

**MINUTES OF MEETING #6 (2008 - 2009) OF THE  
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 6<sup>th</sup>, 2009 AT 1:30PM - 3:00PM  
IN MC D350-L**

**PRESENT:** Professor Angus Smith, (Acting Chair), Ms. Melissa Barnard, Professor Sandra Bosacki, Mr. Robert Eagle, Professor Tom O'Neill, Professor Bulent Menguc, Professor Lynn Rempel, Dean Marilyn Rose, Professor Matthew Royal, Professor John Sivell, Dr. Liette Vasseur, Ms. Judy Maiden (Recorder)

**REGRETS:** Dr. Terry Boak, Dean Ian Brindle, Professor Tamara El-Hoss (Vice-Chair), Ms. Margaret Grove, Mr. Hassan Khalid, Professor Gary Pickering (Chair), Professor Tim O'Connell

**GUEST:** Ms. Valerie Wolfe

**Introductions / Welcome**

**1. Approval of Agenda**

**MOVED** (Rose/Menguc)

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

**CARRIED**

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

**MOVED** (O'Neill/Menguc)

**THAT** the minutes of the #5 (2008 - 2009) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on March 11, 2009 be approved as circulated.

**CARRIED**

**3. Business Arising**

**i. Follow up on the Travel and Field Safety Policy (Val Wolfe)**

Why a Travel and Field Safety Policy is needed is explained in the Faculty Handbook III 24.2. The current policy applies to 'field based research' activities. The existing policy is not being used and this is a concern. From a risk

management perspective, in regard to risk identification and assessment, we need to approach this with some consistency across campus. It is necessary to think ahead by planning in advance of any trip, so a Trip Risk and Emergency Management Plan (TREMP) was developed. The TREMP is not yet form fillable, but soon will be. There are nine items covered to consider all potential and real hazards related to planned activities. This document must be completed and approved prior to departure. After it is filled out and signed it will go to the Travel and Field Safety Review Committee (TFSRC). This committee will be composed of a minimum of eight members; Chair, Vice-Chair, three faculty representatives with a range of expertise in Travel and Field Safety, an individual with expertise in risk management, two representatives from Student Services and an institutional resource person from HR/EHS.

The policy is in draft now and there is an approval and post-trip review piece in it. Something needed to be put in place which people will use and that will not be onerous to use. The purpose of the policy is to achieve the goals of organizing and delivering healthy, safe, productive, stimulating and educational field experiences; minimizing harm or loss by trying to manage our risks; meeting the university's obligations (legal and moral); plus protection of the environment; increasing the level of awareness and respect for safety issues; exercising consistent and reasonable due diligence in identifying and managing the risks inherent in travel related activities.

To identify risk assessment for planning and preparation, there are five areas to ensure people are kept safe; security, transportation, accommodations, food, communication/emergency response. The level of risk has to be identified as low, higher or unmanageable. Both low and higher risk can be considered manageable. Low risk is no hazards greater than coming to work each day. An activity can be deemed to be of higher risk if it has a potential to expose participants to hazards greater than those encountered in everyday life. Unmanageable risks would include travel to war zones or areas with high medical risks, and activities with high risks of natural disasters. Human Resources may need to figure out ways to make a trip manageable, but an independent body would figure out what will make it manageable.

Human Resources offers planning and support with monthly or bi-monthly training in First Aid/CPR, WHMIS, Field Safety, Science Safety Seminars, WAFA/WFER – annually which is better than ordinary first aid and could be advised on what training to offer. HR may contribute matching funds for specialized training.

The scope of the Travel and Field Safety Policy covers field research, off-campus activities, non-credit program components; eg. IELP, course practica, concerts etc, travel for all, participation in extracurricular events.

Concerns expressed are as follows; there were serious questions about the process for choosing committee members and what powers this committee will have; the timing of the committee meetings with the timing of trips, form and signatures; the need to have six signatures each time is not plausible; could have delays and may be controversial; why should anyone know what someone is doing as we are trying to safeguard ourselves and this is violating personal information; personal information that will be provided to the committee; who is responsible to say if a trip is safe enough or not; and what if there are conflicting views on the committee; will there be an opportunity to appeal prior to a decision being made in case there are any problems; can a presentation be made by having the individual come before the committee to present their thoughts on the trip; who would be responsible for lost money if a trip is not approved and money has already been spent; where does it go from the TFSRC committee; how to know when to complete a form and when to have it authorized; need to have assurance that people from each faculty are represented on the committee. Also noted, the Research Ethics Board (REB) is mandated for protection of human subjects and the TFSRC should not be compared to the REB. The protection of the university remains on the administration side.

Dean Rose asked if a trip which is usually made could be filed. It was felt care should be exercised to not be too extreme, but maybe a blanket form could be used for usual trips. The essence of it is for the trip planner to convey the trip in a consistent way to show how the trip is organized.

It was noted that once the form is filled in, signed by the Principal Investigator/Responsible Authority and the Chair/Director sign and it passes to the Dean or the AVP or VP, enough people would have seen it to be clear of the level of risk. It should be kept confidential and sent for peer review, not just have it buried with administration. HR will sign after the department signs and the last signature will be Chair of the Travel and Field Safety Committee.

