the minutes pertaining to Professor McCarthy's comments during the January meeting regarding a revised timelines and signatures memo. Ms. Maiden will send Professor McCarthy the draft signature part of the discussion.

**THAT** the minutes of the #4 (2011 - 2012) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012 be approved with the above addition.

**CARRIED**

**3. Business Arising from Minutes**

Professor Renzetti brought the committees' attention to the awards for Distinguished Research and Creative Activity and Chancellor's Chair for Research Excellence. He noted that in the terms of reference for the committee, FHB 9:12.1 d) recommends the recipient of the annual Award for Distinguished Research and Creative Activity to the Vice-President Academic and Provost; He stated he will follow up on the process with Dr. Libben.

Professor Renzetti noted the name change for the Centre for Bone and Muscle Health was passed by Senate without issue.

He also noted that Professor Susan Sydor gave each committee a book entitled: *Taking Stock: Research on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. He wanted it noted that this resource is available for review.

Professor Renzetti met with Dr. Libben regarding the pillars competition and was pleased with the meeting outcome. He questioned whether there would be time to review full applications before submitting. He noted if the applications are new they will need to come to this committee, but if already existing they will not have to come to us.

Dr. Libben expects to see something soon regarding the timelines memo issue. He stated the roles and responsibilities will be clarified. He recognizes that department chairs may not wish to sign and that this is an issue across the university. He has separated out the memo and signature page. Timelines were also separated out. This issue has to be resolved before the fall season.

Professor Renzetti mentioned he had not heard back from Ms. Lori Walker in regard to the issue with the wording 'auspices' in the FHB 8.

- a. Composition of a committee to review the University's Intellectual Property Policy

Dr. John Wilson, in the Office of Research Services has taken the lead on this issue. Professor Renzetti inquired if anyone was willing to volunteer to sit on the IP committee and stated he would do what he could to ensure the volunteer was not overburdened by the duties. He asked that anyone who is interested contact him. Dean Plyley mentioned that faculty members are not the only ones interested in Intellectual Property, but that graduate student rights need to be addressed as well and that there should be a graduate student on the committee and an associate dean graduate studies.

It was agreed by the committee.

**MOVED (Plyley /McCarthy)**

**THAT the Research & Scholarship Policy Committee recommends to the Governance Committee that the committee investigating the Intellectual Property policy at Brock should include the Copyright Officer at Brock, a Graduate Student and an Associate Dean Graduate Studies**

**CARRIED**

Ms. Maiden will remind Professor Renzetti to communicate the above to the Governance Committee prior to the next Senate committee meeting.

b. Template for Review of Institutes and Centres

Professor Renzetti referred the committee to the draft template which was circulated prior to the meeting. Dean Plyley suggested the self-study document could be styled after the ARC requirements. Discussion ensued around this point and the length of the term of extension for the Research Centre/Institutes. Professor Renzetti agreed to revise point number one accordingly, add contact details, draft a cover letter and circulate it to the committee for comments.

At the January 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, Professor Mandigo agreed to have the 'Centre for Healthy Development' serve as a 'guinea pig' for the review process. After the committee reviews the finalized version of the documents, the next step to initiate the review process will be to invite the Centre for Healthy Development to request a review under the terms of Faculty Handbook (section 25).

Professor Renzetti stated the following step will be to establish a schedule by drawing a draft timeline for 4 to 5 years into the future. He suggested that the reviews begin with the oldest Research Centres/Institutes to the newest, then it will need to be decided how many of these the committee will be able to review each term as they will be kept busy with the pillar applications.

Professor McCarthy requested point 1 of the review document be changed from 3 to 5 years to only 5 years. She felt the committee could review eight a year or one each meeting. Discussion ensued regarding the exact number of Research Centres and Institutes Brock has and that the review process could be longer if the directors are seeking course releases. Professor McCarthy will ask Ms. Greydanus to send the trimmed down ARC document as a template. Professor Renzetti agreed to separate out the terms - 3 to 5 years to an additional 5 years and an additional 3 to 5 years respectively.

