



Research Committee Minutes

Date: January 25, 2024

Time: 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Place: Google Meet

Attendees: Les Jacobs, Jennifer Alsop (joined at 4:00), Susanne Brown, Catherine Davidson, Jennifer Freeman, Lisa Kozycz (guest - Manager, Safeguarding Research), Amy Leach, Peter Lewis, Brad Maclsaac (guest - VP, Administration) Ade Oyemade (guest - Director, Digital Strategy), Robyn Ruttenberg-Rozen, Shahram ShahbazPanahi, Nick Wattie, Elisa Beverley

Regrets: Theodore Christou, Sean Forrester

1. **Welcome**

2. **Approval of the Agenda**

J. Freeman will be late and requested deletion of item 5.

A. Leach requested deletion of item 8.

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

N. Wattie abstained as he did not attend the meeting in question.

S. Shabazpanahi approved. A. Leach seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

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

a. Federal government safeguarding research list and international students

The Federal government recently released a safeguarding research list with a very broad reach of the sensitive areas. This is surprising and makes the process difficult, but the list of entities was a little shorter than what most people feared and is, therefore, more manageable.

S. ShabazPanahi asked for information on a recent federal court case. L. Jacobs explained the case about an international PhD student studying materials engineering at Waterloo who wanted to return to China and take his knowledge with him. The Court ruled against the student.

R. Ruttenberg-Rozen noted that the students' and their spouses' ability to work has been reduced as well so many will return to their home country. This will stymie a lot of researchers' work. Also, despite a carve out for research post graduate work, there will still be a direct effect on the income of Ontario universities. N. Wattie asked if the carve out will apply to course-based masters? This ambiguous right now but J. Stokes (Registrar) thinks it will.

b. Research Excellence Awards and Research Excellence Chairs

L. Jacobs noted that there is commitment to fairness and equity in these awards; however, not all Faculties will necessarily get an award each year.

L. Jacobs feels strongly that decisions on these awards should be peer reviewed and the committee should be composed of voluntary members from the Research Committee, as they were last year. He asked if the members agree, or would they like to strike another independent committee.

S. ShahbazPanahi finds reviewing difficult due to variety of disciplines and he does not have the expertise.

N. Wattie felt comfortable last year but requested the ability to appoint a proxy from his home Faculty in the event of a COI.

A. Leach had mixed feelings after sitting on the review committee last year and does not wish to participate this year. She agrees that the REA and REC are the job of the committee, but they are already stretched thin on reviews. Also, there were issues around COI.

Suggestions discussed:

- L. Jacobs suggested that perhaps the committee review only either the REA or the REC.
- N. Wattie asked if current CRC holders could serve to evaluate.
- S. ShahbazPanahi suggested the current REC holders as well as well as CRC serve; L. Jacobs noted that only 5 reviewers are needed so there should be enough CRC holders to serve.
- P. Lewis suggested establishing a council of reviewers.
- S. ShahbazPanahi suggested first layer of review within the REC/REA applicant's own Faculty to address the reviewers' possible lack of expertise.
 - L. Jacobs felt this would be difficult to do.
 - N. Wattie noted that, logistically, this would increase COI in a small institution.
 - A. Leach agrees with reviewers being former REC recipients if a CRC is not available.
- Is it valuable to have R. Nyaamine (Assistant Vice-President, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging) on the committee – not as a voting member but as a voice of decision making?
 - J. Freeman – R. Nyaamine will not likely have the time.
- J. Freeman – a chair will need to be appointed to the committee.

Decision

At the end of the discussion, no final decision was reached but the proposal was to get consultation from the deans and to decide between the review committee being comprised of current CRC holders with a back up of the former REC holders if needed.

5. **Report of the Executive Director, Office of Research Services.** J. Freeman requested deletion in Item 2.

6. **Safeguarding Research**

L. Kozycz (Manager, Safeguarding Research) further explained the court decision mentioned in 4.a. The student in question had received their undergrad at a Chinese university that was considered high-risk and was on the list. They received their master's online. However, this alone would not have flagged their grant application she looks at affiliation not individuals.

The rest of the presentation was deferred due to lack of time.

7. **Review Intellectual Property Policy.** Deferred due to lack of time.
8. **Improvement for Research Process.** Cancelled per A. Leach's request in item 2.
9. **Annual Reports of Research Institutes, Units, and Centres** - for information. Deferred due to lack of time.
 - a. Institute for Cybersecurity & Resilient Systems (ICRS)
 - b. Centre on Hate, Bias and Extremism (CHBE)
 - c. Centre for Small Modular Reactors (CSMR)
10. **Faculty Outreach Spearheads.** Deferred due to lack of time.
11. **Digital Strategy and Roadmaps**

Continuation of a consultation that began 3 years ago. Last year, the topic was Google storage; this meeting is about strategy. B. MacIsaac said that intent was to share progress and to work with the committee to satisfy as many as possible.

Action Item – The IT group will write a briefing note; the Research Committee to provide information on how to serve research community better.

Discussion after presentation:

- S. ShabazPanahi asked if there is a strategy around integrating FAST into the cloud servers.
 - A. Odemaye will investigate and report back;
 - S. Brown recommended contacting their Faculty's analyst for assistance on FAST and to contact S. Brown if there is no answer.

- J. Freeman – re: AI tools for integrity; a faculty member has asked for assistance with “Turn It In”; this tool used screening for AI used to be free and is now a subscription. A. Odemaye advised faculty members to contact S. Forbes in Teaching and Learning Centre for the process and to cc A. Odemaye.
- J. Freeman – Research is working with Ian Doyle’s team in IT regarding the Research Data Management Plan.

12. Faculty Exchange

FEAS and FHSc representatives both expressed frustration with FAST in their Faculties.

P. Lewis noted that faculty members in FBIT and FSc. are very interested in university licence for [Overleaf](#). Could that be explored? C. Davidson shared that [McMaster University has adopted the Cornell approach to provide it openly on Github](#).

13. Other Business. None

14. Upcoming meetings

February 29, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

April 4, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

May 9, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

15. Adjournment - Unanimous adjournment at 4:33