

COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

AGENDA

Monday, May 27, 2019

8:30 am – 10:30 am

AH 527

	Agenda Items	Materials
1	Introductions	
2	Approval of Agenda	
3	Approval of the Meeting Minutes of March 7, 2019	<i>Appendix A</i>
4	Chair's Report (R. Blake) Introductions	
5	Faculty of Education – SIDRU organization name change (A. Couros)	<i>Appendix B</i>
6	Resource Research Impact – (C. Yost, I. Al-Anbagi, K. Irwin)	<i>Appendix C</i>
7	Council Committee on Research yearend report to Executive Council (Include prioritization of research challenges)	<i>Appendix D</i>
8	Business Arising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Open Access Report forwarded to VPR b. New Cluster Approved at E of C c. New Director for UR Press 	
9	Vice-President (Research) Report (D. Malloy)	
10	Report on Undergraduate Research – (K.McNutt)	
11	Terms of Reference for CCR committee	
12	SSHRC – Research Revenue Theme – (S. Gray)	
13	Indigenous Research Showcase – (S. Gray)	
14	CFI –JELF Internal Review of Potential Applications – (S. Gray)	<i>Appendix E</i>
	New Business	
	Adjournment	

CCR Sub-Committees

Standing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CFI - NSERC Research Tools and Instruments - Research Trust Fund/Sabbatical Research Grant 	Ad-hoc <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research Impact - Research Space Allocation - Terms of Reference
--	--

Distribution

Dave Malloy, VPR Kathy McNutt, AVPRD Sally Gray, Director of Research Office Nicholas Jones, Arts Adrian Pitariu, Business Administration Twyla Salm, Education Amr Henni, Engineering & Applied Science Kathleen Irwin, Media, Art, and Performance Darren Candow, Kinesiology & Health Studies Karen Eisler, Nursing Cory Butz, Science Ken Rasmussen, Johnson Shoyama Graduate School	Miguel Sanchez, Social Work Cara Bradley, Library David Meban, Campion College Andrew Miller, First Nations University of Canada Yvonne Harrison, Luther College Ian Germani, Director HRI Sandra Zilles, CRC Rep. Raymond Blake, Chair - Arts Chris Yost, Council Member , Science Raghavi Kemala Rajakumar, GSA Irfan Al-Anbagi – Council Member, Engineering & Applied Science
---	---



MINUTES

COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Minutes of the Meeting of
Thursday, March 7, 2019
AH 527

Present: R. Blake (Chair), C. Bradley, N. Jones, I. Al-Anbagi, S. Gray, T. Salm, K. Irwin, Y. Harrison, A. Pitariu, K. Irwin, B. Jeffery, I. Germani

Resource: P. Splett (Research Office), recorder

Guest Speaker: Jérôme Melançon, Special Advisor

Regrets: D. Malloy, K. McNutt, C. Yost, D. Candow, Raghavi Kemala Rajakumar, S. Zilles, C. Butz, K. Rasmussen, D. Meban, A. Miller, A. Henni

1. Introductions

2. Approval of Agenda

Jones/Harrison - *moved approval of the agenda*

CARRIED

3. Approval of the Minutes from January 8, 2019

Harrison/Bradley - *moved approval of the minutes with minor revision*

CARRIED

4. Chair's Report (Raymond Blake)

The Chair's report is attached. The Chair advised members that Pam Splett from the Research Office will continue to issue a call to Committee members for agenda items to consider at the upcoming meetings, and that the elected members of CCR will continue to set the agenda for each meeting. The Chair reiterated the importance of staying connected with External Relations and recommended that CCR make it a part of its regular schedule to invite representatives from External Relations to the January meeting of CCR to discuss the importance of including communications about research to the university community and beyond as part of its regular tasks. It is also important that research be an integral part of the University's communication strategy and the Chair advised that CCR remain vigilant and work to ensure that research activities be considered an important factor in the University of Regina's Strategic Plan. The CCR committee must have a voice on the ER Communication plan.

5. Business Arising – None.

6. Vice-President (Research) Report – Attached

The VPR's written report was circulated with the Agenda package and members had the opportunity to peruse the report before the meeting. The VPR's Report noted several points, including:

- The Provincial Auditor's Report on Research indicates the University of Regina has implemented all recommendations from the 2013 audit.
- Research highlights

7. Terms of Reference for CCR committee – Tabled carried forward.

8. Review performance of the emerging cluster Identity: Living Heritage/Communities (Kathleen Irwin) Guest speaker: Jérôme, Special Advisor

Dr. Melançon attended the meeting and provided an update on the recent developments leading to the establishment of a new research cluster, Living Heritage: Identities, Communities, Environments.

In the presentation, the following points were made:

- The Cluster was established in 2016 and having it recognized formally by the University establishes a formal review performance process for the Cluster;
- Members of the Cluster have contributed numerous publications, including many peer reviewed publications and exhibitions, performances and curations. The Cluster will be beneficial to U of R researchers;
- Currently, there are 52 researchers associated with the Cluster representing many different approaches, practices and productions that link directly to community and heritage. Also active within the Cluster are a number of researchers who focus on Indigenization;
- Researchers at First Nations University and Gabriel Dumont Institute are members of the Cluster and will be able to maintain links to Indigenous communities;
- The establishment of the Cluster will better help in building collaborations and partnerships across the University community;
- The Cluster has already exhibited considerable success since it was established in research productivity scholarship, and performance;
- The Cluster special advisors will continue to engage with VPR on how to make the cluster thrive at the university level and across faculties and institute.

After the presentation, which was well-received, there followed a general discussion. CCR then moved the following motion :

“To establish Living Heritage: Identities, Communities, Environments as a new strategic research cluster at the University of Regina.”

Irwin/Jones

– *moved to establishment of new cluster*

CARRIED

9. NSERC – Research Revenue Theme – Comprehensive yearly report – (S. Gray)

As part of CCR's objective of tracking . Tri-Council Results at the University, Sally Gray, Director, Research Office, presented a comprehensive report on NSERC. The following points were made in the presentation and discussion. A copy of the Report is attached.

- Over-view of Tri-Agency NSERC and NSERC programs and results from 2014-2015 to present were presented;
- Revenue totals are the totals in the year the grant was awarded;

Other Tri-Council results will be considered in subsequent meetings as well as contracts and other contributions to research.

10. Research Challenges - Update (C. Yost)

It has been CCR's objective throughout the year to identify and report on challenges faced by researchers at the University. As part of that process, Dr. Chris Yost issued a call on the CCAM moodle site to Council Members to submit their experiences on research challenges occurring at the university. Researchers identifies several common challenges that impeded their research activities and output, including:

- The lack of support for graduate, undergraduate and postdoctoral funding opportunities;
- Time required to deal with the bureaucracy and reporting;
- The failure of the University to deal with issues of equity, diversity and inclusion;
- The absence of an adequate research communications strategy to promote the activities and accomplishment of researchers.

The full report is attached and, after discussion, it was agreed the CCR Committee will prioritize the research challenges that has been identified at the next meeting of CCR and prepare a report for the VPR.

11. Direct Open Access Publishing (C. Yost, C. Bradley)

CCR received a written report on Direct Open Access Publishing from C. Yost and C. Bradley. The goal of the report was to give University of Regina faculty, students, and staff an overview of the broader open access publishing landscape, as well as insight into the Canadian and University of Regina contexts, in order to generate discussion and debate about how the University might respond, and ideally lead, in a rapidly changing scholarly publication ecosystem. The report, which is attached, made the following points:

- In 2015, changes were made to publishing journal articles;
- Europe is a clear leader in the field, mandating that research council funding required open access publishing; Canada has not yet developed a policy but will have to do so soon;
- Libraries are aware of coming need for open-access publishing and the increased cost of such changes to publishing research outcomes'
- The implications of Direct Open Access could be costly:
 - Cost \$2,300 - \$2,500 per journal
 - President Publication fund is less than \$10,000
 - Library is working on developing a service;

The report highlighted a number of issues about which the University must be aware in regards to open-access publishing:

- It is an issue for which ACCRU and VP (Research) must begin to develop a policy;
- The University must be in communication with Tri-Agencies on the matter of open-access publishing and how provides funding;
- Similarly, the University must be in communications with Provincial Government to make them aware of the impact open-access publishing will have for researchers;
- The university must also educate non-academia community of this issue and how it may affect them.