Ms. Wolfe felt the ultimate appeal would go to the new Vice-President Academic. She had originally hoped to have this policy approved by Senate at the May meeting and to have it implemented by July 1<sup>st</sup>, but it will probably have to go to Senate in the fall and be approved by January 1<sup>st</sup>.

A reason given for having the policy is to get the individual trip planner to consider all this information a tool for consistent organization for trip preparation. It has been found useful not as detailed and comprehensive as it could be, but the idea is to introduce the main risk factors and to have these considered prior to undertaking any trips.

It was asked how international destinations would be categorized. Examples given were Buffalo or Norway? There could be different procedures for each incident in order to look after the individual. It was felt there are different and varied risks for each area of the world, as an example, Israel has different risks and it was asked

why a committee should be formed. One member is strongly opposed to this idea and felt information is private and should only be open to the Chair and Dean.

Dr. Vasseur felt there is a need to be careful and the risk is not the same here as in international work and believes it important to respect the Canadian laws when we are abroad as we are obliged to those laws and this should be a part of this document – respect of other laws as well as our own laws. One duty of the risk office is to inform the risk level of the country being visited, but despite all warnings from various sources it should be up to the individual faculty member what they chose to do. Dean Rose said risk management and what the university is liable for and to have to sign off on it becomes more elaborate. It should be simple and streamlined to allow for individual differences you may not need a peer review committee at all at this point as you have a right to go where you wish as long as you do it on your own, but you would need to be covered for liability if you get sick when away.

There has to be something to allow the university to manage the risks they have and to keep them at a reasonable level. The university needs to get something like this policy in place despite the complexity. It was felt we do not need to reinvent the policy. It was mentioned that BUFA has strongly pushed for this committee.

#### **4. Reports from sub-committees**

##### **i Profile Raising**

**(Smith)**

Met on April 23<sup>rd</sup> and Mr. Eagle attended and updated the committee on the new name of the Office of Research Services to Brock Research. It was mentioned that the new Research Communications Officer Carolyn Mullin be invited to the next sub-committee meeting. Having this new position will help to improve profile raising. A new weekly e-bulletin - Brock Research Opportunities is being sent to a select group of people across campus such as; Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, Centre Directors, and mostly people responsible for research, but it will be sent to a broader audience eventually. There will be meetings to raise the research profile and one member from this sub-committee will be invited to attend. There are four new positions to fill in the Brock Research Office and when the new positions are filled the Grants Facilitators will be called Research Officers (RO) and the structure in grant facilitating will change. The Research Officers will have a different role than the Grant Facilitators. Their responsibility will go from pre-proposal to post-proposal and each officer will be responsible for each of the faculties. These RO's will be invited to the brainstorming meeting.

The Faculty of Graduate Studies is moving forward with CTLET to develop graduate professional skills workshops. The GSA will be involved as well. More feedback on the seminars would be helpful. Dean Rose will report to the Profile Raising Committee.

**ii Policies and Procedures**

**(Brindle)**

Met once and the second meeting was cancelled. Have talked about trying to rationalize and make the Intellectual Property policy more current. They are still at the information gathering stage. Dr. Vasseur mentioned the Natural Science Engineering Research Council (NSERC) changed their Intellectual Property Policy last week so this could change what we have to do to match it.

**iii Finance**

**(Menguc)**

No report

**5. Updates and Information Items**

On May 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> the OCE Discovery 2009 event is taking place in Toronto. Brock is sending a delegation to represent Brocks' research interests. There will be displays for CCOVI, Digital Humanities, Applied Health Sciences and the New Science Building. Eight or nine individuals along with eight graduate students will attend. This will be an opportunity to talk about the new Brock and the research intents of Brock. The people who attend are often investors who are interested in these opportunities. This event provides another way to think of how to use your education because it profiles innovation and technology and covers many subjects and disciplines.

The Science and Technology Innovation Council released a report saying Canada is doing well in research but bad in commercialization, which can mean transfer of knowledge and best practice for certain industries. It is not just patents and things that can help the prosperity of Canada. Dr. Vasseur is part of the Commercialization Committee at OCUR and they are working with Minister Gary Goodyear's office in Ottawa.

NSERC and SSHRC results came in and Brock did well. For SSHRC general research awards (SRG), we received 19 of 74 for a success rate of 25% which means a total amount over \$2 million. There is some concern over the approval rate for NSERC Discovery Grants as only 16 of 30 applications were awarded and the national average is 65 %. Our rate is 53.3% to the national average. For Brock, the other problem was there are a number of one year awards because NSERC was not totally satisfied with the applications submitted. Normally an award is for five years and some people received only one year.

Of the 19 awarded for SSHRC, there were 26 others who received 4A status. Brock Research recently held a SSHRC workshop to begin to work with these people earlier and prior to their next application. A representative from CIHR was on campus last week to provide a workshop to interested faculty members. It was stressed the quality of applications is important and we need to ensure the applications are complete before they are sent in.

Professor McCleary mentioned an event which was to take place for a knowledge exchange institute for Ph.D students and nurse participants across Canada.

**6. Other Business**

Date of Next Meeting:

**Wednesday, June 3<sup>rd</sup> - 1:30pm – 3:00pm**

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

**7. Adjournment** (O'Neill/Barnard)

**THAT** the meeting be adjourned.

**CARRIED**

The meeting adjourned at 2:57pm