

**MINUTES OF MEETING #2 (2012 - 2013) OF THE  
RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER, 26th, 2012 AT 1:00PM - 2:30PM  
IN MC D350-L**

**PRESENT:** Professor Steven Renzetti (Chair), Professor Kelly Lockwood (Vice-Chair), Professor Sandra Bosacki, Professor Patricia Debly, Ms. Margaret Grove, Professor Hemantha Herath, Professor Kevin Kee, Ms. Carrie Kelly, Dr. Gary Libben, Ms. Linda Lowry, Professor James Mandigo, Professor Dragos Simandan, Mr. Christopher Yendt, Ms. Judith Maiden (Recorder)

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:** Dr. Ian Brindle

**REGRETS:** Interim Dean Don Cyr, Professor Babak Farzad, Mr. Kiel Omerod, Dean Michael Plyley

**Introductions / Welcome**

Professor Renzetti welcomed members and introduced Dr. Brindle indicating he was attending on behalf of Dr. Libben who was not able to attend. He called the meeting to order.

**1. Approval of Agenda**

**MOVED** (Kee/Herath)

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

**CARRIED**

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

**MOVED** (Grove/ Lockwood)

**THAT** the time the previous meeting ended be amended from 2:30am to 2:30pm.

**THAT** under 'Centres/Institute Reviews Fall Start' reference to the policy guidelines be amended from FHB III: 3.25 to FHB III: 25.5.

**THAT** the minutes of the #1 (2012 - 2013) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2012 be approved with the above amendments.

**CARRIED**

**3. Business Arising from Minutes**

- a. Process and Criteria for Institute/Centre Review

The committee had previously received the Academic Review Committee (ARC) self-study documents for consideration. Professor Renzetti commented that upon reviewing the ARC documents he did not find them relevant to the review process planned for the

Research Centres/Institutes. He reminded the committee that the FHB III: 25.5 required three things in an application for renewal; 1) a request for renewal, 2) a self-study document, 3) copies of the annual reports from the Director of the Research Centre/Institute. He mentioned that the Faculty Handbook is silent on what criteria applications for renewal will be assessed. He provided the committee with a draft outline for a self-study document which is required under FHB III: 25.5. Discussion centred on how to assess whether the centres/institutes are doing what they say they are doing and what the committee wants to learn from them. A question was asked whether it is the mandate of the committee to actually do the review or to evaluate. Professor Renzetti replied the committee is responsible for conducting the reviews and making a recommendation to Senate.

Annual reports were discussed and it was questioned whether there was an automated system in place to input and track information and mentioned that it would be easier for the directors to submit and update these reports each year if it is in place. Professor Herath indicated that the Faculty of Business (FOB) faculty can update their CVs online on the FOB portal which is used for example, AACSB reporting etc. The annual reports are not done online. Gathering and using the information was discussed and the sensitivities associated with its use. Professor Renzetti asked that this item be flagged for Dr. Libben's attention to look into the matter.

Professor Mandigo suggested that since directors report to deans it may be good to include a decanal response. Professor Renzetti concurred that it would be a good idea to include a decanal response. Professor Renzetti indicated that this would be included in the request that is sent to directors.

Discussion ensued regarding operating budgets and whether to include or exclude these once the assessments begin. Professor Renzetti asked if this is necessary information to have and committee members concurred that the financial aspect is very important and it would be good to know what was done with the money received. Professor Mandigo said we need to recognize that each centre would have a different approach to this so it needs to be conceptualized to what the centre actually does. It was asked if the assessment can be conducted without this information even though it was recognized that it may be challenging to obtain. Professor Renzetti suggested another line be added between #4 and #5 in the draft outline for Self-study document requesting the most recent available annual budget. Ms. Lowry referenced the Appendix Proposed Format for the Self-Study in the FHB III: 25.6. 5e - Resource implications: potential outside funding and potential internal demands. How has the Research Centre/Institute managed to obtain the necessary resources to fulfil its mandate and mission? It was agreed this would be satisfactory to

request.

Professor Herath questioned whether the centres/institutes that have graduate programs would be separated from those who do not. Professor Renzetti responded that the graduate program within the Research Centres/Institute would be looked at and assessed within the scholarly activities.

Professor Mandigo asked if a centre hosts a program who would have responsibility and authority at a later date, whether it would be the Research & Scholarship Policy Committee or the Academic Review Committee. He agreed to follow up with ARC.

