

**MINUTES OF MEETING #4 (2009 - 2010) OF THE  
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE  
HELD ON MONDAY, MARCH 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010 AT 10:00AM - 12:00PM  
IN MC D350-L**

**PRESENT:** Professor Tamara El-Hoss (Chair), Professor Tansu Barker (Vice-Chair), Professor Sandra Bosacki, Dr. Ian Brindle, Dean Rick Cheel, Professor June Corman, Mr. Robert Eagle, Ms. Margaret Grove, Dr. Murray Knuttila, Professor Tom O'Neill, Dean Marilyn Rose, Professor Angus Smith, Ms. Judy Maiden (Recorder)

**REGRETS:** Ms. Tabasum Akseer, Professor Cheri Bradish, Mr. Ryan Klamot, Professor John Menzies, Professor Lynn Rempel (sabbatical), Professor John Sivell, Professor Vera Woloshyn

**GUESTS:** Pat Beard, Lori Walker

**Introductions / Welcome**

**1. Approval of Agenda**

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

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

**CARRIED**

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

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

**THAT** the minutes of the #3 (2009 - 2010) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2009 be approved as circulated.

**CARRIED**

**3. Update/Information**

a. Sub-Committee reports from Chairs

i. TREMP

(Corman)

The group met twice and identified several issues. Faculty are concerned about liability issues when travelling with their students or research assistants; travelling alone or for conferences or research. The main concern is the way the draft was written is that it took away their flexibility in travelling. Travel should be negotiated. The sub-committee did not want a redrafting of the report. Dr. Brindle, Professor El-Hoss and Professor Corman met with a faculty member who had a student who could have gone to countries at risk. The potential graduate student has a large grant, but will reorganize her research if she comes to Brock and not undertake at risk travel at this point. Dr. Brindle seemed receptive to facilitating a resolution to the problems faculty and graduate student's encounter at the university when needing to travel. It was mentioned faculty at McMaster regularly travel to countries like Afghanistan. This issue is not resolved yet as it is still being deliberated with the 13<sup>th</sup> floor. Everyone wants to know who institutionally is responsible.

The deans are concerned that the current draft policy has them sign a form which gives them responsibility for what they cannot enforce. They cannot foresee all aspects of a faculty members' travel and are concerned. It was questioned about the liability of the Chair signing such a form and how a chair of a department can judge the liability. Also of concern is what the consequences would be if something went wrong. Professor El-Hoss was concerned whether the person reviewing the application would give it a fair hearing if they are not familiar with the travel being proposed. Whether the policy goes on the negotiating table is to be seen.

ii. Budget

(O'Neill)

A new version of the BRAM was posted in January, but the only difference noted was in the budget numbers. Enquiry was made to whether the VPR is to sit on this committee or someone from the Office of Research Services.

iii. Centres, Institutes, Units and Schools

(Smith)

Numerous meetings were held during the search for clarity of definitions. The President of BUFA, Vice-President, Academic and the Vice-President, Research were consulted and have provided input.

The sub-committee presented a report to the committee for discussion on proposed definitions of institutes, centres, units and schools. The definitions are now being reviewed and policies will be looked at regarding the above in the future. There are currently separate definitions in the FHB for 'academic' centres and institutes as opposed to 'research' centres and institutes. This is felt to be causing confusion, so to clarify this problem single definitions of each of the above terms are being proposed.

'Academic' institutes are administered by a Director and an advisory committee, and report to a designated Dean or the Vice-President, Academic. The difference in 'academic' centres is that they do not report to the Vice-President, Academic. With the addition of a Vice-President Research since the previous definitions were drafted, it was felt institutes should now report to the VPR and centres continue to report to a designated Dean. Proposed redefinitions include; institutes and centres as respectively disciplinary or cross disciplinary collectives/units with a defined research mission. The difference is that an institute would have faculty, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, librarians and other researchers who share a particular research focus of strategic importance to the university and a centre offers one or more programs of study, and is comprised of faculty who share teaching interests and conduct research related to the Centre's focus.

The use and significance of the title 'director' was questioned. It was suggested a director of a research institute should be an academic or member of BUFA or an academic in administration and the word 'academic' should be in front of the title of director. The use of the word Director for the Niagara Community Observatory (NCO) was questioned. In the collective agreement the title means a certain amount of course release and top-up are to be provided. Also suggested was that the 'advisory committee' be replaced with 'program committee'. A program committee

should consist of faculty members and librarians, not administrative positions. It was felt to be uncomfortable having a staff person as head of a research institute conducting academic research. It was thought anything degree granting should have academics on it. This was agreed to be very important that the title 'director' be clearly defined as we try to distinguish between units that offer programs and units that are primarily research entities.

In the discussion with BUFA, Professor Smith struggled with the terms academic, director and advisory committee. It was felt some of these positions can be faculty members, but non-BUFA members should not be appointed when in academic positions.

In the current and proposed redefinition, a unit is a faculty-based collective of faculty, scholars, librarians, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students and other researchers created to explore research issues of importance to the collective/unit's focus. Unit's are currently approved at a departmental level and managed within the department. They are at a different level than institutes. It was proposed faculty are associated with units but are not directly appointed to them and that the research unit be managed by an advisory committee and report to a Faculty Dean.

In the FHB there is currently no definition for 'school'. It was felt the term 'school' needs to be clearly defined. Schools are extra-Faculty in nature and what this means needs to be clearly understood. A few members thought distinguishing schools from faculties should be looked at first and then institutes being the most prominent, then centres and units to figure out definitions. It was suggested certain areas of the university were interested in having schools. An Indigenous School was mentioned. It may be difficult to get approval for schools. There does not seem to be much difference in schools and centres. It was questioned whether any centre would become a school if they had different faculty in it.

