

**MINUTES OF MEETING #6 (2007 - 2008) OF THE
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE**

HELD ON MONDAY, APRIL 14th, 2008 AT 1:00PM - 2:30PM

IN MC D350-L

PRESENT: Dr. Nota Klentrou (Chair), Dr. Terry Boak, Dr. Sandra Bosacki, Dr. Ian Brindle, Ms. Frances Chandler, Dr. Patricia Debly, Dr. Tamara El-Hoss (Vice-Chair), Dr. Bulent Menguc, Dr. Joffre Mercier, Dr. Bozidar Mitrovic, Dr. Lynn Rempel, Dr. Marilyn Rose, Dr. Angus Smith, Dr. Barry Wright, Ms. Judy Maiden (Recorder)

REGRETS: Ms. Margaret Grove, Ms. Iva Matthews, Dr. Cheryl McCormick

Introductions / Welcome

(Nota Klentrou)

1. Approval of Agenda

Barry Wright suggested adding a discussion of whether the June 2nd meeting should be changed to a May date and to include it under 'Other Business'.

MOVED (El-Hoss/Brindle)

THAT the agenda be accepted with the addition of the above item.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

MOVED (Mercier/El-Hoss)

Clarification was requested on 3.3 section iii of the word "resent". It was accepted as is.

To be added to the March 3rd minutes - Dr. Lynn Rempel was present for this meeting.

THAT the minutes of the #5 (2007 - 2008) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on March 3rd, 2008 be approved with minor changes.

CARRIED

3. Business Arising

Sub-committee reports

3.1 Best Practices

(Sandra Bosacki)

The sub-committee met last week to be apprised of what was looked at in regard to the list of centers and institutes. The request for information on centres, institutes, and units came from Governance to the Office of Research Services (ORS). An individual in ORS reviewed information from a variety of university web sites, contacted individuals directly, prepared a chart and sent all gathered information to Governance so they can move forward on this information. This committee would like an update from Governance on the outcome of this search as they work on the list of institutes and centers and review the policies around centres and institutes in regard to implications on staffing (BUFA), budgets and policy development and reporting lines.

Sandra requested ideas for next years' sub-committee be sent to her prior to her departure to the next committee. It is still undetermined whether there is a need for a Best Practices Sub-Committee next year. If continued, a new committee direction and task may be to begin a new lecture series and this could be in collaboration with the External Recognition and Raising Our Profile Sub-Committee. It was mentioned that at another institution, researchers give a last lecture to share their story at retirement level and it was asked if this could be a possible "Best Practice". It was also suggested that upon receiving tenure a faculty member should give a lecture to the broader university community. Next sub-committee meeting will be held at the end of April.

In September there will be a review of the sub-committees and their tasks and it will be decided if there will be regroupings of the sub-committees for next year.

3.2 External Recognition/ Raising our Profile

(Nota Klentrou)

Nota is writing the committees' annual report to be submitted to Governance.

There are currently two Canada Research Chairs being sought. One position is in the Faculty of Business and the other is in the Faculty of Education. Dr. Ping Liang will submit an application to the Canada Research Chair Secretariat for the Mathematics & Sciences, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Canada Research Chair Tier II position.

3.3 Financial

(Barry Wright)

The sub-committee has not met since the end of the semester. Bulent Menguc has not received responses from any of the Deans in regard to the request for information regarding the survey. It has to be determined what questions should be asked in the new survey. The questionnaire will be sent out to each of the faculties by end of the month. Marilyn Rose has received no feedback at all talking to colleagues, but will continue to try to obtain information.

It was noted that Brock improved its NSERC success rate and it is currently at 65 %. There were a number of applications from people that were not approved because they were sent to the wrong council and poorly constructed. This needs to be addressed in the

future and sorted out, but overall, we have done quite well. It was mentioned that we need to move away from Tri-Council funding as there is less and less money available. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) numbers are currently at 17 to 18 % within the university. There were a quite a number of 4A's this year. At the University of Waterloo, they find money for 4A's to keep people going on the assumption they will come back and improve their success rates. People there are encouraged to work with Grant Facilitator's to increase their chances of obtaining funding. We will try to implement this same practice if we can find money to do so. We may need to consider only awarding 4A's who have received help. This year the number of applications submitted to SSHRC was up, but the approval rate was not. It was mentioned that the size of the pot stays the same, but more people seem to be chasing it. David Petis will be invited to meet with the committee to discuss this situation.

ACTION to invite David Petis to speak to the committee during the May meeting on funding of research at innovative sources and to add this item to the agenda for the next meeting.

We have the data to prove how beneficial it is for researchers who receive assistance from Grants Facilitators'. The percentage of successful applications increases with assistance. The Office of Research Services needs to broadcast this fact across campus to make people aware of it. It is felt that people should not be allowed to put in SSHRC or NSERC applications without seeing a Grants Facilitator for assistance, but we need to be sensitive to a lot of issues if this is required. Senior researchers should seek help from colleagues in their departments who can vet the applications and could strengthen them. From a reputational standpoint we are below the industry standard. We may need to send in fewer and stronger applications. A higher number of submitted proposals does not always guarantee greater success rate.

