

**MINUTES OF MEETING #5 (2007 - 2008) OF THE
SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP POLICY COMMITTEE
HELD ON MONDAY, MARCH 3rd, 2008 AT 11:00AM - 12:30PM
IN MC D350-L**

PRESENT: Dr. Nota Klentrou (Chair), Dr. Sandra Bosacki, Dr. Ian Brindle, Dr. Patricia Debly, Dr. Tamara El-Hoss (Vice-Chair), Ms. Margaret Grove, Ms. Iva Matthews, Dr. Cheryl McCormick, Dr. Bulent Menguc, Dr. Joffre Mercier, Dr. Lynn Rempel, Dr. Marilyn Rose, Dr. Barry Wright, Ms. Judy Maiden (Recorder)

REGRETS: Dr. Terry Boak, Ms. Frances Chandler, Dr. Bozidar Mitrovic, Dr. Angus Smith

ALSO PRESENT: Ms. Maureen Murphy

Introductions / Welcome (Nota Klentrou)

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED (Mercier/Brindle)

THAT the agenda be accepted as circulated.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

MOVED (Mercier/El-Hoss)

THAT the minutes of the #4 (2007 – 2008) Senate Research & Scholarship Policy Committee held on January 14th, 2008 be approved.

CARRIED

3. Business Arising

Sub-committee reports

3.1 Best Practices

(Sandra Bosacki)

- i. The sub-committee met last week to review updates. The list of centres, institutes and research units information is included below and was provided by Frances Chandler. According to Gaby Donia, Human Resources and Mike Farrell, University Secretariat, the information gathered and sent out to Lynn Rempel and Cheryl McCormick is all the official information on centres and institutes at Brock. In talking to them it appears there are some interesting issues:
 - 1) Some people are informally getting together, calling themselves a unit and doing work together but there is no official information on these units.
 - 2) All sanctioned centres and institutes with directors appointed by the VP Academic are on the list sent out.
 - 3) It appears that there are clear criteria in place regarding these entities; however, no one seems to be charged with the responsibility of reviewing the operation of these centres and institutes to see if they have "morphed" over time resulting in organizations that might no longer fit the criteria.
 - 4) The Governance Committee of the Senate will be reviewing the policies around centres and institutes in regards to implications on staffing (BUFA), budgets and policy development.

The Office of Research Services is continuing to look at the definitions and compiling information to present to Mike Farrell for the Governance Committee.

This committee would like to hear back from the Governance Committee on this issue.

3.2 External Recognition/ Raising our Profile

(Nota Klentrou)

Sub-committee did not meet this month - nothing to report.

A sub-committee met on Monday, February 25th to discuss the document entitled, "BROCK 2014: Knowledge, Engagement, Transformation – An Academic Plan for Brock University". There were quite a few points raised. It was noted that when the document reaches the next level there will be a need to ensure there are enough resources available. It will be interesting to see how all the comments and points received from all the Senate committees are incorporated into this document. Nota Klentrou wrote and submitted a report to Terry Boak on the committees' recommendations.

3.3 Financial

(Barry Wright)

- i. Last year's sub-committee looked into what kind of financial resources were spent in the research community. 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. The old survey did not meet their goals. Need to seek permission to ask for new information. If approved, they will revamp the questionnaire to ask where the dollars for internal research funding are spent. In the original request for information, only six of seven faculties reported, but the questions asked were not answered by all.
- ii. Marilyn Rose is investigating what other universities who have similar dollars and students are doing to get an overall perspective in order to compare us to them. For information on External Benchmarking she has worked through the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), but has not received a very good response thus far. Two questions were asked; the first question was whether COU can make available to us (or help us to find) information that they have collected (or know about) on internal research funding that is available at Ontario Universities -- i.e. system-wide data. The second is to ask whether COU can help us to identify “comparator institutions” – those universities to whom we might legitimately compare ourselves in this regard. This will be especially important if system-wide data is not available, because we would then need to approach those comparable institutions directly to ask them to share their information with us.
 - iii. Met with Council of Academic Administrators (CAA) to ask for their support and to inquire as to what kind of questions should be asked in the revamped survey. The commitment of the Deans to complete the questionnaire when it is resent was requested as well. This issue was on the agenda for the last CAA meeting, but there was a lack of time on the previous agenda to explore this issue fully. An invitation to this committee will be extended to give input to the CAA in regard to dollars and cents that are needed. The deadline to receive this information is the end of March. This is for the Internal Benchmarking. Bulent Menguc has taken this task on behalf of the sub-committee.
 - iv. Web sites at the University of Toronto, York University and the University of Western Ontario were explored for information, but nothing could be found as the information is not generally publicized. It can be difficult to find information on web sites because of the way it is organized. There may be external funding to the specific university shown, but what happens in each individual faculty is not shown. There is a publicized report by the Canadian Association of University Business Officers (CAUBO) and in it they want to know what the percentage of research funding to the university operating budget is. They are gathering this information and it is a pass worded report which not everyone is allowed to access, but there is a lot of useful information in it.
 - v. Ian Brindle will be visiting George Dixon, Vice-President Research at the University of Waterloo in April to review their office organizational structure and to see how it compares to Brock University. Their Office of Research has very few Grant Facilitators as they put them into the faculties. They deal with \$130 million in research grants a year. He hopes to obtain information on what happens to internal costs, their distribution and how they are so successful in obtaining external funding. It is an ongoing process for