The report also identified two issues that will require University attention:

- Violation of copyright
- Predatory publishing

Following discussion, there was a motion “To accept report on Direct Open Access, to append to the Research Challenges, and to forward the report to VP Research.”

Harrison/Irwin – *moved to send this report to the VP Research*

CARRIED

12. Resource Research Impact preliminary report (Jones, Al-Anbagi, Irwin)

The CCR Committee on Resource Research Impact presented a preliminary and oral report. It noted there was concern on acknowledging certain types of research, notably:

- Indigenous Research;
- Community-Based Research;
- Artistic research; and
- Undergraduate and Graduate student research

In its oral report, it noted the following:

- The necessity for further development of Indigenous Research which is part of the University’s Research Strategic Plan;
- The possibility of creating a subcommittee to consult with Human Resources to determine if the Annual Information Forms (AIF) could be used to create a systematic way of reporting research;
- The necessity of finding ways and means to report student research;
- The possibility of a creating a publication database within the new Grants Management System;
- The possibility of streamlining the AIF into the Grants Management system to include research impacts;
- The necessity of cataloguing research outputs in a meaningful way.

In the discussion that followed, it was noted that it is important that the Board of Governors understand the extent and quality of research the University and fully understand the general research culture at the University. It was noted that there might exist among the Board of Governors a lack of knowledge about the range and diversity of research at the University. It was noted in general discussion that CCR would like to work with the VPR to showcase research activities of faculty and students to the Board. It was noted, too, that the discussion of research performance presented to the Board was more quantitative than qualitative.

13. Volunteers for CFI-JELF review committee

- Irfan Al-Anbagi and Adrian Pitariu volunteered for this committee.

14. New Business

- There has been a sudden departure of Bruce Walsh as director of University of Regina Press and a new job posting for Director for U of R Press had been issued. CCR would be updated on the process at the next meeting.

Adjournment

Irwin/Pitariu – *moved to adjourn.*

Approved by the
Faculty of Education
University of Regina
December 4, 1985

Revised November 24, 1988
Revised June 26, 1990
Revised June 28, 1991
Revised April 16, 2019
Revised May 12, 2019

**CONSTITUTION:
CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, COLLABORATION, &
DEVELOPMENT
FACULTY OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF REGINA**

1. NAME AND DESIGNATION

The name of the organization shall be the Centre for Educational Research, Collaboration, and Development, of the Faculty of Education at the University of Regina. In keeping with the University of Regina's policy on research institutes and centre, the designation of the organization shall be that of a faculty-based research centre.

2. PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the Centre is to support the growth and development of educational researchers and research communities in conducting educational research and development projects that are meaningful to and serve the needs of diverse communities in local, provincial, national, and/or international contexts.

In particular, the mission of the Centre shall include:

- 2.1 Promoting and supporting meaningful and relevant educational research in the Faculty of Education and beyond;
- 2.2 Providing enhanced opportunities for faculty members to undertake research activities and for student researchers to gain experience and competency in supporting and engaging in research and development projects;
- 2.3 Working collaboratively with the Faculty of Education's Research and Graduate Programs to attract and support graduate students through the generation of funding opportunities such as scholarships, awards, fellowships, visiting scholars, and postdoctoral appointments;

- 2.4 Increasing the impact of the Faculty's research by disseminating research findings to researchers, practitioners, and communities through traditional and open-access publications, professional learning events, public lectures, community engagement initiatives, webinars, and other means;
- 2.5 Supporting the development of Faculty-based research clusters to facilitate connections and collaboration amongst faculty and student researchers with complementary interests;
- 2.6 Securing external sources of revenue for the Faculty through the facilitation of research and professional service contracts with various partners; and
- 2.7 Building the reputation of the Faculty of Education (and by extension the University of Regina) as a leader in educational research and development.

3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Centre adheres to the guiding principles of the Faculty of Education's mission and vision statements, with a strong emphasis on the following: the enhancement of teaching and learning; an overarching focus on Indigenization and decolonization; the pursuit of a more equitable and just society; the development of engaged citizens; and the respectful and critical engagement in local, provincial, national, and international communities.

4. FACILITIES AND FINANCES

- 4.1 The Faculty of Education of the University of Regina shall provide the physical facilities to accommodate the Centre and shall encourage and support the participation of academic staff in the Centre's activities.
- 4.2 Sources of funds administered by the Centre will include revenue from grants-in-aid and revenue from contract research and services.

5. ORGANIZATION

The Centre, as a University entity, shall follow the rules and regulations of the University of Regina. In particular, the Centre shall be guided by the University of Regina's policy relating to research institutes and centres.

5.1 Director

- 5.1.1 There shall be a Director, to be appointed for a three-year term, and subject to renewal at the end of said term, by the Dean of the Faculty of Education, University of Regina. The Director shall exercise authority over the Centre and its operations. The Director shall report regularly to the Management Board.

5.2 Management Board

- 5.2.1 The membership and quorum of the Management Board shall be composed of:
- (a) The Dean of the Faculty of Education, University of Regina (Chair)
 - (b) The Director of the Centre
 - (c) The Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Programs, Faculty of Education, University of Regina
 - (d) Two elected faculty members from the Faculty of Education, University of Regina
- 5.2.2 The primary role of the Management Board will be to provide oversight of the direction of the Centre and of such operational, financial, and contractual matters as deemed necessary by the Board.
- 5.2.3 The Management Board will meet at least twice yearly and at the request of any Management Board member as issues arise.
- 5.2.4 The Dean of the Faculty of Education shall serve as chair of the Management Board.
- 5.2.5 The Management Board shall have the power to establish terms of reference for ad hoc committees for the purpose of the Centre's operations and strategic planning.
- 5.3 Provincial Advisory Board
- 5.3.1 There shall be a Provincial Advisory Board designed to maintain the Centre within the communicative and influence network of education in Saskatchewan. The membership of the advisory board may be revised in the future to include national and international members depending upon the types and breadth of activities that the Centre undertakes.
- 5.3.2 The Provincial Advisory Board shall be composed of:
- (a) The Director of the Centre (Chair)
 - (b) The Dean of the Faculty of Education, University of Regina
 - (d) The Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Programs, Faculty of Education, University of Regina
 - (e) One elected faculty member from the Faculty of Education, University of Regina
 - (f) A representative from each of the following:
 - College of Education, University of Saskatchewan;
 - Indigenous Education, First Nations University of Canada (FNUC);
 - League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents (LEADS);

- Ministry of Education, Government of Saskatchewan;
- Saskatchewan Educational Leadership Unit (SELU);
- Saskatchewan Professional Development Unit (SPDU)
- Saskatchewan School Boards Association (SSBA); and
- Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation (STF)

5.3.3 The task of the Provincial Advisory Board shall be to provide advice on strategic directions with respect to the role and function of the Centre.

5.3.4 The Provincial Advisory Board shall meet at least once per year and at the request of the Chair of the Board.

5.4 Constitutional change

5.4.1 As necessary, the Management Board shall review and amend the constitution of the Centre. Constitutional amendments must be reviewed and approved by the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Education.

6. STAFF

6.1 As projects are undertaken, staff shall be employed by (or become associated with) the Centre as need dictates. The association may be intermittent or full time over the life of the project. In all projects, attempts shall be made to include in a direct way individuals or their representatives from the communities impacted by or involved in the research. Appointments may include (but will not be limited to):

6.1.1 Faculty researchers: As the Centre develops research partnerships with various entities, faculty members with compatible research interests and capacities will be invited to carry out research contracts.

6.1.2 Students: Where appropriate and whenever possible, graduate and undergraduate students will be invited to take on research support roles.

