

**SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND
GRADUATE STUDIES
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
Thursday, March 11, 2021
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
MS Teams Online**

| Voting Member Quorum 7 members | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Paul Adams Daniel Bernstein – Chair Deepak Gupta Deborah Henderson Victor Martinez Karen Meijer-Kline Joel Murray | Paul Ohler Mandeep Pannu Mark Vardy Diane Purvey Elizabeth Worobec | |
| | | Non-voting |
| | | David Burns |
| Regrets | Senate Office | Guests |
| Sundeep Varaich | Meredith Laird | Tara Lyons Jim Rahaman |

1. Call to Order

The Chair opened the meeting with a Territorial Acknowledgement and called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Deborah Henderson moved the agenda be confirmed as presented.

The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes, January 14, 2021

Joel Murray moved the minutes be accepted as presented.

The motion carried.

4. Chair's Report

Daniel Bernstein provided a verbal report. He highlighted the success of the work of the committee to advance the Definition of Post-Doctoral Fellow through endorsement by Senate, that work performed in editing journals advances research at KPU, and encouraged members to consider how this committee could be of benefit in their own research and might therefore advance research generally within the institution as a whole.

He informed the committee that the Senate Subcommittee on Governance and Nominating had discussed the proposal to create a subcommittee for Nominations to the Royal Society and

concluded that this process should be managed through the Office of Research Services with the support of the Senate Standing Committee on Research and Graduate Studies. The Chair requested that members volunteer to take on the action items identified by the committee in order to share the work among the membership.

Action: Daniel Bernstein, Deepak Gupta, Diane Purvey, Tara Lyons, and David Burns will read and provide feedback on the Draft Payments to Participants Guideline.

5. Associate Vice-President, Research, Innovation and Graduate Studies Report

The committee received the written report. Deepak Gupta highlighted progress made on the simplified flat-rate replacement cost model, the draft animal care policy and procedure which will be coming through the appropriate groups for review and approval, and the development of experiential learning guides and templates that are also applicable to research. He shared that the guides and tutorials from the Association for College Research on Responsible and Ethical Conduct of College Research are available online for use by students and faculty members and that the University library has created a subject guide on program development in graduate studies. He suggested the committee may wish to invite representatives from the Office of Planning and Accountability to share results from 2020 Teaching, Learning, Scholarship and Research survey.

5.1. Attestation Letter for In-Kind Contributions

Deepak Gupta shared that the need to track in-kind contributions to comply with Tri-Council requirements was identified in the most recent BPAS audit, and suggested that attestation letters could meet the obligations without imposing a significant burden on researchers or community partners.

The committee discussed tracking both proposed and actual contributions through the life cycle of projects, the preference for simplicity in any solutions developed and using the data on in-kind contributions provided to KPU from industry partners as another metric of community engagement.

6. Chair, Ethics Research Board Report

The committee received the written report. Tara Lyons shared the recent changes to Covid-19 application research turnaround times will mean that not every Covid-related study will be fast-tracked. The Research Ethics Board is planning to review all the REB templates including Romeo, and will focus on course-based research consent forms and guidelines.

The committee discussed the strategy of eliciting feedback from those who use the documents most, who teach courses that involve course-based research, that the Teaching & Learning Commons might also provide feedback and the process of onboarding for new faculty members through HR might be one way to engage faculty throughout the institution.

Tara Lyons informed the committee that a revised consent form template is currently being reviewed by an outside legal firm and that revisions may be suggested following that review.

7. New Business

7.1. Draft Payments to Participants Guideline

Jim Rahaman shared a presentation with the committee, providing background to the creation of the draft guidelines and highlighted the aspects of confidentiality and compliance that it proposes to address. He reminded the committee that payments to individuals of amounts under \$500 per year do not require reporting to the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA), as long as participants are not in an employee or contractor relationship with the University.

The committee discussed how to communicate this broadly throughout the institution and that the REB might have a role in noting applications where payment might be expected to exceed the annual maximum for the CRA waiver, the difference between payments to corporate entities and to individuals, and where the authority for approving payments to participants resides.

7.2. AVPIRGs Action items from White Paper, Funding Research and Scholarship

Deepak Gupta shared that he hopes discussion of the White Paper action items will be an ongoing discussion item of this committee, and that the categories of discussion would be grad studies, research centers and institutions, infrastructure and supports. He shared that the 2019 Teaching, Learning, Scholarship, and Research Survey has been helpful in flagging the need for increased investment in property, time, and financial support. The results of the 2020 survey demonstrate that modest progress has been made.

The committee discussed whether the Teaching and Learning Commons is a suitable analogue for the role of the Office of Research Services within the institution, the general attitude towards research within the institution, how to anchor research within a polytechnic, teaching-focused institution, and how an endowment might solve the threat that some perceive research poses to adequate supports for teaching, student experience and student success.

The committee discussed support for grant-writing, the usefulness of institutional “seed funding” in allowing projects to develop to a size to enable application for external funding, the need to support Canada Research Chairs to ensure their success, the role of the foundation and its connection to the ORS, how Professional Development funding as a support and enabler of research, the role of students in research and the need to educate the broader KPU community that educating students about research is teaching.

7.3. SSCRGS Action items from White Paper

The Chair informed the committee that Senate has endorsed several of the recommendations of the White Paper and sent others to committees for consideration and action. Two items that Senate referred to SSCRGS will become standing items for this committee to discuss and act upon.

The committee discussed whether Senate should request or recommend that all departments develop formalized plans related to research, how to broaden the conversation about what constitutes research, how the student perspective could be included in the conversation, and the role of program review and curricular review in updating courses and programs to include a research component.

Action: Diane Purvey will bring the conversation about academic departments developing a formalized research plan to the Deans Council and will report back to this committee.

7.4. Sharing Ongoing Research at KPU

Daniel Bernstein reminded the committee of its previous conversation about how it might inform itself about ongoing research within the University and the suggestion that it might issue invitations and agreed that members of the committee may begin to share their own research within the committee as a way to start this initiative.

Action: Chair to speak with Paul Ohler about his availability to present his research to the committee.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:54 p.m.