



Research Committee Minutes

Date: March 21, 2023
Time: 12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Place: Google Meet
Attendees: S. Brown, C. Christou, S. Forrester, J. Freeman, L. Jacobs (Chair), A. Leach, C. McGregor, R. Ruttenberg-Rozen, S. ShahbazPanahi, V. Sharpe (secretary), N. Wattie
Guest(s): B. Maclsaac
Regrets: C. Davidson

1. **Welcome**

L. Jacobs welcomed everyone and commenced the meeting.

2. **Approval of the agenda**

L. Jacobs noted that B. Maclsaac will join to add information regarding item 7.

Approved by consensus.

3. **Approval of previous meeting's minutes**

Correction to add T. Christou to attendees and to correct the spelling of McGregor. Approved by consensus.

4. **Report of the Vice President Research & Innovation**

L. Jacobs noted that research is ramping up and teaching is wrapping up.

Information items:

- Ontario Tech is a partner on a biomedical research hub proposal submitted by the University of Toronto. Five hubs have been approved (University of Montreal, University of Toronto, University of Alberta, University of British Columbia, and a joint one physically housed at the University of Ottawa (McMaster, Ottawa, Alberta, UBC). This is a new way for the federal government to accelerate research in biomedical and to disperse a large amount of money that is being provided outside of tri-council envelopes. Each hub is being funded \$500,00/year for 5 years. Additionally, there is a \$500 million fund to be funnelled through the five hubs. Details will be released soon, and it will not require any provincial match. The Letter of Intent (LOI) deadline for projects that the hub will propose need to be done by the 3rd week of April. Full applications will be due in September. Although the University of Toronto is hosting, they are not necessarily funnelling the funding.
- Ontario Tech is trying to shift sustainability. Historically it has been housed in the OCIS office as the campus was being built. This didn't allow for much reporting and oversight on sustainability in research and teaching. In the next 6 weeks or so the Deans will receive a copy of the report. There is a real opportunity for Faculty Members to shape what constitutes the sustainability agenda and reporting for the university.
- Ontario Tech was designated by the IAEA to host the first major convention in years (for Canada). Participants from any member agency can attend. Global Affairs has said Canada is withdrawing its application so Ontario will now not host.

N. Wattie noted that there are a number of Faculty Members who would be interested in putting in an LOI. L. Jacobs noted that R. Dubrowski in ORS is the coordinator for Ontario Tech and is looking for Faculty Members who want to be involved. She was going to reach out to C. Rodgers last week. The plan is to have an information workshop next week. **ACTION:** L. Jacobs will ask R. Dubrowski to reach out to Research Committee members.

S. ShahbazPanahi asked about having a joint meeting to invite interested Faculty Members to get together to share ideas and interest. L. Jacobs commented that that is a great idea.

C. McGregor noted that there is some confusion about when the workshops are happening. There are three rings and Ontario Tech is in the outside ring. They'll be looking for us to work on projects in the 2nd ring and the 1st ring. It's not for us to work independently.

T. Christou encouraged ORS and Faculty to loop in SGPS for student numbers and how graduate students can be part of the projects. He talked about how graduate students across Canada are working collaboratively via a podcast, etc. L. Jacobs agreed that one of the priorities of the funding of the hubs is because they are not only interested in funding talent development of future researchers but also HQP in this industry; an industry where Canada has advantages.

5. Report of the Executive Director, Office of Research Services (ORS)

J. Freeman provided a presentation that included information on/about:

- Safeguarding Research – Some activities by foreign governments, militaries and other actors pose real risks to Canada's national security and the integrity of its research ecosystem. To address these risks, researchers, research institutions, federal granting agencies, and the Government of Canada have a shared responsibility to identify and mitigate any potential national security risks related to research partnerships. To ensure the Canadian research ecosystem is as open as possible and as secure as necessary, the Government of Canada is introducing the National Security Guidelines for Research Partnerships.

Some applications were denied because the risk assessment found the risk too high. L. Jacobs and J. Freeman are developing a new job of Manager, Safeguarding Research. ORS is helping Faculty Members one-on-one to achieve security clearance and determine risk assessments.