6.1.3 Administrative/technical staff: As needs arise, additional staff will be contracted to take on specific administrative and/or technical roles related to the Centre's activities.

6.2 Staff shall be responsible to the Director for work commissioned under the aegis of the Centre.

7. REPORTING

The Centre shall produce and disseminate an annual report to the Provincial Advisory Board, to the Dean of Education, and to other interested agencies.

Approved by the
Faculty of Education
University of Regina
December 4, 1985

Revised November 24, 1988
Revised June 26, 1990
Revised June 28, 1991

**CONSTITUTION FOR
SASKATCHEWAN INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT & RESEARCH UNIT
OF THE
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF REGINA**

1. NAME

The name of the organization shall be the Saskatchewan Instructional Development & Research Unit of the Faculty of Education, University of Regina.

2. PURPOSES

In general, the Unit shall be an agency for instructional development and for research having to do with teaching and its impact on learning.

In particular, the mission of the Unit shall include:

- 2.1 conducting development activities and research relevant to classroom instruction in Saskatchewan
- 2.2 establishing and maintaining the capability to provide effective consultative service for information about research findings and new developments in instruction and learning theory and their applicability to Saskatchewan
- 2.3 disseminating research findings, methodological approaches, and critical analyses to researchers and practitioners through publications, training events, and other means
- 2.4 facilitating cooperation among individuals, groups, and organizations in identifying research needs and resources, and in undertaking appropriate projects
- 2.5 providing opportunity for research training for graduate students in education
- 2.6 identifying, securing and distributing research funds.

3. FACILITIES AND FINANCES

- 3.1 The Faculty of Education of the University of Regina shall provide the physical facilities to accommodate the Unit and shall permit such participation of the academic staff as is deemed necessary and appropriate.
- 3.2 Sources of funds administered by the Unit may include revenue from grants-in-aid, revenue from contract research, and charges for Unit services and facilities.

4. ORGANIZATION

The organization of the Unit, as a University entity, follows the rules and regulations of the University of Regina. In addition, a prime consideration with respect to organization shall be the relationship to be built and retained with the educational agencies in the province.

4.1 Director

There shall be a Director, to be appointed annually by the President, on the recommendation of the Dean of Education, University of Regina. The Director shall exercise overall authority over the Unit and its operations. The Director shall be responsible to the Dean.

4.2 Provincial Advisory Board

4.2.1 There shall be a Provincial Advisory Board designed to maintain the Unit within the communicative and influence network of education in Saskatchewan. It is essential that it include representatives from all educational agencies and from the teaching profession.

4.2.2 The Provincial Advisory Board shall be composed of

- (a) the Dean of Education, University of Regina (Chair)
- (b) the Director of the Unit (Secretary)
- (c) the Associate Vice-President of Research and Graduate Studies, University of Regina
- (d) the Manager of Graduate Programs, Faculty of Education
- (e) the Chairperson of the Education Program Policy Advisory Committee (EPPAC)
- (f) a representative from each of the following agencies:
 - Faculty of Education, University of Regina
 - College of Education, University of Saskatchewan
 - Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation (STF)
 - Saskatchewan School Trustees Association (SSTA)
 - League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents (LEADS)

- Saskatchewan Education, Government of Saskatchewan
 the directors of the Saskatchewan Educational Leadership Unit (SELU)
 and the Saskatchewan Professional Development Unit (SPDU)
- (g) such representatives at large as the Chair of the Provincial Advisory Board, on recommendation from the Provincial Advisory Board, shall approve.

The terms of representatives in items (f) and (g) shall be for no more than 3 years and may be renewed.

4.2.3 The task of the Provincial Advisory Board shall be to provide policy advice on the role and function of the unit.

4.2.4 The Provincial Advisory Board shall meet at least twice per year and at the request of the Chair of the Board.

5. STAFF

- 5.1 It is intended that, as projects are undertaken, staff will be employed by (or become associated with) the Unit as need dictates. The association may be intermittent or full time over the life of the project. In all projects, attempts shall be made to include in a direct way the individuals or their representatives who are to benefit from the project. Teachers may be seconded to the Unit, graduate students involved, Saskatchewan Education personnel assigned on attachment.
- 5.2 Staff shall be responsible to the Director for work commissioned under the aegis of the Unit.

6. REPORTING

The Unit shall provide an annual report to the President of the University of Regina, to the Provincial Advisory Board, and to other interested agencies.

**REPORT OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (CCR)
SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH IMPACT
May 22, 2019 (Draft)**

**Implementation of Recommendations in
The Report of the Subcommittee on Research Impact (2016)**

Prepared for the CCR by:

Dr. Irfan Al-Anbagi

Dr. Kathleen Irwin

Dr. Nick Jones

INTRODUCTION:

The sub-committee of the Council Committee on Research (CCR) was asked to look at ways in which research undertaken at the University of Regina, as well as its impact, is reported to the University's Board of Governors (BOG) in accordance with one of the strategic priorities (research impact) identified in the University of Regina's 2015 – 2020 Strategic Plan: "*Peyak Aski Kikawina – Together We Are Stronger*". Research impact is defined in the strategic plan as, "An intellectually active and innovative research community with the supports and infrastructure to expand the boundaries of knowledge and to have meaningful impact at home and beyond."¹ Ensuring the Board of Governors receives a complete, clear, and substantive account of research – and its impact - was of noted concern by CCR as the Board of Governors, in no small measure, determines the strategic direction and allocation of resources that the University takes based on information provided to them.

Two concerns noted in CCR discussions triggered the creation of the second subcommittee on research impact. The first was the recognition by the Council Committee on Research (CCR) that, while the VP Research reports quarterly to the Board of Governors, it uses a limited range of categories that fail to capture the scope of research undertaken by all researchers on campus. The second trigger was a lack of clarity regarding the methods currently used to gather information related to various forms of research output – leading to impact – at the university. The office of the VP Research appears to gather information – other than that easily provided by the Research Office (number of grant/contracts and dollar values of them) as well as requests to faculty (identifying research collaborations with international scholars) - in a manner that appears ad hoc at best, and the sub-committee is considering ways to improve the process.

The goal of this report for the CCR are twofold:

1. To review the 2016 CCR subcommittee report, identifying the issues raised and provide possible means to address those issues.
2. To enable the Office of the VP Research to fully and accurately report successes representative of the entire scope of research across the university as well as aligned with

¹ University of Regina's Strategic Plan "*peyak aski kikawina - Together we are Stronger*" (URSP 2015-2020).

the University of Regina's Strategic Research Plan: *Peyak Aski Kikawina – Together We Are Stronger Serving Through Research*” that acknowledges that “research encompasses creative endeavours and other scholarly activities that foster new knowledge”, and has “meaningful impact at home and beyond”² to the Board of Governors, to government, and to the public.

Process:

The subcommittee undertook a review of the 2016 report of the CCR Subcommittee on Research Impact³ as a starting point to guide this current investigation as it provided previous context as well as the opportunity to examine if any of the previous subcommittee's recommendations had been implemented. The 2016 Report flagged two main areas of concern with regard to the adequate recording of research Impact: 1) Indigenous Research⁴, and 2) community-engaged research. To these, the subcommittee would like to suggest a third under recorded area: artistic/creative research.

Looking for ways to implement components of the 2016 report, we have consulted with: 1) the Community Research Unit (CRU); 2) the Faculty of Media, Art, and Performance (MAP); and 3) the Office of Indigenization. This represents a cursory first step in developing consensus around how to efficiently and reliably report on that which is, at times, process rather than result oriented, pertains to relationships rather than concrete outcomes and has long term social impact that resists short term quantification.

In order to address the seemingly “ad hoc” nature by which research-related materials are provided to the VPR's office, we engaged with individuals associated with these processes to determine if there were missed opportunities in terms of making the collection of information more systematic. We also reviewed numerous quarterly reports provided to the BOG – specifically the “research highlights” to identify the additional materials reported outside of the standard four measures reported on regularly.

What is currently being captured in the reports to the BOG?