Professor Renzetti questioned the committee on how they would assess the documents once they have been received. He referenced the three recommendations that the committee could make: 1. that the term of the Research Centre/Institute be extended for an additional three to five years; or 2. that the term of the Research Centre/Institute be extended for an additional three to five years subject to modifications recommended by the Senate Research and Scholarship Policy Committee. 3. that the Research Centre/Institute should be disbanded, in which case the Senate Research and Scholarship Policy Committee shall refer the matter to the Dean (in the case of a Research Centre) or the Vice-President, Research (in the case of an Institute).

Professor Renzetti agreed to submit a report for the information of Senate outlining the timeline for reviews and that it will be communicated to the directors of the centres and institutes on how it will proceed.

b. Drop Box (Brock Box)

Ms. Maiden provided a brief report on the status of her inquiry to ITS for Brock Box. She stated that on September 6th she put in a request to ITS to set up a Brock Box for the committee and it was acknowledged, but by September 17th she had not heard back from ITS, so she followed up with another email. It was again acknowledged through email, but nothing was done until she called ITS and left a message on September 21st and on September 25th she was informed through email that someone from ITS would be in touch. As of the meeting, no further contact was received from ITS.

c. Two Centres from Faculty of Business

Professor Renzetti provided a brief update on the information he received from Interim Dean Don Cyr regarding the names of the two centres in the Faculty of Business. These will be added to the list of Centres/Institutes.

d. Brock Research Institute for Youth Studies (BRIYS)

Professor Renzetti referenced an email he received on September 6th from Professor Teena Willoughby the Director of the Brock Research Institute for Youth Studies indicating that the Brock Research Institute for Youth Studies (BRIYS) currently was subsumed under the Lifespan Development Research Centre after the LDRC received a CFI grant. Professor Willoughby asked that BRIYS be disbanded. The committee discussed this proposal and agreed to recommend to Senate it be disbanded as per the Director's recommendation.

Discussion ensued and it was questioned whether BRIYS had any positions attached to it. It was agreed that Professor Willoughby would be contacted and asked. Ms. Maiden was tasked with following up with Professor Willoughby.

**MOVED (Simandan/Lockwood)**

**THAT the Research & Scholarship Policy Committee recommends to Senate the Brock Research Institute for Youth Studies (BRIYS) be disbanded, not because of performance, but at the director's recommendation.**

**CARRIED**

**4. Reports from Sub-committees**

a. Formation of sub-committees

Professor Renzetti will look at what sub-committees to form this year and get back to the committee with his thoughts at the next meeting.

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

a. Intellectual Property Policy (Brindle)

Dr. Brindle reminded the committee the IP issue has been ongoing for four years and was last worked on by Ms. Maureen Murphy, former ORS Legal Advisor. The issue identified was that references to Intellectual Property are buried in several places in various documents and not all the wording is the same in each, so it is a difficult to deal with. For the last few months Dr. Brindle has worked to gather all documents that make mention of intellectual property. The major reference is found in the Agreement sections 38 and 39 for IP, and Copyright, in the Policy on Integrity in Research, which is attached as an appendix to the Agreement. Also documents in the Faculty of Graduate Studies

make mention of IP issues. Dr. Brindle has captured most places where IP is referenced and plans to pull together an all-inclusive document to present to the committee a policy that could be applied to all places with the language normalized in all areas.

In discussions he has had with a variety of people he discovered that in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge IP does not reside with individual faculty members, but that the university holds the IP. Cambridge came to this decision only 4 or 5 years ago. Dr. Brindle said he was not saying Brock should do this but universities have radically different ways that they treat IP. Dr. Brindle agreed to circulate to the committee the documents he has discovered to ensure members are aware of the variations in language. The timeline for Dr. Brindle to accomplish this task is before the end of December.

## 6. Other Business

Professor Renzetti reminded the committee that Dr. Libben wanted the input of the committee for discussion of the Strategic Research Plan (SRP). He suggested the October 10<sup>th</sup> meeting be devoted to this discussion. Dr. Libben will be asked to circulate documents on the Strategic Research Plan to the committee prior to the next meeting.

Dr. Libben will also be asked to provide an update on the two Associate Vice-President Research positions at the next meeting.

Professor Renzetti agreed to update the list of Research Centres/Institutes and send the review schedule to Senate for their information only. The directors of the Research Centres/Institutes who are first on the list will be contacted to let them know what is expected of them regarding the process. The process for review will be followed as set out in the FHB 25.5 Review and Renewal and FHB III: 25. 6 Appendix - Proposed Format for the Self-Study.

Meeting Dates:

Wednesday, October 10th

Wednesday, November 14th

Wednesday, December 5th

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

The meeting adjourned at 2:10pm.