**4. Reports from Sub-Committees**

None

**5. Report from Vice-President Research**

a. Template for Research Metrics

Dr. Libben gave an oral report and requested the committee discuss how to move forward to develop a framework for research metrics as he would like to make some progress in this regard. He stated that a simple way to develop a framework would be to look at how many research dollars we have, but we want a variety of research metrics that align with the strategic goals of the university. The question to ask is how and what to measure. We should provide faculties the opportunity to provide what is important to them. Dr. Libben asked if it would be possible to

develop a framework to propose to faculty and suggested two steps to do so. The first step would be to develop a list; the second step would be to determine research objectives. After this we could then develop a superset of metrics that will be customized to help faculties support their goals. Ms. Grove suggested some information may be available in annual reports. Dr. Libben noted that we do not have a mechanism to collect data from annual reports. To obtain the metrics themselves it would be useful if we had an electronic template for annual reports.

Professor McCarthy suggested the information is available through ARC. She agreed that when each unit does a self-study it is important to see what they are doing and what is important to them and suggested this is already being done and questioned why we are stressing over it. She also mentioned that if Dr. Libben tries to obtain this information, BUFA will most likely be in contact with him. Professor Renzetti mentioned that BUFA had already contacted him. It was noted, the goal is to see if we are moving towards our goals, and operational needs. This framework could be a vehicle to allow us to celebrate ourselves.

Dean Cyr suggested we use the aggregate data to convey how well we are moving towards our strategic goals and that it is important to be at an aggregate level, not a performance based level. Dr. Libben suggested it would be better if we have primary data and that possibly departmental level would be the appropriate level. He knows what we want to do, but is unsure of how to measure it. Dean Plyley said this needs to be a BUFA concern, so that they can be part of the process and that metrics are being collected at other institutions. He noted that we report at a low level in comparison. This is mostly on the research side, not the productivity side.

Professor Renzetti agreed the departmental level is the appropriate level for aggregation, but we need to let them know there are no resources associated with this process and that this is not part of a resources aggregation. The purpose needs to be made very clear. Web-based annual reports would be a good start in the right direction. It was suggested this idea be taken to the Associate Dean's to see if each faculty will agree to it. The Dean's Office can provide information, but we could not ask for it. Other areas will not help with this request as there would be uncertainty as to what the data will be used for. At the chair level depending on department rules, submissions are sent to the dean. We need to celebrate our research as it is not about finding out what areas are not as productive as others. Dr. Libben thought the big part is to be found in the annual report, but the big part is quality types of things, types of publications, impact on community, etc. We will need to find the means to get the numbers, but to also expand on these. This will do a lot for our research culture. The goal is to raise the process of the entire enterprise.

Professor Renzetti made two suggestions on how to move forward. The first; we need to look where it is best for this initiative to begin – at this committee – the disadvantage is we have no power or could it begin at an alternative decanal level group such as the Deans or Associate

Deans Research. We have the statutory to look at these matters. The second; is whether to create the framework, the grand work, or to do it incrementally. It has to be determined which is better to do first. He stated that the framework is better, but harder to do, but if done then you have the framework to move forward on.

Professor McCarthy stated the dean is the boss and the chairs are not. To do the work to help the deans is of value, but leaving this with the deans would be less contentious and she thinks leaving it with the deans is the best move. Dean Cyr stated the Faculty of Business collects data electronically and that their database helps them to generate data to use for various external agencies.

Professor Renzetti stated he would be happy to bring this matter to the Associate Deans Research meeting. Dean Pyley regularly meets with this group and indicated the next meeting is on March 19th, 2012 from 2:00 - 3:30 in MC D350-L.

Dr. Libben questioned the committee on what it is we are trying to find out and what do we actually want to know with respect to overall goals in respect to research. Professor Renzetti asked if the function of the committee is a passive one or are we the promoters of research to champion it and move forward the research agenda at Brock. Professor McCarthy suggested the advancement officers of each faculty be involved in this process as they actively promote what their faculty is doing. She also suggested the word 'metrics' should not be used in communications.

## **6. Other Business**

There was no time remaining in the meeting to discuss the President's Report to Senate 595 – January 18, 2012 on 'Whither Pedagogy'. This item will be held over to the next meeting. Ms. Maiden will add this item to the next agenda.

### **Meeting Dates:**

Monday, March 26, 2012

Monday, April 30, 2012

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:20am.