<div align="center">
University Research Council Minutes
Wednesday, January 9, 2019
10:30 am – 12:30 pm
Mills Memorial Library, Room L304
</div>

In attendance:
Rob Baker (Chair), Karen Mossman, Peter Mascher, Nick Markettos, Khaled Hassanein, John Preston, Gianni Parise, Pamela Swett, Vivian Lewis, Kathy Charters, Tracy Arabski, Sherisse Webb, Ty Shattuck, Lori Dillon, Danelle D'Alvise

Regrets: Jonathan Bramson, James Gillett, Gay Yuyitung

1. **Minutes of University Research Council Meeting of September 19, 2018**
   Not ready – to be circulated later

2. **Report by VP Research**
   - Core Facilities development
   - Possible movement of at least some institutes and centres (that answer to the OVPR) to individual Faculties; one on one basis
   - Province setting budget. McMaster is submitting a pre-budget draft; to maintain ORF-OCE support; experience difficulty with submitting applications; any feedback from the URC to be sent to the VPR; Trilliums gone
   - Had good meeting with Marc Fortin, NSERC on January 7, at which Dr. Fortin emphasized he needed more stories to support NSERC's efforts on partnerships. In addition, while not finalized, there would be no new Calls for Strategic Partnerships Grants or any new IRCs. CRDs are still in place (expect more flexibility in duration, amounts required, number of partners, etc.). Question posed if any McMaster member served on a Committee for the overall review of NSERC partnership programs. This would be checked with the MILO Executive Director.

* Ty Shattuck joined at 10:45 am

3. **McMaster IT Strategic Plan (Gayleen Gray) (document circulated)**

   - Launch of IT Strategic Plan on January 23, 2019. Circulated document not to be distributed widely. Outlines future of IT for the next three years. Three pillars – key objectives:
     1) Connected McMaster Community
     2) Seamless Foundation
     3) Transformative Information Technologies and Services
     Plan is wide; still have work to do.
     Q. Are we at 21st century technology?
     a. We are behind but aware. Wireless is behind.

Comment made that a government representative was on campus and did not have access to Wi-Fi. Requesting Wi-Fi for guests could help.

Q. Undergraduate students have a new virtual calendar (not in Mosaic), called "My Timetable". Can we integrate this?

A. Technologies cost money so we need to at look at our priorities.

Comment made that researchers are experience difficulty connecting back and forth between MIP and McMaster. UTS has worked with previous issues at MIP (i.e. Rogers outage), and will continue to engage.

The URC Chair noted that the Seamless pillar requires addressing prior to moving to the Transformative. The IT community across campus to come and work together.

A URC member was involved with the IT Governance Structure Review. Content and functionality focus affects research and academic work. The URC Chair agreed. At the Research Technology Committee (RTC) and IT Executive Meetings, the VPR is not exactly aware of the implications. Need more discussion about academic implications.

Q. As URC, have we asked for something?

A. Good point. We should do.

GG Q: After the Launch, what are the key things for short-term and long-term? They have been evaluating Wi-Fi environment and done other things.

Comment made to keep in mind for budget. Require plain language. The URC Chair asked for the Associate Deans of Research to advise the VPR, and then bring forward to RTC for heads up.

4. **Research IT Review (Gayleen Gray/Ranil Sonnadara)**

- Research Technology Review to take place (CTO and VPR to sponsor; Research Technology Committee to act as Steering Committee). Panel will include researchers who have broad expertise in research computing support. The panel will meet with people to understand gaps and will make recommendations for core and 'enhanced' services.
- Will review data from previous IT review, existing work done by Research Technology committee and also collect new data. The first step will be to develop a more comprehensive plan on how to look at needs/gaps for researchers across the institution. Comment made that the process did not include Faculties. The reply to this was that the approach was still being planned. ADRs would be heavily involved. Also, Deans/ADRs would be invited to select with whom the panel would meet.

5. **Reports from the VPR Team**
   VPR thanked Karen Mossman and his team for their work during his Administrative Leave.

   Karen Mossman
   Core Facilities
   - CFI is looking for convergence; old model does not work; important for sustainability.
   - MNR and Microscopy – immediate need. Kim MacDonald is looking at best practices and immediate needs. Core Facilities can include all Faculties.

- o Visited Monash University and talked to Southwestern and have seen what's successful there. What do we need? What are the facilities we need? What is a Core Facility? Criteria? What is the underlying platform that would work for core facilities? Looking at current list of facilities.
- o Require Associate Deans of Research to identify key managers of their core facilities. Need 8 to 10 people in working group. What are their practices? How can we help? This is the request to ADRs. Current working group members could be Andreas Korinek, Tracy Campbell, a Microbial person and an MNR person.
- o Attended a Chicago Core Facilities workshop.
- o Julie at Monash University has a PhD and an MBA; she works with each core facility and also collectively with VPRs for strategic decisions.
- o Provost will put money into this. The VPR role is to help the core facilities being efficient, not directing research.
- o Animal Facility; Russell Archives; Archaeology at MIP. CCAC suggested for our animal facility to have the VPR in charge of oversight and compliance. At Monash, some are for both external and internal, or just internal, or first-come/first-served.

Nick Markettos
- BEAM FedDev: All claims in by March 2019. Talks with BEAM Director; sustainable footing.
- Garage at MIP: FedDev completed by end of March; 10,000 square feet space
- Advanced Manufacturing Consortium (AMC) – core facility moving to MIP
- Working with Ty Shattuck at MIP
- Three streams with CFI

Kathy Charters
Research Finance and Faculty of Health Sciences Research Finance info sessions

Sherisse Webb
CFI Innovation Fund (IF) Competition Timeline:
- o CFI has indicated that the call for proposals for the CFI IF competition will not be issued until the consultation with Canada's research community initiated in November 2018 regarding the future role of the CFI is completed; it is anticipated that the consultation process will conclude at the end of February
- o In response to the delay in release of the call for proposals, ROADS has revised the timeline for McMaster's internal selection process; an opportunity for research teams to revise their applications in response to external reviewer comments has been added
- o The deadline for submission of the Faculty Endorsement Forms has been changed to allow Faculties the opportunity to respond to the revised applications
- o ROADS endeavoured to find at least three external reviewers for each internal application; we were able to secure a minimum of two for each application

- ROADS has asked external reviewers to provide their comments by February 8th; once all comments have been received, they will be shared with the project leader and his or her Associate Dean Research
- Late proposals for projects led by other institutions will be accepted if they receive Faculty endorsement; if they are received before the next stage of the internal selection process, then they will be considered along with all of the other applications received to date; if they are received after the next stage of the internal selection process, then they will only be considered for the 10% holdback
- The AVPR noted that it will need to be decided how commitments of IOF will be made to projects selected for submission to CFI. IOF can be used strategically rather than committed to each project, as has been the case it the past.
- URC members suggested that applications led by other institutions should only be considered if they have been subjected to the same kind of review as applications led by McMaster; external review arranged by the host institution should be required and it should be necessary that the external reviewer comments are shared with McMaster

Meeting Adjourned at 12:30 pm