The research reports – presented quarterly to the Board of Governors – is broken into a number of standing sections including: 1) Status report on the response to the Provincial Auditor's Report on Research, 2) Report on the status of action plans to actualize the Strategic Research

² University of Regina's Strategic Plan “peyak aski kikawina - Together we are Stronger” (URSP 2015-2020).

³ Report of The CCR Subcommittee on Research Impact:

https://www.uregina.ca/research/assets/docs/pdf/Report%20on%20Research%20Impact%20June%2016_3.pdf

⁴ Indigenization is “the transformation of the existing academy by including Indigenous knowledges, voices, critiques, scholars, students and materials as well as the establishment of physical and epistemic spaces that facilitate the ethical stewardship of a plurality of Indigenous knowledges and practices so thoroughly as to constitute an essential element of the university. It is not limited to Indigenous people, but encompasses all students and faculty, for the benefit of our academic integrity and our social viability” (URSP 2015-2020, ft 3, p. 9).

Plan, 3) Performance Measures, and 4) Highlights. Of interest to this subcommittee were the performance measures and highlights components. The “Performance Measures” include: 1) Research Impact/Sustainability (measure: research grants = total number of active, externally-funded research projects administered by the University), 2) Research Impact/Sustainability measure: research revenue = total research funding received from all active externally-funded research projects administered by the University), 3) Research Impact (measure: Average of Relative Citations (ARC) = The number of citations received by papers authored by University of Regina faculty during a 5-year period following the year of publication. Citation counts are normalized by the average number of citations received by all papers in the world in the same subfield. ARC values are 5-year averages with a 2-year lag), and 4) Research Impact (measure: International Research Collaborations = the percentage of total publications co-authored with researchers outside of Canada. Five-year average with a two-year lag). As noted above, the subcommittee is concerned the limited categories of reporting – not discounting the challenges that may be present in systematically collecting additional information – does not provide the Board of Governors with a sufficient overview of the research conducted at the UofR and its impact.

We undertook a review of numerous (2016 – 2018) posted reports to the BOG available on the UofR website focusing on the “highlights” section of the reports. We examined the reports using the categories (and suggested metrics/indicators) based on the CCR Subcommittee’s (2016) report that drew from performance review criteria documents across the university: 1) Research Impact on Disciplinary Knowledge and Academia, 2) Research Impact in a Professional Area of Expertise, 3) Research Impact on the Broader Community and Society, 4) Research Impact in the area of Public Policy, 5) Indigenous Research, and 6) Community-Based Research. The information in the “Highlights” section of the reports was organized under the categories and indicators as well as secondarily coded as individual, faculty, or university depending on the specifics of the entry.

With respect to the first category, Research Impact on Disciplinary Knowledge and Academia, the “highlights” primarily focused on reporting individual successes in receiving grants. While this information would be generally captured in the standing categories of research grants and research revenues, we do consider it worthwhile to celebrate these successes with the Board of Governors. Other indicators for the category (bibliometric indices, peer reviews of publications) may be captured to some degree in the average relative citation standing category, but this remains somewhat unclear. The vast majority of other indicators suggested by the previous subcommittee report are absent in the reporting (for example, editorship of a journal, supervising graduate students/training HQPs, and induction into academic societies).

With respect to the second category, research Impact in a professional area of expertise, the indicators contributions to invention and innovation in professional practice, professional prizes and awards, and membership on a professional association’s board, were featured on across numerous reports. What remained absent was the providing consultation, guidance, or knowledge to a professional association and technical reports.

With respect to the third category, research impact on the broader community and society, evidence of every suggested indicator was present in the highlights section across numerous

reports. These all focused on individual contributions; celebrating the work of faculty at the UofR.

With respect to the fourth category, research impact in the area of public policy, two of the three indicators were each represented by a single example over the numerous reports. In one instance, an institute was recognized, in the other, a faculty was recognized.

Contributions reflecting fine arts activity, while mentioned with a degree of regularity, were not formalized as a discrete category of endeavor.

Recognizing the sections that follow provide information with regard to what the 2016 Report referred to as “emerging areas” (with the exception of creative/artistic work), the fifth and sixth categories (Indigenous and community-based research respectively) were featured across the reviewed reports, albeit fairly limited in number and scope.

While the “highlights” section of the reports on research to the Board of Governors clearly do capture many of the indicators across many of the categories suggested in the 2016 report, what remains unclear is the process by which this information is/is not collected and provided to the VPR’s office for inclusion in the reports. As the categories and indicators emerged from performance review documents, it suggests the potential to use faculty annual information forms – once they become electronic – as a means for gathering this data systematically.

How to capture (and report on) Indigenous research?

In the Report of the CCR Subcommittee on Research Impact (June 2016), the following Indicators of research impact from Indigenous perspectives were suggested as ways to track, gather and report on Indigenous research:

1. Number of funded Indigenous graduate students; number of community projects with First Nations, Inuit, Metis organizations or communities;
2. Evidence of Indigenous project leadership (e.g., co-principal investigators from Aboriginal organizations, council members from First Nations);
3. The amount of the budget for supporting research in general that directly supports Indigenous organizations, researchers, communities and participants
4. Appropriate acknowledgement of Indigenous contributions to research publications through co-authorship with Indigenous research collaborators (community knowledge holders, researchers and community leaders); and
5. Publications for community use that include descriptions of research purpose, processes, results, and implications using an accessible language. Community resources can include newsletters, short videos and other recordings. It may be appropriate to support Indigenous language revitalization by making recordings and text of research findings available in Indigenous languages.

While this is a start towards recognizing the impact of Indigenous research, upon closer scrutiny, one may detect an unconscious bias towards European ways of knowing that does not necessarily value Indigenous methods. Included within the notion of Indigenous methodologies, embodied,

grounded and lived approaches are deployed against colonizing epistemologies and methodologies as a means of addressing the goals of enhanced human rights, equity and social justice in a variety of minority circumstances. Such research values the relationships formed (with people, environments and the more-than-human), understands knowledge mobilization as possible through means such as storytelling / counter storytelling and "naming one's own reality"—using narrative to illuminate and explore experiences of racial oppression (Delgado & Stefancic 1993). Valuing Indigenous research also exposes the overall acceptance of current, dominant academic research traditions that exclude “from knowledge production, the knowledge systems of the researched, colonized Other” (B. Chilisa, *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. 2012. Xvi). How do we, then, report inclusively on research not here-to-fore understood as meritorious?

In partial answer to this question, the following few suggestions were proposed in consultation with Emily Grafton in the Office of Indigenization (Feb.6, 2019)

Much has been written on how might Indigenous centered research practices differ from and produce knowledge not readily captured by means of the currently used research categories. Relationship building, storytelling techniques, and OCAP methodologies (Ownership, Control, Access, Possession) are examples of differences in approach. In order to shift the discourse in reporting Indigenous research, possible ways to capture this might include reporting activity using the following designations:

1. Research that addresses Reconciliation through the Truth and Reconciliation 94 Calls to Action; and
2. Research that is OCAP certified (<https://fnigc.ca/ocapr.html>)⁵

How to capture (and report on) Artistic research?⁶

The basic premise underlying the research done in MAP is that art has a positive influence on the individual and on society in terms of quality of living (economic), mental health (well-being, stress reduction) and increased social interaction. While, the transformative powers of the arts lie in the aesthetic experience, attitudes and motivations are enormously influenced in the encounter between the participant and the cultural event. The transformative effects of the arts do not dwell solely in the artifacts or performances themselves, the value of which is largely subjective, but in the bonds created between human beings in a local or global context, overtime (Nanna Kann-Rasmussen, 34).

⁵ The First Nations principles of OCAP® are a set of standards that establish how First Nations data should be collected, protected, used, or shared. They are the *de facto* standard for how to conduct research with First Nations.

⁶ *Measuring Cultural Engagement: A Quest for New Terms, Tools and Techniques*. National Endowment for the Arts and the Arts and Humanities Research Council.
<https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/measuring-cultural-engagement.pdf>

How to measure and report such impact includes the question of how to paint a broader picture of how people's lives are connected to the arts, how communities are formed, and how they interact through participation with the arts. For the sake of this report, practically-speaking, it is, also - how do we measure the value of art and report it effectively within the academic institution using clear and accessible language.

Given the scope of disciplines within arts practice - i.e. traditional forms as well as rapidly evolving art practices; emergent technology and new media platforms; and a shift among many artists to community-based interactions that blur the line between art, social justice and social work (CRB) – there is no simple answer.

Some measurements may be effective in regard to qualitative data:

1. What forms of funding supported the work –beyond the Tri-council.
2. Where / how the work was disseminated – local, national, international?
3. How many people saw/ heard it?
4. With whom did the artist researcher partner – locally, nationally, and globally?
5. How did the work express innovation?
6. How was the work impactful in the short term and how may it effect change in the future?
7. Has the work been acquired with a recognized art institution or art gallery?
8. Did it align with the University Strategic Plan, the University research objectives and clusters and, for example, the Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action?

Cutting to the chase, how might using these indicators work as a means for developing a matrix for reporting up and out. The challenge is how to collect this information from Faculty members engaging in art-making. Adding a section in the Annual Information Form (AIF) wherein it is definitively identified and briefly annotated so that it is readily understood by others outside arts disciplines would be useful. Systematically and regularly reporting on art research (as well as Indigenous and community-based research) at the level of the Board of Governors would underscore the relevance alongside STEM research. By improving and supporting the platforms by which graduating art projects are archived by the Archer Library's oURspace platform, anyone would be able to investigate current art practice easily online. With the understanding that practice-based art research is the equivalent to all other forms of knowledge may come enhanced funding opportunities and an expectation to see the work regularly reported and celebrated at all levels.

How to capture (and report on) community engaged research⁷

An “emerging form of research and research impact that needs closer attention is community-engaged research. As noted earlier, “commitment to our communities” is one of the three strategic priorities in the U of R Strategic Plan 2015-2020. The URSP also refers to “professional

⁷ Dr. Lynn Gidluck - the Acting Coordinator of the Community Research Unit in the Faculty of Arts – is primarily responsible for the development of this section. Dr. Michelle Stewart – Director, Community Research Unit – also provided input into this section.

recognition of community engaged research” as one of the success indicators in delivering its research impact objective” (CCR Subcommittee on Research Impact, 2016, p. 13).

Before one can begin to measure the impact of Community-based research (hereafter CBR), one must try and posit a definition – recognizing that many exist and it might not be fully agreed upon. CBR is “A research approach that involves active participation of stakeholders, those whose lives are affected by the issue being studied, in all phases of research for the purpose of producing useful results to make positive changes” (Nelson, Ochocka, Griffin & Lord, 1998, p.12)⁸. A community-based research approach recognizes the community as knowledge-rich partners, able to deliver insider knowledge to the shaping of the research purpose and questions, and by collaboratively refining theory (Ochocka & Janzen, 2014)⁹. Jointly, community and academic partners determine what they wish to learn and achieve through their research and together they develop a research framework and process that helps them reach their research goals. Some are looking for evidence that they can use to advocate for policy change. Others seek to document work and share with others what they believe works and does not work, with the objective of improving services (MacKinnon, 2018)¹⁰.

According to the literature (see for example Janzen, Ochocka & Stobbe, 2016¹¹; Ochocka & Janzen, 2014) there are three “hallmarks” of what CBR is.

- **Community-driven** – begin with a research topic of practical relevance to the community and promotes community self-determination.
- **Participatory** – community members and researchers equitably share control of the research agenda through active and reciprocal involvement in the research design, implementation, and dissemination.
- **Action-oriented** – the process and results are useful to community members in making positive social change and to promote social equity.

According to Beckman, Penney, and Cockburn (2011)¹², define the output in a typical CBR project as the report or findings from the research in whatever form given. Outcomes are considered as the effects of that research in the medium term. An example of an outcome is if the research is used to create or improve a program. Impact is defined as an accumulation of

⁸ Nelson, G., Ochocka, J., Griffin, K., & Lord, J. (1998). “Nothing about me, without me”: Participatory action research with self-help/mutual aid organizations for psychiatric consumer/survivors. *American journal of community psychology*, 26(6), 881-912.

⁹ Ochocka, J. & Janzen, R. (2014). Breathing life into theory: Illustrations of community-based research hallmarks, functions, and phases. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 7, 18-33.

¹⁰ MacKinnon, S. (Ed). (2018). *Practicing Community-Based Participatory Research: Stories of Engagement, Empowerment, and Mobilization*. Vancouver: Purich Books.

¹¹ Janzen, R., Ochocka, J., & Stobbe, A. (2016). Towards a theory of change for community-based research projects. *The Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-engaged Research, Teaching, and Learning* 2(2), 44-64.

¹² Beckman, M., Penney, N., & Cockburn, B. (2011). Maximizing the impact of community-based research. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(2), 83-104.

outcomes, and ultimately improved community well-being. Created as a collaborate effort of participants at a Canadian Summit - “Pursuing Excellence in Collaborative Community-Campus Research”, Janzen, Ochocka & Stobbe (2016) provide a framework of impact indicators for CBR. The following table represents an adapted version of their work with consideration given to the Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences (FHSS) (2017)¹³ report - Approaches to Assessing Impacts in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

Indicators of Research Outcomes in Community-Based Research Projects	
Outcome	Indicators
Greater mobilization of knowledge	Number and reported quality of knowledge mobilization products disseminated
	Number and reported quality of community members contributing to the development and dissemination of knowledge mobilization products to various audiences
	Media coverage of research (newspapers, TV, online)
	Requests for media appearances
	Research-related social media
	Public use of research-based web resources on social and cultural issues.
	Number and reported quality of visual and oral dissemination strategies
	Number and reported quality of community information sessions held
	Number of requests for knowledge mobilization products
	Number and reported quality of new connections brokered
	Reports of research being useful for multiple stakeholder groups
	Number of new stakeholders showing interest in the research results
	Number and reported quality of community forums or other knowledge exchange events held
	Reports of research products informing policy development (citations in government documents; Invitations to participate as an expert witness, and advisor, on an expert panel or committee; requests to consult for governments or think tanks; requests for commissioned reports).
	Reports of research products supporting new funding applications.
Greater mobilization of people	Evidence of Short-term mobilization
	Faculty serving advisory roles and/or holding board memberships in community-based organizations
	Reports of stakeholders implementing recommended action
	Reports of stakeholders having built CBR capacity and wanting to learn more about CBR
	Reports of stakeholders reconciling value dilemmas and agreeing to common goals despite different perspectives and interests

¹³ Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences. (May 2017). Approaches to Assessing Impacts in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Retrieved February 11, 2019, from http://www.ideas-idees.ca/sites/default/files/impact_report_en_final.pdf

	Reports of stakeholders valuing and owning the knowledge coming out of the project
	Reports of research products informing policy development (citations in government documents; Invitations to participate as an expert witness, and advisor, on an expert panel or committee; requests to consult for governments or think tanks; requests for commissioned reports).
	Evidence of Long-term Mobilization
	Number of community members acknowledging CBR as an important tool for change
	Reports of increased community capacity to enact change(s)
	Reports of decreased time-lag between research dissemination and policy changes
	Reports of CBR influencing local activities and policy
	Reports of revenue opportunities and cost savings in the public, private and not-for-profit sectors resulting from research applied in practice
	Reports of CBR influencing policy at the regional, national, or international level.

We might use these indicators as a means for developing a matrix or practice for moving forward. The issue remains with how to collect this information from Faculty member engaging in CBR. Adding a section in the AIF wherein CBR is definitively identified by Faculty members may provide a useful start. A forum that highlights and brings recognition CBR at the UofR could also be a catalyst for engaging faculty in a discussion regarding how to recognize and report CBR. External Relations could “cover” the forum and disseminate on/highlight the forum and/or some of the projects presented at the forum.

How the AIF might be used to capture research in a meaningful way.