Conversation ensued and the following was noted; there are institutes in some faculties that report to the dean of the faculty, not the VPA or VPR. Many of the institutes do not fit the definitions nor do all existing centres or units. The Humanities Research Institute reports to the Dean of Humanities. It was questioned if some entities should be required to change their names. In the old definitions the reporting line was to the Dean or Vice-President Academic. Annual reporting or more occasional reporting should be considered. It is defined in the policy who makes up the board of advisory committees. The policy should be looked at to determine how these committees should look.

Professor Barker expressed concern with the hierarchal matrix we are forming. He questioned whether the Vice-President, Research is seen as a line or staff position and felt that if an academic reports to the VPR it becomes less of a staff than academic position. Department chairs report to deans, deans to the Vice-President, Academic. Professor Smith thought the matrix makes more sense now with the addition of the VPR at the university.

General consensus is that some of the existing names should be changed and/or be grandfathered. The terms institute, centre, unit and school all have different connotations associated with them. Some are thought to have more pizzazz than others.

It was asked who would be responsible for the pot of funds associated with the different entities and if there will be money allotted to VPR accounts if he is to oversee them. In order to ensure proper accounting of finances and accountability for research grants are secured someone needs to be responsible for these complexities.

The sub-committee would like to add new members since they recently lost one.

#### Intellectual Property

(El-Hoss)

In January, Professors El-Hoss, O'Neill, Bosacki and Ms. Maureen Murphy met with Dr. Vasseur. They want to come up with an all inclusive policy. There are currently two policies; the one in the Collective Agreement cannot be touched. The IP Policy in the Faculty Handbook can be amended and would become a living document. The hope is that the policy in the Faculty Handbook can be made into an all inclusive policy which would also cover graduate students.

#### b. Discussion of REB (Research Ethics Board) Annual Report (Committee)

Ms. Walker took questions from the committee. It was noted that as a board they are concerned that there is not expertise to look at biomedical research, so attached to the proposal is a second REB (REB2). The board wants to get the expertise in place because there is one professor who has all his applications sent for external review and this holds up his applications. Unfortunately the current REB members do not have the expertise to conduct a review of these applications. This is viewed as a problem. Originally the former VPR denied a second REB because of financial costs and lack of volume, but there are already people willing to sit on this board if it goes forward.

A new advanced research administration system is expected to be purchased in 2009-2010 which could phase out the current REB administrative assistant position. Whether or not the office moves forward in staff training and workload distribution, due to the online system, will need to be considered.

The revised Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS) is a new and living document. This will mean quite a bit of policy change at Brock. Once a final version of this document has been accepted by the three granting agencies, the REB and the Ethics Office will work to bring Brock policies and REB practice in line with the new guidelines and work to educate the Brock community. Changes will be required in the faculty handbook and to the REB Guidelines. Ms. Walker inquired whether these changes will need to come to this committee or not.

Dean Rose inquired about what the financial implications of two REB's would be and what would happen if graduate students applications do not move through the system quickly enough. She expressed concern that the university could be held responsible for additional funding and wondered if work were redistributed would they still need the same funding.

Professor Barker felt the cost involved in not securing a second REB does not seem to be justified since ethical principles need to be applied quickly and questioned if there is a

requirement that a university should look at ethics separately. Ms. Walker stated that departmental committees are not being proposed, but that they want to divide into two committees, REB1 and REB2. There could be a possible cost to ensure that the new Tri-Council policy statement is adhered to, and possibly someone more knowledgeable on biomedical issues and someone with a law oriented background would be required.

**ACTION** Ms. Maiden will contact Ms. Walker to provide the date of the next Senate meeting

**ACTION** Ms. Maiden will let the University Secretariat Office know that Ms. Walker, Professors Michelle McGinn and Linda Rose-Krasnor may plan to attend the Senate meeting to answer any questions that arise regarding the 2008-2009 REB Annual Report

**ACTION** Professor El-Hoss will submit a report to Senate for information only that after much discussion it was agreed that the committee supports in principle the establishment of two Research Ethics Boards (REB1 and REB2) as suggested in the REB 2008-2009 Annual report.

c. Policy on Surveys

(Knuttilla/Beard)

Professor El-Hoss asked if a department wishes to survey their students whether they would have to fill out the Request for Approval of the Survey Management Committee form. Dr. Knuttilla answered yes because it was noted that they are not only your students but other peoples' students as well. There is a high profile of surveys and survey fatigue could result in diminishing rates. It was noted there is not enough control on surveys, so this will ensure that all surveys would have to go through the policy.

**ACTION** Professor El-Hoss will submit a report to Senate for information only that the committee reviewed the Policy on Surveys, has no objections and did not recommend any amendments to the policy.

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

(Brindle)

Reorganization is currently taking place in the Research Office. Dr. Brindle hopes to report in more detail at the next meeting. He mentioned the name Brock Research will convert back to the Office of Research Services (ORS) so that the word service will be in the name again because it is felt to be important that it is widely known that the office provides 'service'.

The NSERC results look good with a 55% overall average and a high level of 60% success rate which is good for Brock.

Dr. Brindle spoke with Chad Gaffield, president of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and Suzanne Fortier, president of Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) regarding health matters being funded by SSHRC.

Group discussion ensued.

A way has been found around the issue of travel and field safety for faculty members going abroad in countries on a DFAIT watch.

**5. Other Business**

Dates of Next Meetings:

Wednesday, May 12, 2010 at 11:00am - 12:30pm

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

**6. Adjournment**

(Barker /Smith)

**THAT** the meeting be adjourned.

**CARRIED**

The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm