

## COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Thursday 11 February 2021 – 2:30 to 4:00 pm

### AGENDA

Time	Agenda Items	Lead	Material
2:30 pm	Approval of Agenda		
2:32 pm	Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 3, 2020		Appendix 1
2:35 pm	Chair's Report	Al-Anbagi	
2:45 pm	VP Research Report	McNutt	
2:55 pm	Indigenous Research Showcase Update	Gray	
3:00 pm	SSHRC-NSERC Leaders Meeting Discussion	Dahms/Blake	Appendix 2
3:15 pm	Care and Use of Animals Policy Changes	Gray	Appendix 3
3:25 pm	Post Covid-19 Research Recovery Discussion	Al-Anbagi	
3:50 pm	Business Arising		
4:00 pm	Adjournment		

#### CCR Subcommittees

##### Standing

- CFI

##### Ad-hoc

- Research Impact
- Research Space Allocation
- Terms of Reference
- Covid-19 Return to Research

#### Distribution

Kathy McNutt, VP Research  
Chris Yost, AVP Research  
Nick Jones, Graduate Student & Research  
Sally Gray, Director, Research Office  
Raymond Blake, Arts  
Lisa Watson, Business Administration  
Twyla Salm, Education  
Raman Paranjape, Engineering & Applied Science  
Jim Farney, Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School  
Larena Hoeber, Kinesiology & Health Studies  
Christine Ramsay, Media, Art & Performance  
Joan Wagner, Nursing

Cory Butz, Science  
Gabriela Novotna, Social Work  
Kaetlyn Phillips, Library  
David Meban, Campion College  
Francesco Freddolini, Luther College  
Bettina Schneider, First Nations University of Canada  
Sandra Zilles, CRC Rep.  
Nathalie Reid, CTRC  
Irfan Al-Anbagi – Council Member (Chair of CCR)  
Shela Hirani, Nursing  
Sheila Petty, Council Member, MAP  
Shrinath Manoharan, Graduate Student Association

#### Guest

Tanya Dahms

#### Join Zoom Meeting

<https://uregina-ca.zoom.us/j/96066130733?pwd=bXVGWW56eDVVMUtdSdFg4WlQxUmlLZz09>

Meeting ID: 960 6613 0733

Passcode: 693922

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH**

Minutes of the Meeting of  
Thursday 3 December 2020  
2:30 – 4:00 pm

**Present:** I Al-Anbagi (Chair), R Blake, C Butz, S Gray, A Henni, L Hoeber, S Manoharan, K McNutt, G Novotna, S Petty, C Ramsay, N Reid, T Salm, J Wagner, L Watson, C Winter, C Yost

**Regrets:** J Farney, F Freddolini, N Jones, D Meban, B Schneider, S Zilles

**Resource:** L Todd

**Guests:** D Farenick

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Ramsay/Salm

Moved that the agenda be approved as presented.

CARRIED

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 8, 2020**

Ramsay/Blake

Moved that the minutes from November 19, 2020 be approved with the correction of one minor typing error.

CARRIED

**CHAIR'S REPORT**

I Al-Anbagi asked if CCR needs to look at the Research and Risk Assessments again. It was pointed out that the applications were very conservative and we will continue to be vigilant in following the provincial health guidelines. Staying the course seems to be the appropriate action right now. It was suggested that a field-work message, with the restrictions still in place, be sent in the new year (include community based research).

**VICE-PRESIDENT (RESEARCH) REPORT**

The Vice-President Research Report was distributed prior to the meeting. K McNutt stated that it is straight forward. She reviewed some research initiatives that are taking place and mentioned that work on the Research Strategic Plan would begin in spring 2021.

## **INDIGENOUS RESEARCH SHOWCASE UPDATE**

S Gray advised of the Town Hall on December 2, an event in the Faculty of Education in September and a Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies event that is coming. A lot of activities are being organized by EDI.

K McNutt thanked S Gray and E Grafton for all the success in their efforts.

## **FEDORUK CHAIR IN NEUTRON IMAGING**

D Farenick briefly reviewed the proposal for a Fedoruk Chair in Neutron Imaging and advised it is very similar to the Fedoruk Chair in Nuclear Imaging, which has been very successful. Discussion took place regarding junior level versus senior level chairs and attracting highly skilled physics faculty and students to the University.

McNutt/Ramsay

Moved that the Council Committee on Research approve, in principle, the proposal for an externally-funded Fedoruk Chair in Neutron Imaging.

CARRIED

## **TIER 1 CRC IN COMPUTATIONAL LEARNING THEORY**

KcNutt provided some text on this proposal. D Farenick briefly review the proposal and advised they are looking specifically to recruit a self-identified female. Discussion took place on recruitment/retention of faculty, the University's policy on hiring family members, hiring other CRC Chairs and student enrolments.

McNutt/Watson

Moved that the Council Committee on Research approve the proposed change in the Faculty of Science's current Tier 1 CRC allocation from Water, Environment and Sustainability to that of Computational Learning Theory.

CARRIED

## **RESEARCH IMPACT SUBCOMMITTEE**

I Al-Anbagi mentioned that an e-mail went out asking for volunteers. There were no volunteers that came forward. He suggested the subcommittee be made up of one elected member and two associate deans. K McNutt cautioned not to duplicate some of this work since M Stewart is also looking at community based research and will present to CCR in the new year. C Yost advised that he and R Deschamps are meeting with SciVal regarding impact measures. He suggested that we wait to see if there are gaps/issues before a subcommittee is formed.

## **RESEARCH SPACE ALLOCATION SUBCOMMITTEE**

K McNutt advised that space issues start with the Deans and then proceed to the higher Space Allocation Committee, which includes the Vice-Presidents, so this would be a duplication of work.



Watson/Salm

Moved to dissolve the Research Space Allocation Subcommittee.

CARRIED

### **BUSINESS ARISING**

R Blake asked CCR members how people are finding the connection between research and covid since individual researchers are dealing with work, families, etc. It was pointed out that the Risk Assessments should include physical and mental health issues. K McNutt advised that she asked Bridget Klest in the Department of Psychology to do some research on this and will hopefully have some information to share shortly. It was suggested that some type of mentorship program be established to help junior faculty members' deal with some of these issues. CCR to discuss this further at the January 2021 meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

L Watson moved that the meeting be adjourned at 3:54 pm.



# Memorandum

**To:** Dr. Kathy McNutt, Vice-President Research  
**From:** Tanya Dahms, NSERC Leader and Raymond B. Blake, SSHRC Leader  
**Date:** 11 January, 2021  
**Re:** 2020 Joint Annual SSHRC-NSERC Leaders Meeting

---

## Introduction

The Annual Leaders Meetings of SSHRC and NSERC adopted a new format this year as Leaders from two of the Tri-Council Funding Agencies met jointly via Videoconference (Zoom) from 2-4 December. SSHRC Leaders met on 2 December, NSERC Leaders met on 3 December, and a Joint Meeting with both NSERC and SSHRC Leaders convened on 4 December. The objectives of the Annual Meeting was to update and engage with SSHRC and NSERC Leaders of key developments related to policy, programs, and research-related initiatives. Dr. Tanya Dahms, University of Regina NSERC Leader, attended the NSERC Leaders Meeting, and Dr. Raymond Blake, University of Regina SSHRC Leader, attended the SSHRC Leaders Meeting. Both attended the Joint Meeting for SSHRC and NSERC Leaders Meeting on Friday, 4 December.

Throughout the 3-day virtual meetings, both SSHRC and NSERC officials in Ottawa pointed out that those events gave them the opportunity to listen to the concerns of both NSERC and SSHRC researchers across Canada through the wisdom and experiences of SSHRC and NSERC Leaders who are closest to the researchers funded by the two granting agencies. Officials with both granting agencies used the opportunity to explain the many activities with which they are – and have been – engaged and, not surprisingly, considerable attention was given to how SSHRC and NSERC responded to the crisis created by the pandemic. There was considerable attention given, quite broadly, to issues regarding EDI in research and, especially, to issues around racism, particularly racism experienced by researchers of colour, which reflected the wider societal concern about incidents of Black racism that have been heightened by recent developments, particularly in the United States, and the resurgence of Black Lives Matter protests there and in Canada.

### **Annual Meeting of SSHRC Leaders, Wednesday, 2 December 2020**

The Terms of Reference for the SSHRC Leaders Network call for an open forum to exchange information between the Social Sciences and Humanities Federation of Canada and researchers at universities throughout Canada. However, the meeting was primarily an information session with SSHRC officials explaining in great detail their accomplishments over the past year. It was not an event that allowed for a two-way conversation but it was, rather, an opportunity for SSHRC Leaders to listen to those who manage the programs and procedures at SSHRC rather than engage with SSHRC about the issues at hand. The question and answer sessions were focused primarily on particular programs that have been introduced, and SSHRC Leaders often asked questions seeking clarity around aspects of particular initiatives and targeted funding research that SSHRC had introduced.