- Subcritical Assembly – website is running and dedicated to providing information to the public. For any questions contact J. Freeman or F. Arnaldo.
- IP Provincial Commercialization Framework and Reporting – Ontario Tech has been complying to have a centralized location for all of our policies and resources including the IP Policy and Strategic Research Plan. We've met the significant timelines and have submitted our annual report. T. Christou asked about indigenous consultations and at what level they are happening. J. Freeman noted that Indigenous engagement is embedded with the leaders of the local communities and key indigenous communities specifically for the licensing process. L. Jacobs noted that the licensing body designates so called Nuclear Host Communities, which are by their nature local.
- The Research Ethics Board (REB) has Indigenous representatives, and two new full-time continuing staff were hired to keep the REB timeline on track to return baseline reviews to 4-6 weeks.
- Research Data Management (RDM) – The REB is an active participant in the creation of the templates and the plan.
- IPON – Jenn shared information on IPON activities.

ACTION: J. Freeman will circulate her presentation.

6. Research Data Management Draft Strategy

J. Freeman presented the Research Data Management Survey Summary.

ACTION: Research Committee members are encouraged to provide feedback.

A. Leach asked about the language around the REB accepting the RDM principals noting that there doesn't seem to be much movement in the document about the REB's commitment to follow the RDM strategy. J. Freeman note that the main focus has been on the template and how it works operationally with a goal of

looking at what makes sense for the RDM strategy (strategy document not an operational document). It needs stronger language about how the REB works in alignment with this strategy. ORS will do checkbacks with the Research Committee to see how faculty feel about the alignment in the document.

R. Ruttenberg-Rozen commented that the REB application is already labour intensive, so we need to find ways to ensure this is not labour intensive.

S. Shahbazpanahi asked if there is access to some service data provider or a repository that Faculty can access that shows already purchased data. L. Jacobs noted that RDC has databases available that are barely used by Faculty members although there are basically free through a pretty basic process. He noted particular RDC at York, Queens, others and that very few people are aware of them. Maybe this is something that feeds into B. Maclsaac's broader digital strategy.

J. Freeman suggested that they may be able to acknowledge the piece about digital repositories in the document.

7. Google Storage Limits

S. Forrester asked to have this as an agenda item about the Google Drive storage limits and how it was communicated. Many Faculty Members were concerned about losing the drive space and contacted their Associate Deans and Deans. He noted that the communication may not have been as effective as it could have been as it generated a lot of email activity. Things that have an academic connection should have had consultations with faculty via the Research Committee, Academic Council, and other avenues. Perhaps IT should have a research strategy to consult before moving forward with processes that impact Faculty.

Guest B. Maclsaac joined the meeting.

B. Maclsaac noted that 1) the first message was not communicated well, and he welcomed the opportunity to clarify it, 2) no faculty member or student will lose space if they require it for teaching or research, and 3) there is no need to ask for an exemption as only about 5 people are actually impacted. The university is asking all staff to tidy up electronically stored files to help reduce Google storage because Google will start charging the university in July. B. Maclsaac noted that he and IT haven't come to the Research Committee to ask about researcher needs and he committed to attending a future meeting/meetings to hear about research IT needs.

N. Wattie noted the importance of a communication strategy and that IT attended a Graduate Research Seminar where they were helpful about informing about other storage areas such as OneDrive.

C. McGregor asked about the university back up strategy and how Google Drive is backed up? She noted the need for direction and procedures on how to store data including what and where. B. Maclsaac noted that tips and tricks were hidden inside the FAQs and that they are being moved out and positioned more prominently.

A. Leach sought clarification on whether the storage limits apply to the .net accounts and the .ca accounts and how information is being communicated to grad students. B. Maclsaac noted that the storage limits only apply to personal accounts and not shared accounts. Many grad students are TAs so they got the staff message. B. Maclsaac and T. Christou will communicate with grad students that they won't lose teaching files, etc.

ACTION: B. Maclsaac asked representatives to share with faculty the messages about Google storage limits. He invited Faculty reps to collect digital strategy responses from their Faculty Members. L. Jacobs noted that he, B. Maclsaac and J. Freeman will meet to discuss and create a draft document and then B. Maclsaac can come back to a meeting in 2-5 months.

8. Mask Mandate for Research Wet Labs

S. Forrester noted that Faculty are inquiring if it is still appropriate to be masking in research labs as there is a low risk of COVID transmission and masking creates safety issues in research labs. L. Jacobs shared that the committee that has been directing the mask mandate has made a decision that as of May 1st the mask mandate will be lifted. Masks will still be required throughout the exam period.

9. Faculty Exchange
Deferred.

10. Other Business
None.

11. Next meeting – ~~April 18, 2023~~, cancelled, May 24, 2023

12. Adjournment – 2:00 p.m.