

**MINUTES OF MEETING #4 (2007 - 2008) OF THE
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE
HELD ON MONDAY, JANUARY 14th, 2008 AT 11:00AM - 12:30PM
IN MC D350-L**

PRESENT: Dr. Nota Klentrou (Chair), Dr. Sandra Bosacki, Dr. Ian Brindle, Ms. Frances Chandler, Dr. Patricia Debly, Dr. Tamara El-Hoss (Vice-Chair), Dr. Greg Finn, Ms. Margaret Grove, Dr. Cheryl McCormick, Dr. Bulent Menguc, Dr. Joffre Mercier, Dr. Marilyn Rose, Dr. Angus Smith, Ms. Judy Maiden (Recorder)

REGRETS: Dr. Terry Boak, Ms. Iva Matthews, Dr. Bozidar Mitrovic,
Dr. Barry Wright

ARRIVED AFTER MEETING START: Dr. Lynn Rempel

Introductions / Welcome

(Nota Klentrou)

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED (Brindle/Menguc)

MOTION that the agenda be accepted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

MOVED (Mercier/El-Hoss)

MOTION that the minutes be accepted as circulated.

CARRIED

3. Business Arising

Sub-committee reports

3.1 Best Practices

(Sandra Bosacki)

- i. The group met after the last committee meeting on December 12th to debrief and continue ongoing conversation in regard to scholarship and research and how it connects to some of the practices. Ask guidance from the committee on this issue.

- ii. Database development - once the database is ready to go it will be posted on the Office of Research Services (ORS) web site. The online database should be easy to use. People can type key words into this database to obtain an experts list.
- iii. The issue in regard to faculty members seeking help with the preparation (writing editing and submitting) of journal articles went to the Council of Academic Deans (CAD) for discussion in December. The Deans felt that writing assistance for faculty is best done through faculty members within their individual faculties. Frances Chandler in ORS is often contacted requesting this help, but she has been instructed to refer faculty members who need help to the Dean or Associate Dean within their Faculty. Marilyn Rose sent an email outlining the collective response of the Deans, which has been filed as part of this committee's January minutes. This issue is now concluded.

3.2 External Recognition/ Raising our Profile

(Nota Klentrou)

- i. This sub-committee did not meet.
- ii. New item – the recruitment DVD is good – it is being circulated to secondary schools and Recruitment and Liaison will be using this DVD in the fall. This is a new way to recruit and to raise our research profile.

3.3 Financial

(Marilyn Rose)

Barry Wright is attempting to have the request from the December meeting placed on the Council of Academic Deans (CAD) Agenda for March. This request was to ask if the questionnaire can be revamped for how many dollars were spent for internal spending on research in the faculties.

3.4 Policies and Procedures

Intellectual Property Policy

(Ian Brindle)

- i. The Intellectual Property policy was given to Maureen Murphy in the Office of Research Services for legal opinion and to revise to recognize the rights of faculty and the rights of the university. This policy currently sits as part of the Integrity in Research and Scholarship Policy - also in the Brock University Faculty Association (BUFA) agreement, so any changes will be part of contract talks related to the mismatch between the faculty handbook and the Integrity in Research and Scholarship Policy. The change in policy is a slower process as it needs to engage with negotiations with BUFA.
- ii. In the integrity document there is a template for agreement with the researcher and student but it only mentions and does not speak to what needs to be addressed. The intrinsic value of Intellectual Property needs to be addressed and is not addressed anywhere and the implications are significant. This is a weighty document and it must be correct. There may be something to present at the next meeting.
- iii. In this sub-document the relationship of the graduate student and researcher is vague as to who owns what. In regard to the IP agreement between faculty and student regarding authorship there is no real process as to who is first author, the

Principal Investigator (PI) or the student. How this is decided and the mechanism for resolving disputes is not clear.

4. New Business

- b. What is an Academic Centre, Research Centre or Institute and what the differences are? (Nota Klentrou)

Discussion ensued and questions were asked;

- i. The policy reads clear, but the practice is inconsistent. It is very vague as things seem to change – do we change the name or status as the membership changes over the years? How would we proceed? Could look at the centres/institutes listed across the university and see which ones meet the definition and if they need a name change, and then notify them to ask if they want to change their name - Centre, Institute or Unit?
- ii. It should be determined whether the policy covers everything. Should we change the policy prior to asking the groups to change? Would this identify what needs to be fixed? We believe there are problems, but before asking for compliance we should see if there is any change in the policy.
- iii. We need to find out what ramifications there are for graduate students and do we want to isolate all graduate programs from these.
- iv. The practical implication is members of institutes or centres can use the title to obtain grants as this has more weight in a grant if it is an institute than a centre. The main difference in centres or institutes is who governs them.
- v. It is not known what the value of a research unit designation is or why we have this category. There seems to be no external implication at all. This could be predated. It should be reviewed as to whether the Unit designation is useful or not. Do we have any “Research Units”? This may need to be taken out of the policy.
- vi. After looking at the centres, units and institutes and the differences the guidelines may need to be rewritten and looked at as to how they best serve the university and how you build a university reputation around the categories. The “institute or centre” name can be used to attract grants and gain more credibility. Terms sometimes suit a group better. “Centre” status might be necessary to get other government funding.
- vii. The language is difficult because there is no university definition of centres, institutes or units. It may be hard to define institute versus centre. There is a need for consistency within the university.

ACTION The Best Practices sub-committee will review and create a list of all approved Centres, Institutes and Units to see if they follow the policy and if any discrepancies exist. Then gather information on the major differences, how they operate, titles and whether they go across faculties or not. The findings will be presented at the March meeting.

b. Centre for Sport Capacity

(Ian Brindle)

Discussion ensued and questions were asked;

- i. Information on Sport Capacity across Canada will be focused here. This Centre could grow beyond Brock University as there is a significant gap in this area of research, but this gap will be filled by the Centre. There are grass roots clubs which exist across the country, but there is little in terms of a unifying thread to pull them together. There is a great amount of applied research potential that could lead to program assessment and how government's policy affects this utilization. The sense is it could be a significant contribution. There are collaborators from across Ontario. It crosses faculties with Social Sciences currently involved and it may grow to involve the Faculty of Education as well, so we should look at the term "Institute" eventually. Not certain whether "Centre" or "Institute" would be the best title. At the moment the term "Centre" will remain with this application.
- ii. The last paragraph of the proposal is trying to tie graduate students to grants. When there are grants tied to these centres can we assume students will be working or supported on these? Ian will clarify the last paragraph of the proposal and report back to the committee at the next meeting.
- iii. The proposal and CV's are in the Office of the Associate Vice-President Research for review.

MOVED (Brindle/Menguc)

MOTION to approve the application to send to Senate

CARRIED

ACTION Ian Brindle to check whether there are grants Graduate Students could be hired on and to contact John Corlett and ask for clarification on what role students and graduate students will play in this centre and report back to this committee at the next meeting.

6. Other Business

Date of Next Meetings:
March 3rd, 2008 - 11:00am – 12:30pm
April 14th, 2008 – 1:00pm – 2:30pm
June 2nd, 2008 - 11:00am – 12:30pm

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

MOVED (Mercier /El-Hoss)

MOTION to adjourn

CARRIED

7. Adjournment 11:55pm