Perhaps, not surprisingly, SSHRC's response to Covid-19 dominated the agenda and considerable time was spent by Ted Hewitt, the President of SSHRC, and others of the SSHRC executive team in explaining how they have responded to the pandemic. In many ways it was a self-congratulatory exercise, as they explained how they had worked with the Government of Canada and its various departments to get additional funds into the hands of researchers and to fund SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19-related research initiatives. Much of the meeting was organized around presentations of SSHRC Vice-presidents, though there was some time set aside after each presentation for questions. It should be noted, too, that questions were submitted in advance and put to members of the executive team but it seemed at times that the moderator (mostly a SSHRC official) selected particular questions from those submitted to put to the executive team.

The major points raised in the executive presentations included:

- SSHRC Strategic Plan: *Momentum 2020-2022*. It was clear from the presentation that SSHRC has as one of its major aims, globalization – becoming a global leader in research and having Canadian researchers working with global partners. The five strategic themes at SSHRC are: Enhancing Canada's global leadership in social science and humanities research; producing impactful researchers; strengthening the Research Enterprise in Canada or what is termed the research ecosystem; contributing innovative solutions to global problems; and Building a nimble, forward looking organization.
- Addressing systemic racism, particularly Anti-Black racism, within the organization and in all research funded by SSHRC.
- Advancing Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in research.
- Promoting Tri-Council Data Management Systems. SSHRC is developing a robust culture of open access and responsible stewardship of research data that, it believes, will strengthen the research enterprise, enhance research excellence, and



benefit Canadian researchers working in international partnerships, as funders around the globe implement more stringent data management requirements.

- Growing global partnerships.

SSHRC had also organized for the Annual Meeting presentations from institutions which reflected the diversity of the Canada's post-secondary institutions. Each was assigned the task of discussing the impact of Covid-19 on research generally and research methodologies. The presenters (from McGill, Ottawa, and Mount Royal) talked of the slowing of research for many researchers, the impact on graduate and post-doctoral research, the nimbleness of researchers to pivot to SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-related research, the impact on community-based research, and the reduction of the carbon footprint of researchers, largely because of reduced air travel. Yet, it was noted that while some researchers, particularly those in health-related research, were much more able to change the focus of their research, it was much more difficult with those researchers engaged in "basic research" or in "curiosity-driven" research to shift their research focus quickly. It was also noted that universities were encountering more difficulty during the pandemic in finding mentors for new scholars and to having colleagues participate in the early evaluation of the research applications of new scholars.

One of the interesting points was made by the SSHRC Leader from Mount Royal University in Calgary who suggested that SSHRC might offer providing greater resources for basic research and just "trust" researchers to do good and effective research. This was an important observation as SSHRC, increasingly, has a tendency to "direct" research into certain areas that reflect what SSHRC considers new societal issues or what it considers emerging themes, often in collaboration and consultation with the Government of Canada and its departments and agencies. One example of this is SSHRC working with Horizons Policy Canada, a federal agency that attempts to predict policy disruptions that may be on the horizon, and then to fund new research into a variety of topics, ranging from "asocial" economy to working in the digital economy.

There was little opportunity for SSHRC Leaders to engage with SSHRC executive and administrators. It was largely an information session and even the dialogue/discussion sessions were simply an opportunity to ask questions about programming and how SSHRC's strategic objectives (such as EDI), for instance, will be implemented in research methodologies and in the adjudication committees. When questions were asked about more substantive issues, such as whether SSHRC intends to offer a program for undergraduate researchers similar to one that already exists with NSERC summer undergrad research, there was no opportunity to contribute to the discussion (aside from adding a comment in the chat box). Incidentally, to that particular question of SSHRC funding summer research for undergrads, the answer was that such a program would be too expensive for SSHRC given the number of undergraduates in the social sciences and



humanities. Such a program is not likely to be introduced anytime soon. The Annual Meeting was not designed to the fullest extent possible to engage with -- nor consult with -- representatives from the social sciences and humanities research community from across Canada as the meetings were billed.