The University is in the process of automating the performance review process. To accomplish this Human Resources and the Research Office have jointly purchased a database product called Converis from a company called Clarivate.

The plan is to have a fully functioning system that ties in Research Ethics Board/Animal Ethics approval; tracks the grants and contracts that are managed through the Research Office; and feeds the grants and contracts that a faculty member recorded in the Research Office directly into their AIF.

Converis is used at more than 100 organizations world-wide, including a number of universities in Canada (University of Calgary, University of Toronto, University of Saskatchewan, Wilfred Laurier, and University of Montreal).

At this point in time, HR is looking at taking a revised AIF and using that for the system. The revised AIF must be clear in what information is being requested in order to encourage academic staff members to enter more detailed information.

One area for further discussion is the AIF information and potential privacy concerns. Right now, the AIF is restricted to the Performance Review Process and individuals named in Article 17 of the collective agreement. The key consideration is to be thoughtful in how we expand the use of this form.

The reporting tool seems to have the potential to improve the data collection and dissemination process. The tool has the ability to facilitate research analysis, graduate student management, publication management, etc. We see an opportunity to improve the research impact by allowing faculty members to provide inputs on metrics that can be used to measure the research output in addition to the AIF data. We recommend that faculty members become aware of this tool and its potentials through proper training. A key component to successful data collection and management is to have a specialized central entity on campus to manage the tool and preserve users' privacy.

Summary/Conclusions/Recommendations

- Pending further investigation and in consultation with Human Resources around issues of privacy, this may include some kind of digital (and minable) universal AIF form (see below). This appears to be a moment of truth in regards to the development of the new AIF. If we are able to move nimbly in consultation with HR, we will be able to address a critical problem in achieving equitably represented research across all disciplines.
- The public talk by Kathryn Graham - facilitated by the office of the Vice-President Research - on February 7, 2019 provided a number of things that the UofR should consider in moving toward measuring and reporting on research impacts. For both good and bad, we should be aware that "What gets measured gets improved." Therefore, in light of our intent to proceed with measuring research impact, we must be considerate of that which we want to improve upon. It also suggests that we must be clear on what it is we value with regard to research. As noted above, we need to be inclusive in our definition of what research is, as well as, therefore, what metrics we consider to measure them.

Bibliography:

Sources culled from the CAUT Website:

Approaches to Assessing Impacts in the Humanities and Social Sciences (this is the one that Nic had on the meeting today - it looks very good).

http://www.ideas-idees.ca/sites/default/files/impact_report_en_final.pdf

Bibliometrics and research evaluation: Uses and abuses

Yves Gingras.

The MIT Press, 2016; 119 pp;

ISBN: 978-0-26203-512-5.

(not in Archer Library)

Measuring Cultural Engagement: A Quest for New Terms, Tools and Techniques. National Endowment for the Arts and the Arts and Humanities Research Council.

<https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/measuring-cultural-engagement.pdf>

Book review / Bibliometrics and research evaluation: Uses and abuses

<https://www.caut.ca/bulletin/2017/04/book-review-bibliometrics-and-research-evaluation-uses-and-abuses>

Lost in the Metrics

January 2018

CAUT Bulletin; Toronto [Vol. 65, Iss. 1,](#) (Jan 2018): 1-4.

https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.uregina.ca/docview/2104965378?accountid=13480&rfr_id=info%3Axri%2Fsid%3Aprimo

<https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.uregina.ca/docview/2104965378/fulltextPDF/F7E3CA1C7DAB47FEPQ/1?accountid=13480>

Nanna Kann-Rasmussen

<https://iccpr2018.sched.com/speaker/nanna.kann.rasmussen>

Graham, K. (2019). Assessing research and innovation impact. Research and Innovation Impact Symposium. February 07, 2019: Regina, SK. Power-point slides available at:

<https://www.uregina.ca/president/assets/docs/pdf/kathryn-graham-slides-1.pdf>

<https://www.uregina.ca/president/assets/docs/pdf/kathryn-graham-slides-2.pdf>

Report to Executive of Council
From
Council Committee on Research

19 June 2019

Purpose and Mission:

The Council Committee on Research (CCR) is responsible for providing strategic advice and recommendations on research initiatives, policy and matters at the University of Regina to Council and its representatives and the Vice-President (Research). CCR currently has a membership of twenty-three (23), including twelve (12) who are Ex Officio, six who are appointed by the Vice-President Research, three who are elected from Council, and one member appointed by the Graduate Students Association. Sally Gray, Director, Research Office, is also a member, and the CCR Administrative Coordinator is Pam Splett from the Research Office. At the outset, I must acknowledge the contribution of Sally Gray and Pam Splett for their generous and enthusiastic support to the Council Committee on Research.

Objectives for 2018-19 Academic Year:

When CCR met in September 2019, it largely dispensed with its regular agenda and engaged in a wide-ranging discussion of its role and purpose. In essence, the discussion focussed on the question: Would anyone notice – or care – if CCR disappeared? Over its recent history, CCR has been primarily a place to receive updates and reports on research and research-related matters. The agenda rarely dealt with actionable items and it did not serve as a sound-board on research matters nor has it been an advisory body to Council or to the Vice-President Research. Given how it was currently constituted and operated, there was general consensus that it would be of little consequence if CCR did not exist. Moreover, the feeling among many researchers was that it was not a particularly useful body and it would not be missed if it ceased to exist.

The Chair of CCR met with several Council Members and then VPR, David Malloy, and discussed the situation around CCR, and it was agreed that CCR's role and effectiveness should be the focus of our first meeting in September. At that meeting, several issues were raised and it was agreed that one of our goals for the year should be a course of action that would allow CCR to fulfill its mandate more effectively and advise Council on matters that would improve research and research culture at the University of Regina.

- A. It was agreed that the composition of CCR should be reviewed and that researchers in Council should have a greater presence in CCR. Currently, each of the associate dean (research and graduate students) is an Ex Officio member of CCR. A number of members of CCR are appointed by Council through the Vice-President (Research) or by others such as the representatives from the Federated Colleges. Of the 23 members of CCR, only 3 are elected. The role of the elected

members of Council is minimal in CCR and does not compare equally with the Council Committee on Academic Mission which has 8 members of Council, 2 students, appointed by URSU and GSA, respectively, and 2 Ex Officio members (Provost and Vice-President (Academic) & Vice-President (Research)). It is recommended that Council and CCR make changes to the composition of the membership of CCR in the coming year to allow for the election of a greater number of members to CCR. CCR passed a motion at the 6 September meeting to add to the CCR Terms of Reference that “Each Faculty’s Associate Dean Research or Designate” would attend CCR Meetings which allowed each of the Associate Deans to designate a representative to CCR if s/he could not attend.

- B. It was agreed that the agenda for CCR meeting be established by the three elected members of Council, with Sally Gray as resource person. This was done for all CCR Meetings in 2018-2019 with the exception of the September 2018 meeting.
- C. It was communicated to the Vice-President (Research) throughout the year that CCR meetings should be regarded as an opportunity to talk openly about research at the University, including hopes and aspirations for research as well as challenges and problems that might be on the horizon. Above all, CCR should not be used as a place to relay information but as a venue to engage researchers.
- D. It was also agreed that CCR would include in its annual report to Executive of Council a list of research priorities and concerns that it discussed throughout the year.

What follows, then, is a list of concerns and issues that have been identified by CCR throughout the year. It is CCR’s hope that it can work with Council and the various units at the University of Regina to eliminate any obstacles and barriers to research to enhance the productivity of all researches and strengthen the research culture at the University of Regina.

1. Visibility of Research at the University of Regina.

CCR believes that CCR and research-related activities should have a higher profile throughout the University of Regina. To accomplish this objective, CCR recommends the following actions:

- A. CCR Agenda and Minutes be included with other Council meetings materials under the Governance tab in the Office of the President (<https://www.uregina.ca/president/governance/council/committees.html>). The materials for CCR is stored on the Research Office webpage while Committee of Academic Mission is available under the Governance Table.
- B. The Office of the Vice-President (Research) is the only office of any of the vice-presidents not included in the Presidential suite of offices. One might consider the relocation of the

Office of Vice-President (Research) out of the President suite of offices to be poor optics as it relates to the importance of and commitment to research at the University of Regina.

