

**MINUTES OF MEETING #2 (2009 - 2010) OF THE
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 11th, 2009 AT 4:00PM - 5:30PM
IN MC D350-L**

PRESENT: Professor Tamara El-Hoss (Chair), Professor Tansu Barker (Vice-Chair), Professor Sandra Bosacki, Professor June Corman, Mr. Robert Eagle, Dr. Murray Knuttila, Professor John Menzies, Professor Lynn Rempel, Dean Marilyn Rose, Ms. Judy Maiden (Recorder)

REGRETS: Professor Cheri Bradish, Dean Ian Brindle, Ms. Margaret Grove, Mr. Ryan Klamot, Professor Tom O'Neill, Professor John Sivell, Professor Angus Smith, Dr. Liette Vasseur, Professor Vera Woloshyn

Introductions / Welcome

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED (Corman/ Barker)

THAT the agenda be accepted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

MOVED (Corman/Bosacki)

THAT the minutes of the #1 (2008 - 2009) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on September 30th, 2009 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. Business Arising

- a. Postdoctoral Fellowship Policy (Rose)

Dean Rose spoke briefly of the discussion at the Canadian Association for Graduate Studies on this issue, and indicated she would prepare a fuller report for the next meeting.

ACTION Mr. Eagle will gather information on who our Postdoctoral Fellows are; what faculty they are associated with; and the type of postdocs we are attracting.

ACTION Dean Rose will present her report at the December meeting.

b. Sub-Committee reports from Chairs

1. TREMP (Corman)

The sub-committee has not received the new policy, but once received it will be reviewed and comments will be submitted to Greg Finn.

2. Budget (Barker)

Two main priorities were discussed; the impact of the proposed Brock Resource Allocation Model (BRAM) model on research and the university infrastructure; and the need for the university to develop in regard to its use of soft money and the impact it may have on Brock Research in the future.

The larger committee was asked for guidance, direction or endorsement on whether these issues should be analyzed further. It was suggested the Brock Research budget be looked at to determine if there is enough money to do what is necessary regarding research, ethics, etc. This could be valuable to the office in order to see where the money should be spent.

Mr. Eagle felt the proposed BRAM could have a profound effect on what Brock Research offers to faculty as soft money, indirect costs is used to fund staff positions. The Indirect Costs Program is currently under review and it may be scrapped which could greatly impact the university. It was asked how the university is prepared to support research so we can grow into the aspirations of 2014.

These issues will be examined this year and have the full support of the committee.

3. Centres and Institutes (Rose)

The committee met on October 28th and looked at the 2002 policy which established the definitions and guidelines for approval and review. The policy was to be reviewed in 2007, but was never reviewed. It was discovered that existing units, centres and institutes have not been subjected to the review process, there is not a comprehensive list of centres and institutes and the current ones do not always adhere to the policy guidelines. The review process will also need to be looked at this year. The committees' priority will be to review and suggest changes to the 2002 policy before a review of existing centres and institutes can take place.

It was suggested that when new entities are established they should be considered probationary and reviewed by the end of the first year. Schools will need to be added to the list as well. It was determined the mandate is to look at definitions of centres, institutes, units and schools and wondered if they should be less hierarchically rigid. How to define these entities and work through the nomenclature was questioned. Titles are very important and each should be

reserved for those that do certain work and will need to be defined in order to move forward and not get stuck on what has been done in the past. Institute is deemed very important and should be reserved for institutes that do work with a level of research and conductivity for the larger world. The names of the entities in existence on campus today will need to be looked at.

As new entities continue to develop on campus, this issue will need to be resolved. It was mentioned there is a document which was presented to Governance outlining protocols for review which could be looked at. It was mentioned that Governance had decided to pass this issue on for this committee to resolve.

4. Intellectual Property

(El-Hoss)

Met once and the job ahead is great. The goal is to have one Intellectual Property policy on the website which needs to be in-line with the Tri-Council policy, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada and the Government of Canada guidelines. Intellectual Property is part of the Collective Agreement as an annex, it was mentioned if it could be removed and added as a procedure. It was noted that whenever there is a change to the Collective Agreement BUFA members needed to vote and approve the change. A single document has to be created. The Collective Agreement is blocked for 3 years, so if other organizations decide to change the policy we would not be able to change our own policy until the end of the term of the Collective Agreement, but we have to adhere to the guidelines; we must also have a single document that applies to everyone. It is hoped that by next term there will be one document for everyone including Graduate Students and Post Docs.

When Graduate Students are involved with Intellectual Property there needs to be some sort of an agreement signed to protect the graduate students and the university. There needs to be a process involved in order to ensure there are forms signed.

ACTION Sub-committee to look at the document to ensure the university and graduate students are protected.

4. Updates and Information Items

None

5. Other Business

Brock Research application approval form

Mr. Eagle mentioned it is not an approval form, but it needs to be assigned a name. The purpose of the form is to summarize certain components of the research undertaken including the commitment of the person signing, the Chair and Dean. This form is a checklist to engage the three parties to help them to determine implications and

requirements such as; budget, space, equipment, special facilities, compliance, ethics, renovations, location, number of personnel, training or certificates. Obligations need to be adhered to and understood by all the parties involved. We need to be sure people are protected when travelling and to ensure faculty, staff, students and visitors are protected when working on campus.

It was questioned whether the form complies with the university policy and other external policies. The wording needs to be reconsidered. The Vice-President Research can reject signing the form if proper guidelines are not followed or in order to protect the university from liability because all the legalities need to be covered.

It was stated that the need to know and the right to approve are not the same thing and academic freedom is not mentioned. It was mentioned that people are not pleased with the form. Intellectual Property issues should be addressed before hand.

ACTION Mr. Eagle re-examine the form, revise it and send it to the six faculties to review and will bring it back to the committee.

It is felt this is information which does not need Senate approval

6. Date of Next Meeting:

Wednesday, December 16th, 2009 from 3:00pm – 4:30pm

Above meeting to be held in the Brock Research/Graduate Studies Boardroom
(MC D350-L)

7. Adjournment

(Barker/Corman)

THAT the meeting be adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30pm

CARRIED