evaluating how money is spent here and elsewhere and there is a need to ensure we are efficient in how we spend our dollars. Has also met and had discussions with the Vice-Presidents and will report on the new structure of the Office of Research Services at the next meeting. The new structure will have the added components, protecting Intellectual Property and a more aggressive outreach program will be included.

ACTION - Ian Brindle is to report on the new organizational structure of the Office of Research Services at the March meeting.

Barry Wright has started to identify a "Tomorrow file" for any future considerations which the committee may wish to explore at a later date. He will receive any issues, not just financial ones, which this committee may wish to, have added to the file.

3.4 Policies and Procedures

Intellectual Property Policy updates

(Ian Brindle)

- i. Maureen Murphy was asked to review the existing documentation. She reviewed Appendix "C" in the Integrity and Research and Scholarship policy as it relates to ownership of Intellectual Property and discussed and compared it to the Faculty Handbook, Section 3, Subsection 23, ownership of Student Created Intellectual Property. This exercise was a review and compare to point out the documents were not consistent. This is a two page agreement and the language should be made consistent. Once this review is complete she will report to this committee. The revisions will need to go through the Brock University Faculty Association (BUFA) and Senate in order to be approved. If it were ready soon it could comprise part of the negotiations with BUFA which will start next month.
- ii. Need a policy on Intellectual Property considering where we were and where we want to go. This committee will take upon the task of presenting a new document to Senate for approval to include ownership of Intellectual Property. The Faculty Handbook policy could be the best document to start with by creating something that will eventually become the only document. This could be achieved by working on a compendium document which would ask what needs to go into the Faculty Handbook. This document should not have a lot in it as it could move this process forward quickly as the Faculty Handbook may not need too much information added to it.
- iii. The most common problem is joint ownership and there have been three issues of student ownership in the last month. It needs to be ensured that there is an Intellectual Property policy agreement signed at the commencement of a research agreement. An agreement needs to be signed prior to the development of Intellectual Property and consent should be discussed ahead of time. This should be standard practice. The current procedures are incomplete. This could belong in the Faculty Handbook. Schedule C was designed to start a conversation, but it needs to be more substantial than just this. It would be appropriate at this point to recast this agreement document and to present to the joint committee. We may be able to add a new schedule C now and see where we go from there and whether

- we can replace the current template letter until we have time to review the entire policy. This could be submitted as a modification to see if it will go through.
- iv. There needs to be a way to ensure that every graduate student signs an agreement and they can not start work until this is done and it is filed in the Office of Research Services where all the other documents are kept. Need to ensure there is a mechanism that this is regularly done. The student needs to be protected and we need to ensure that there is fairness on both sides when the projects come to fruition. There is more than authorship as there is ownership as well. The policy needs to be broader and to take in the differences across the university.

ACTION Ian Brindle will ask Maureen Murphy to produce a document with consistent language. Once complete this committee to present document to Senate.

MOVED (El-Hoss/Brindle)

MOTION To ask the Associate Vice-President Research to initiate an examination of the Intellectual Property issue which covers the faculty handbook and the Brock University Intellectual Property policy as well as a “discussion” section regarding the BUFA (schedule C) agreement.

CARRIED

Margaret Grove left at 12:05pm.

4. New Business

- a. Report on Academic Centre, Research Centre and Institutes and the differences
(Sandra Bosacki)

Please note Best Practices sub-committee findings above.

- b. Centre for Sport Capacity update (Ian Brindle)

The formation of the Centre was passed through Senate.

6. Other Business

Date of Next Meetings:
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/Menguc)

MOTION to adjourn

CARRIED

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:15pm