- C. More importantly, CCR is concerned about the presence and coverage of research and research stories in the University of Regina's Communication Strategy, particularly the visibility of reporting on research and researchers on the University Webpage. In CCR's discussions with members of External Relations, we were informed that the University had opted to provide fewer stories on the U of R homepage as External Relations believes it allows more time to be spent on content. External Relations is also using new communication tools, particularly social media and Conversation Canada, that bills itself as an independent news and views site from the academic and research community at Canada's universities. It is funded by universities throughout Canada, including the University of Regina, and those Conversation Canada pieces are often picked up by news organizations across Canada. While Conversation Canada is a venue for disseminating research it also includes an op-ed dimension. CCR is concerned that research stories that, for a time appeared regularly on the University Homepage, have lost some of their immediacy in University's overall communication strategy. CCR believes it is important to disseminate research stories from both students and faculty to the wider communities as was the case for the past several years. The University's communications strategy is about creating a certain narrative of the university that emphasizes, for example, the University of Regina as diverse and inclusive – attributes that members of CCR welcome and share, but CCR believes there should also be a clear communications strategy for research. The period of presenting as many stories of the output of researchers as possible has been replaced with a more targeted communications strategy and we fear that research will not be well served by such a strategy.

2. Open-Access Publication

CCR members, Cara Bradley and Christopher Yost, prepared a Report on open-access publication that was adopted by CCR earlier this year. A full copy of the report is attached but the major thrust of the report can be summarized briefly. The immediacy of open-access publish is now apparent but few, if any, Canadian universities are prepared to deal with the wide implications of it. The Report notes that open access is not intended to replace scholarly journals, nor does it aim to tamper with the peer review process, which is vital to scholarly communication. Instead, it aims to ensure reasonable publication costs are covered while also providing free access to research results. After a lengthy consultation phase, NSERC, SSHRC, and CIHR introduced in 2015 a harmonized policy (largely based on CIHR's pre-existing policy) requiring that peer-reviewed journal articles produced from funded research be made openly available within 12 months of publication. The full impact of this policy is just beginning to be felt as it applied only to grants received after May 2015, and it is only recently that articles from this funding period are being published, with few having yet reached the 12 month open access

deadline specified in the policy. The University of Regina Library, recognizing the unsustainability of rising journal prices in recent years, has been engaged in open access advocacy and development of infrastructure to support open access since approximately 2007. The CCR Report recommends that the University of Regina needs to proactively engage with open access and changes to the scholarly publishing and funding landscapes. The Report acknowledges that there are many options, some conservative and some transformational, for moving ahead with open access, including:

- Leading discussions on transitions to open access, particularly in the unique context of Canadian small and medium comprehensive universities, at the Alliance of Canadian Comprehensive Research Universities (ACCRU).
- Raising open access publishing and APC (article processing charges) challenges when meeting with representatives from CIHR, NSERC, SSHRC, and other funders.
- Communicating open access publishing and APC challenges to the Provincial Government, and seek financial assistance in covering APCs in order to bring University of Regina research to all Saskatchewan residents and the rest of the world.
- Drafting and seeking endorsement for an open access publishing statement from relevant University of Regina bodies (faculties, Executive of Council, Senate).
- Developing a new service to assist University of Regina researchers in understanding copyright agreements, negotiating with publishers, and depositing appropriate versions of articles in OURspace.
- Allocating a percentage of the Indirect Costs of Research funding received from the Tri-Agencies to off-set APCs.
- Redirecting some of the library's journal subscription budget to off-set open access publishing costs (APCs, etc.).
- Encouraging researchers to include publication costs (for APCs) in research funding applications as a matter of course.
- Encouraging (or requiring) that researchers make research publications openly available whenever possible.

The Report concludes that open access publication has begun to have a significant impact on the scholarly publishing landscape, and is gaining momentum, both worldwide and in Canada. Now is the time for the University of Regina to act, in order to guarantee that our researchers remain compliant and competitive in pursuit of funding, and to ensure that our research continues to have high impact and reach the widest possible audience.

3. Resource Research Impact

CCR also appointed a committee comprised of Irfan Al-Anbagi, Nick Jones, and Kathleen Irwin to consider Resource Research Impact. More specifically, the sub-committee of the Council Committee on Research (CCR) was asked to look at ways in which research undertaken at the University of Regina, as well as its impact, is reported to the University's Board of Governors (BOG) in accordance with one of the strategic priorities (research impact) identified in the University of Regina's 2015 – 2020 Strategic Plan: *"Peyak Aski Kikawina – Together We Are Stronger"*. The sub-committee's goal was to develop a report that will: 1) Review the 2016 CCR subcommittee report, identifying the issues raised and provide possible means to address those issues. 2) Enable the Office of the VP Research to fully and accurately report successes representative of the entire scope of research across the university as well as aligned with the University of Regina's Strategic Research Plan. The sub-committee analyzed the 2016 report of the CCR Subcommittee on Research Impact and the current reports to the BOG. The sub-committee considered different methods to capture and report on Indigenous research, artistic research, and community engaged research. The sub-committee then discussed how the Annual Information Form (AIF) might be used to capture research in a meaningful way. Finally, the report was concluded by providing a number of recommendations on the way forward in regards to improving the University of Regina's research impact.

4. Research Challenges

CCR agreed in its first meeting to identify in consultation with Council members obstacles that they considered to impede their research productivity at the University of Regina. This was an item for discussion at each of our bi-monthly meetings and members of CCR were encouraged to reach out to their colleagues and bring their concerns to CCR. As well, CCR reached out through the CCAM moodle site to Council Members, encouraging them to identify challenges that they felt were impacting their pursuit of scholarly work. We were particularly interested in identifying challenges that were common among faculties and departments, and we reminded faculty that it was our hope to begin the process of formulating recommendations that address these challenges in our capacity as advisory to Council and particularly to the Vice-President Research. It is CCR's hope that they can work with Council and the VPR to mitigate the challenges but also continue to monitor them so that the challenges and obstacles that have been identified can be addressed. It is the expectation of CCR that each year, it will report on the progress that have been made to address those challenges and continue to identify new ones that might arise. CCR realizes that its role is advisory but it believes that by raising those issues we are meeting our objective of making CCR more meaningful and useful for researchers.

It will come as no surprise when the list below is considered, a number of faculty members expressed concern about what might be considered the lack of a "research culture" at the University of Regina.

The challenges identified include:

A. Graduate Student and Post-Doctoral Fellow Support:

CCR believes that the University of Regina is not competitive in our support for graduate students relative to comparable comprehensive universities across Canada. This was a consistent issue that was raised by several Council colleagues across multiple faculties. This challenge was emphasized by some faculty members as the most critical challenge impeding their research activities. One faculty member wrote, “The single greatest challenge to my research is recruiting and retaining excellent graduate students to my program. We are not only challenged by our geography, but also our lack of entrance scholarships, provincial graduate student funding, tuition waivers, and high tuition fees for international students.” Another added with respect of post-doctoral fellows, “We have no (or insufficient) policies, procedures, and standards for post docs and graduate students with respect to funding, space, and resources - we should have minimums and some mechanisms for ensuring equity, even if that means we are going to limit what we can do or who we can accept; could we please create some policies and plans that focus on quality, sustainability, and equity?” The matter of graduate student and post-doctoral fellows was considered an issue across several faculties.

