



**University Research Council
Minutes
March 5, 2015
1:30- 4:30 pm
MUSC 318**

Attendees:

Mo Elbestawi, Chair
Bonny Ibhawoh
Tony Porter
Stephen Collins
John Preston
Gay Yuyitung

Jonathan Bramson
Barb McKenna
Kathy Charters
Greg Weiler
Vivian Lewis
Patrick Deane

Peter Mascher

Regrets:

Fiona McNeill
Nick Markettos
Gianni Parise
Willi Wiener (Acting ADR, Faculty of Business)

AGENDA

1. Minutes of University Research Council Meeting of December 4, 2015
2. Business Arising/Action Items
3. VPR&IA Briefing:

Strategic Funding Opportunities:

- ORF
- Provincial Job Prosperity Program

4. Research Administration Update – 5 minutes by Each Director
5. Tri-Council's New Mandate on Open Access – Vivian Lewis
6. Other Business

1. MINUTES OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COUNCIL MEETING OF DECEMBER 4, 2014

- Mr. Greg Weiler asked that a clarification for his comment about the central research facilities be amended in the December minutes (amended as requested)
- Dr. John Preston motioned to accept the minutes of the December 4, 2014 meeting (with amendment by Mr. Weiler) and Ms. Vivian Lewis seconded. Motion carried.

2. BUSINESS ARISING/ ACTION ITEMS FROM THE DECEMBER 4, 2014 MEETING

1) Associate Deans of Research to consider the best possible candidates to be involved in the Canada First Research Excellence Fund (CFREF).

UPDATE: Moved this item.

2) Dr. Gay Yuyitung to provide an update on the progress with HR on the MILO incentive plan.

UPDATE: Dr. Yuyitung will update this issue as appropriate.

3) Associate Deans of Research to discuss the possibility of dedicating financial resources to grant writing with their Faculty Deans.

UPDATE:

- Dr. Collins did discuss this issue with Dr. Kelton and noted that the CIHR has changed their entire format; will defer
- Dr. Porter said that for Social Sciences, more of an issue with the ORF; they will approach on a 'one by one' basis according to the call
- Dr. Preston said that they are working with a few freelance writers on a case by case basis
- Dr. Elbestawi said that his take is that this is an issue and would like to see due diligence in reviewing proposals – different types of talent needed

- i.e. when we apply for a \$10M CFI project we need more work done on review of proposal – both external and internal; find a way to encourage going through this process
- Dr. Collins noted that it's not so much the scientific content but how it's pitched and asked for Kathy Charters to comment
- Kathy said that it's important that the case is made in the applications and that there are things that researchers don't think of or consider; she also said that the issue is (in some cases) that the researchers don't get the application in so that it can be reviewed in a timely fashion
- Dr. Elbestawi said that there needs to be more discipline with proposals like CFI and major ORFs so that there's enough time for experts to review and that we have to find a way for offices to have a good look at proposals; if there's enough time for a review it's more likely that there will be a positive outcome
- Dr. Collins wanted to know how this could be enforced; can we refuse to sign off?
- FHS has implemented a review with the "opinion not to go out", particularly with late submissions
- It's a constitutional right to submit, and it's up to the individual to decide whether they want to go forward; it's a real problem
- Dr. Elbestawi noted that realistically we can't enforce; the best we can do is show statistics and evidence and success rates
- There's room to improve this situation; ROADS talks about this to the researchers
- Dr. Ibhawoh asked if CFI incentivizes; Kathy Charters said no, not with the writing process; ROADS provides more administrative assistance with travel/equipment/vendors
- Preference would be for Faculty to sit down early on in the conversation; frustrating to know a project has potential but needs more work
- ORF is difficult because of requirement of an industry partner and it's best if the researchers are involved with their partners early on in the process; they can't state this often enough to the research community – they need to communicate early with their partners and many researchers start too late
- Kathy said there's not so much a need for writers, but for individuals to take on a project management role to pull all of the pieces together
- Before going through the funding application they need to look at what's needed; one solution is to try to partner with successful grant applicants
- Dr. Elbestawi asked what is the real need in each Faculty? What is needed to increase success – is if money devoted to writers, project managers? How do the researchers best see this?

- Dr. Elbestawi noted that he and Dr. Collins were to meet with Dr. Wilkinson – Dr. Collins said that the proposition would be that the animal facility have central support; not clear what a central facility is i.e. reactor, BIMR
- Dr. Elbestawi said the McMaster Nuclear Reactor is self-contained and runs on a cost recovery basis; BIMR and MOBIX = central funding;

VPR&IA BRIEFING:

1. There is a proposed Advanced Manufacturing Consortium involving 3 universities: McMaster/Western/Waterloo. It is a multi-facility concept with Engineering/Business/Social Sciences; lots of excitement and interest; manufacturing is a core competency of McMaster. Plan on capitalizing fully on this

Strategic Funding Opportunities:

- Appeal for Faculties to get partners ASAP; the probability of success increases when there is an opportunity to review before the deadline
- Need to convey this message; if the application doesn't fly, it makes us look bad
- ADR's need to send emails to their faculty reminding them of ORF deadlines and that they need to have 1. Partners in place or 2. Indicate as early as possible if they need help with partners or companies
- Dr. Bramson asked if they were allowed to say if the application isn't in by a particular date that it will not be allowed
- Dr. Elbestawi prefers that it's clearly shown to be in their best interest to get their applications submitted in a timely fashion
- Dr. Bramson noted that not all researchers are reasonable; that there's an ethos at work and we need to change that ethos
- Dr. Ibhawoh noted that there are constitutional rights; he prefers the soft pedal approach with academics
- Dr. Bramson said that we're now in the 8th round of the ORF-RE and that a soft touch isn't going to change anyone
- Dr. Preston said that it becomes institution vs individual – if they want institutional approval “good luck” if it's late
- Dr. Ibhawoh said that a reasonable approach is needed; there is the institutional commitment of course
- Dr. Bramson said that the institutional commitment needs to therefore be that the applications are submitted with a reasonable timeline

- Kathy Charters noted that there is a practical reality – time is also need to build a budget
- Dr. Collins said that we have to try to become more enforceable
- Dr. Porter said not as much with ORFs: applicants have leverage and it's hard to say no; while it's a good idea to become tougher, balance is needed
- Greg Weiler said that it gets forgotten that they're not the only person applying; if the application lands at the last minute the quality and reputation are not reviewed – it's not a good scene
- Vivian Lewis noted that a compromise position is needed and that we not offend faculty
- Dr. Elbestawi suggested that an email is drafted (by Gay Yuyitung & Kathy Charters) that can then be run by URC
- Transformative university applications – should we request more discipline with those?
- Dr. Preston said that it's one of the priorities in Engineering: increase the number of faculty able to get proposals done; the biggest mistake is that they leave support letters too late; they have an internal deadline; provide assistance with industry letters; help junior researchers; sometimes they need help from the VPR i.e. a good research idea but no partner – the VPR's office can help
- Kathy Charters said she will work on something and send it to the ADRs

Jobs and Prosperity Fund

- \$2.5 billion over 10 years
- Only one that allows partnership with research institutions – cited Jonathan Bramson and BEAM
- VPR will help with participation in these projects

Research Administration Update

Gay Yuyitung – MILO

- referred to Mark Schankerman and incentives for staff at MILO; the university's goals are not aligned with Schankerman's innovation incentives; not a goal at McMaster therefore incentive plan won't work
- Dr. Elbestawi noted that the IP Policy is in the process of being revised; discussion with the 2 VPs from the hospitals; asked what's important here? The business of promoting research results vs generating dollars. Should be talking about recovering \$\$ already spend
- Stanford and MIT don't have liberal policies
- Dr. Bramson said we need a clear statement of what MILO represents; Dr. Elbestawi noted that they are trying to fix this and said that McMaster has the largest number of licenses in Canada
- Gay said that MILO is working on 2 CECRs (Heather Sheardown and Qiyin Fang)
- Greg Weiler noted that CECRs are large proposals – often a project management problem; need

to legitimize someone as a project manager

- Dr. Elbestawi said the CECRs do not include the indirect costs of research; basically you only get bragging rights
- Gay spoke about an RFP with Abigail Payne and Magdalena Janus
- MILO needs more communication around the activities they're doing; how do they promote all activity in MILO
- Dr. Elbestawi said there are weakness in the system; information is not disseminated by Faculties

Kathy Charters - ROADS

- Following up on ORF
- Email she's sending out will encourage people to attend workshops
- ORF results should be out shortly
- For NSERC Discovery and SSHRC Insight ROADS does a satisfaction survey; will sent that out
- Canada Research Chairs: reallocation of Chairs this spring
- CFI-JELF: finished the February competition
- Working for June – the allocation was depleted in some Faculties
- Dr. Deane asked about the CRC reallocation – is there an inkling as to the numbers?
- Kathy said that they do try to forecast internally; it varies where they go internally ie between Tri-Council allocations; no firm sense of where the allocations are going

Barb McKenna – Research Finance

- Handed in the budget submissions; a significant portion goes to Faculties
- Federal government – overhead is \$12.5M; the current rate is 19.833%, should be 46%
- Federal Indirect Costs of Research is changing its name to the Research Support Fund and they are enhancing performance reporting

Vivian Lewis – University Librarian

- Spoke about the Tri-Agency Open Access Policy on Publications – peer reviewed scholarly access free to reader
- Book chapters and conference proceedings – No
- Mandate not to go back in time
- After May 2015: have to put in one of two places within 12 months
 - 1) at the institution
 - 2) open access journal
- ResearchGate is social media, doesn't count; posting to a personal webpage also doesn't count

- Which version? Full text not formatted by publisher; library is working how to make decisions simpler
- Who pays? Free to the reader but not to the producer or author
- Can put charges into grant applications
- Open access numbers go up each year; allow self-archiving
- Journals aware of this; Canada is far behind
- The library is connecting with ROADS; help direct faculty with grant writing etc
- Gay Yuyitung noted that Sarah O'Byrne in her office is also working with Vivian Lewis; there will have to be workshops
- Dr. Deane spoke about endorsing the Berlin Declaration at the upcoming Senate
- Dr. Elbestawi closed the meeting and announced that this would be his last University Research Council meeting and thanked the committee for their hard work