The applications have to be submitted earlier. The Dean and Vice President Research both have an opportunity to not sign off if they feel it is poorly written and chances to be successful are very low. It has to be determined at what point should they not sign off. The percentage success rate does register and it has an impact with the granting councils.

The peer review process, especially with SSHRC is becoming a problem. More people on campus need to become involved in this process in order to increase our visibility. Brock researchers should be sitting on peer review committees more often as they can learn from committee participation. These are best practices and these messages should be out and loud and clear.

The request for the intent to apply is submitted in August and is voluntary. ORS can get a feeling for who is applying, but may not always know how many are applying until the last minute.

There were three Brock applications that were awarded for the extra eleven million dollars from SSHRC for the Business Management and Finance component which was a Canada wide competition.

3.4 Policies and Procedures

- i. Intellectual Property Policy updates (Ian Brindle)

The sub-committee met to review the proposed document which will be structured between faculty and students and it is being worked on to craft a new version of it. There are several documents that are scattered throughout various areas of the university that need to be amalgamated.

ACTION Ian Brindle and Maureen Murphy to work on this document for the next meeting

4. **New Business**

- a. Update on the new organizational structure of the Office of Research Services (Ian Brindle)

The new model of the Office of Research Services (ORS) will have Intellectual Property as a bigger entity in the university. The office needs to be more recognized and utilized by faculty members. The proposal of a new organizational structure will recognize a number of functions that do more than we currently have. The structure is tentative, but the hope is the structure will have new offices which do not currently exist. In the organizational chart, there is a Business Development Strategic Initiatives Office which does not currently exist, but this is beginning to develop more throughout the university. A Project Management Office is needed as sizable research grants are being applied for by faculty. We now have multimillion dollar grants and it is becoming difficult for people to manage their grants when they are large in size. The Research Financial Officer now deals with this, but we need to ensure that projects are on time and deadlines met. The Office Manager position will manage a team of administrative assistants and will allocate work within the office. The search is to be renewed for the Executive Director position. There are few of these positions in place now.

The new Office Manager position has to be created as do the office administration positions. The Business Development Office has been established with Hitesh Jain and Maureen Murphy in place now. We have established the need for a Communication and Information Office. Other individuals employed in the department are on soft money for now and we are trying to find ways to obtain more funding for these as fulltime positions. The current complement of fulltime positions is at about six (6) but we need ten (10) positions to have the office function properly. The Associate Director position will change eventually, but it is not known how yet. When the chart was created the roles were looked at for what the needs are in the office, not as the current situation exists.

Ian Brindle visited George Dixon, Vice-President Research at the University of Waterloo last week. They have fifty (50) people in their office and seven (7) are financial people. They have had enormous successes.

- b. Institute for Transnational Studies in the Americas (ITSA)

(Nota Klentrou)

Jane Koustas from Brock University and Munroe Eagles from the University of Buffalo would like to establish the institute. Institute seems to be the right term for this entity because there are many collaborators involved. This proposal will eventually need to be taken to Senate after clarification has been obtained in regard to the following;

On page 10 of the proposal, it is mentioned that there are 50+ faculty members at the University of Buffalo and 50+ at Brock University. It is not clearly indicated if some or all of these people have agreed to participate in this institute. It has to be determined whether some or all will participate and the names of these people will have to be provided. It was mentioned that it would help the proposal if they can be more specific on the nature of the graduate students and how many will be involved as this information could be added to the proposal. It was stated that the funding was to be equally divided between Brock University and the University of Buffalo, so a budget has to be submitted. It was questioned whether the Deans from both universities will be involved and if they will provide letters of support. It looks like a worthwhile proposal, but clarification is required on these issues.

Discussion ensued as to whether to approve in principal but not to send to Senate without clarification or until more details have been provided, but it was decided it would not be approved until more details are provided.

ACTION Nota Klentrou to contact Jane Koustas for clarification on the number of Faculty Members and Graduate Students and the degree of their involvement with this proposal. A budget will help to determine how the funding is divided between the two universities. To inquire as to whether there is decanal support letters from both sides.

The Niagara Observatory does exist and has been approved by Senate. This new institute will not rival the Niagara Observatory or the Regional Institute at UB and this is clearly stated in the proposal.

The Crossing Borders 2008 Conference and reception was held recently in Buffalo and Ian Brindle was one of only three people from Brock who were in attendance. More participation from Brock University should be sought and encouraged for next year.

5. Other Business

To look at the possibility of changing the date of the Monday, June 2nd meeting to an earlier date in May.

ACTION Judy Maiden to poll the committee for their availability to meet the week of May 26th and/or to determine whether the June 2nd meeting date is more suitable for the schedules of most members.

Date of Next Meetings:
June 2nd, 2008 or TBA

All meetings to be held in: MC D350-L Research Services/Graduate Studies
Boardroom.

MOVED (Mercier/Wright)

MOTION to adjourn

CARRIED

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:20pm