B. Improvements Are Required To Simplify the Research Policy Processes:

Many faculty members felt that the amount of paper-work and reporting was an obstacle to sustaining research activities. While researchers generally understood the rationale behind the necessity of certain bureaucratic procedures, they felt the processes already in place were taxing and burdensome. The comments of one faculty member perhaps reflects the frustration with the paper-work associated with submitting a grant application: “The Research Office’s (RO) Funded Research Approval Form (FRAF) is a major bureaucratic barrier to research grant applications. Often through no fault of our own, researchers will be applying for grants on a very tight timeline (e.g., government contracts that are only open for a month or two; opportunities we’ve just learned about recently but which are closing soon). The FRAF requires multiple levels of approvals: Department Head, Dean, RO. Hypothetically, if the Department Head needs 2 weeks to review and approve, and the Associate Dean needs 2 weeks to review and approve, and then the RO needs a few days to approve, I am already looking at having a well-developed proposal and final budget prepared more than 1 month before the deadline. This is often not possible and actually serves to discourage applications. Plus, the archaic PDF form only allows hard-copy signatures, which means I’m spending valuable grant-writing hours physically running around for signatures or scanning things, which seems ridiculous. I do understand that these approvals are needed, especially when we are asking for contributions from our departments/faculties. My suggestion is to simplify the process: have researchers fill out a simple form, which provides a basic summary of the project and funds/contributions requested from department and/or faculty. Simple and straightforward, this can be done while researchers are still fine-tuning their applications and developing the rest of their budgets. And it should allow electronic signatures”

C. The Communicating of Research Activities:

The challenges that CCR and faculty members across the University recognized here related to both communication strategies by External Relations but also how communication about research occurs from the Office of the Vice-President (Research). It was noted that there appears – as one faculty member put it – “to be confusion among professors regarding the broad research strategy of the University.” It was pointed out that there needs to be better strategic direction on research coming from the University. What precisely is the University’s expectations in research? Some faculty members wanted greater clarification regarding the planned long- and short-term commitments of the University as well as “tactful plans to action those strategies?”

D. The University of Regina’s Rankings in the Research Category of Maclean’s Ranking of Canadian Universities.

It was noted in CCR throughout its deliberations that the University of Regina ranks poorly in the research category in the *Maclean’s* annual survey of universities. This is especially the case with regards to the University of Regina’s ranking in the area of Social Science and Humanities Research Council funding where it has for the past few years ranked at or near the bottom of comparable comprehensive universities. The University no longer formally responds to the annual ranking. CCR has undertaken as part of its objective the tracking of Tri-Council results for the University, and Sally Gray, Director, Research Office, presented to CCR a comprehensive report on recent results in NSERC competitions. Other Tri-Council grants will be reviewed and discussed in the 2019-20 academic year.

E. Measuring Research Outcomes:

In both CCR’s engagement with faculty and in our regular meetings, there was a general feeling that the reporting structures from the Office of Vice President (Research) are currently not designed to identify challenging areas in research and that we are lacking an honest and fulsome assessment of research challenges. While there is much research activity at the University of Regina, some of the most common measures, such as success at Tri-Council funding, however suggests that the University is a laggard among comparable universities across Canada. We need an effective system to gauge research, scholarly and creative activity on our campus and identify the challenges that might exist. As one faculty member noted in our discussion over the CCAM moodle site, “The VPR must commit to providing an accurate assessment of the health of the research enterprise, even when that assessment is not wholly positive. Data must be reported completely and non-selectively, such that they provide an accurate picture of the current state of research at our institution.”

F. The Issue of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion:

Some faculty members identified issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion as an obstacle to research productivity. A faculty member stated that the greatest barrier to research is gender discrimination. Not only is research success not being acknowledged but it was being diminished relative to other colleagues. It was also suggested that many women faculty particularly feel the impact of gender discrimination. Another faculty member added that she was not receiving acknowledgement for the accomplished successful research activities, “I never had the impression that our Dean acknowledged my research work as relevant, let alone meritorious.” CCR believes that if any researcher experiences discrimination of any kind, it must be addressed.

G. Research Resources:

CCR identified common concerns across the faculties regarding the challenge of space requirements for conducting research and the challenges of balancing other duties, such as teaching and service, with research. It was noted several times in discussions in CCR that the lack of time is a critical challenge to research output. In a separate survey done in the Faculty of Arts by its Committee on Research and Graduate Studies in 2018, it was noted that time devoted to service and teaching were identified as major impediments to research.

The issue of space as an obstacle to research is serious. Faculty members noted “We have no (or insufficient) policies, procedures, and standards for research space and resource access from the “central” university capacities; as it currently stands there appears to be a great deal of inequity or, at least, inconsistency with respect to how space and resources are allocated.” It was recommended that policies and plans be implemented that “focuses on quality, sustainability, and equity?” It was also noted that there is no consistent policy or approach to providing space for post-docs on our campus.

The changing demands of teaching was also identified as issue in research. It was noted that as the faculty complement shrinks, faculty members are having to teach outside their field to support and maintain the majors and honours program within their small, struggling program, and this can diminish time for research activity.” It was also noted that “increased time on teaching, especially with the increase in international students who need a lot more support” has also impacted research time.

Conclusion:

The goal of CCR in the 2018-19 academic year was to change the orientation of this important Council Committee from being a body that largely received updates and reports to one that would better meet its mission of providing strategic advice and recommendations on research initiatives, policy and matters at the University of Regina to Council and its representatives and the Vice-President (Research). I feel that CCR has taken significant steps in this direction and I wish to acknowledge the support of Dr. David Malloy, former Vice-President (Research) and Dr. Kathy McNutt, Interim Vice-President (Research), for encouraging CCR to adopt a more proactive role. I wish as well to acknowledge the contributions of all members of CCR for their participation and wisdom, but I wish to acknowledge particularly those who prepared reports for CCR, notably Nick Jones, Kathleen Irwin, Cara Bradley, Irfan Al-Anbagi, and Christopher Yost. CCR might not yet have the answers to the issues that it has identified as obstacles and challenges to research at our university but we have made an excellent start by identifying a series issues. I am confident with Irfan Al-Anbagi and Christopher Yost returning as elected members of Council to CCR (and Christopher as the incoming Chair) CCR will become the effective Council Committee that it must be to help create a great research culture at the University of Regina and make our university a research leader among comprehensive universities in Canada.

I respectfully submit to Executive of Council, the year-end report from CCR.

Raymond B. Blake
Chair, Council Committee on Research, and
Professor, Department of History

CFI JELF – LOI Review Summary for Senior Research Team

Meeting to review internal LOIs for the CFI JELF was held April 17, 2018.

Sub-Committee Members:

Andrew Cameron, Biol
Adrian Pitariu, Business Admin
Irfan Al-Anbagi, Engg
Justin Longo, JS GS
Tanya Dahmns, Chem/Biochem

- \$363,000 remains in the 2017-2020
- 4 proposals were received, with requests totaling \$502,732
 - Assessments were based on the CFI criteria. The committee noted the high quality of the two recommended proposals and the impact of the infrastructure on the research programs of two emerging scholars along with other numerous users on campus.
 - Committee supports potential increases (10-15%) to the budgets. This brings the recommended amount in line with the remaining allocation.
- Results:

PI and UofR Co-I, external not listed.	Title	CFI Request (Total Budget)
Proposals to move forward		
HANSMEIER, Nicole (Luther Sci) Tenure-track Co-I: T. Chao, J. Buttigieg, B. Wissel (Biol); R. Raina-Fulton (Chem); L. Sykes Tottenham (Psyc)	<i>Biomarker of cannabis intoxication</i>	229,022 (836,096)
MANG, Cameron (KHS) Tenure-track Co-I: J. Barden, D. Candow (KHS); L. Zhang (Engg)	<i>Neuroplasticity and Neurorehabilitation Research Laboratory (NNRL)</i>	108,710 (271,776)
Total (+ 10 to 15%):		\$337,732
Not recommended		
AZAM, Shahid (Engg) Tenured Co-I: G. Huang (Engg); M Velez (Geol) * Committee recommended application be improved and resubmitted to a future call.	<i>Environmental Triaxial System for Problematic Soils</i>	88,000 (220,000)
PENG, Wei (Engg) Tenured Co-I: G. Huang, Y. Jin, K. Ng (Engg)	<i>A Pipe Loop System and Analysis Centre for Drinking Water Quality</i>	77,000 (192,500)