What emerged, finally, from the SSHRC Annual Meeting was that SSHRC has been actively trying to support researchers during the pandemic, that SSHRC has designs on being a global player with other national granting agencies in international and global research in the social sciences and humanities, and that SSHRC will work with the federal government to be responsive to the pressing social issues of the day. It is noteworthy, too, that in 2019, much of the focus was around Indigenous research and the engagement of Indigenous scholars and communities; this year, SSHRC shifted its focus from Indigenous research to racial issues in the Fall SSHRC Leaders meetings, particularly of Black scholars and the Black community in Canada, although SSHRC stated its ongoing commitment to its Indigenous Strategy. SSHRC is well on its way to fulfilling one of its strategic goals of being nimble and able to respond to the new and emerging challenges and the pressing societal issues of the day.

#### **Annual Meeting NSERC Leaders, Thursday, 3 December 2020**

*(Additional notes from the October NSERC Leaders meeting appear in bracketed italics.)*

The December NSERC meeting was similar to the SSHRC meeting described above, in its trajectory, sentiment and execution. The Tri-Councils had a significant opportunity to 'crowd source' the NSERC and SSHRC leaders, but chose not to do so aside from formal presentations by select leaders. Given zoom technology, we could have engaged in manageable groups using the break out rooms, and thus generated new ideas to address the pandemic, EDI, and other important issues. The presentations were informative, but certainly did not inspire community amongst Leaders or between the Leaders and tri-councils. The questions submitted in advance were not always addressed, leaving the chat as the only other query option.

#### **NSERC Updates**

**Dr. Alejandro Adem, NSERC's President**, articulated their commitment to research continuity. In relation to the COVID-19 pandemic by the SARS-CoV2 virus, he emphasized that NSERC is not only fully committed to helping students and researchers navigate this stressful time, but also address the pandemic through basic and applied research, and through education to reduce vaccination adversity. *(He also pondered the impact of the pandemic on first year graduate enrolments, on NSERC itself and its partners. For example the partnership with MITACS for OCEs will be part of the Alliance program.)*

During his visits to many Universities, Dr. Adem noted the disproportionate impact on women and other groups at risk, including our Indigenous colleagues, by the pandemic, and this has fortified NSERC's pledge to build EDI into all programs. He acknowledged Canadian University efforts with strong EDI initiatives.

Science and Engineering have always struggled to find ways of evaluating science, not simply with bibliographic numbers, and NSERC will continue to strive towards a more holistic way to evaluate research.

Dr. Adem noted the importance and continued catalysis of international collaborations through various partner programs. He alluded to security becoming an international priority, saying we would revisit this, but it never was clarified during the meeting.

**Dr. Marc Fortin, Vice-President, Research Partnerships**, noted NSERC's significant interventions to address the impact of the pandemic on research, which included \$100 million to researchers in support of trainees, flexibility related to relaxed reporting and granting requirements, and additional guidance to grant writers and reviewers in relation to expected progress (or lack thereof) during the pandemic. NSERC distributed \$20 million for COVID-related projects sometimes with very short processing times (1 - 4 weeks), and most grants were processed in 12-16 weeks. The question arose as to whether further extensions and supplements would be awarded to HQP if the pandemic continues, to which NSERC responded that they would need to see how it all unfolds. They will take into account the impact of the pandemic on people, research, etc. and continue to work with and support us.

In terms of industrial partnerships, larger companies were highly concerned in April 2020, but now it is the mid-sized and smaller companies that are having a harder time and struggling to participate in the Alliance programs. During this time, the Alliance program was continued and reignited, with the second phase rolled out, having a more generous contribution from NSERC, and NSERC partnered with MITACS to enable internships. Fortin announced a series of webinars to come that will help researchers and trainees alike. He acknowledged the need to adjust programming, enabling R&D to become higher profile. Along the same lines, they are initiating collaborative agreements with other countries that will facilitate Canadian researchers as leaders of international collaborations.

**Dr. Danika Goosney, Vice-President, Research Grants and Scholarships**, outlined NSERC's participation in a CIHR-led initiative to leverage science in the context of the UN research roadmap for COVID recovery.

The award of grant extensions means that only 30% of grants require review, lightening everyone's load. In terms of EDI, they have instituted childcare stipends and other costs for virtual reviews, including dependent care up to \$100 per day and a daily allowance of \$50



(for each half or full day of participation in the adjudication process) to cover technology and/or other miscellaneous costs.

*(During the October meeting, we learned that NSERC is accounting for leaves, and has published guidelines for COVID-19 issues to understand the impact to different programs and researchers. They are further trying to connect different resources, build on CIHR initiatives, conduct careful analysis of NSERC programs in terms of Gender based analysis+ (GBA+, not just gender), and determine potential barriers in the RTI program based on institutions and language. They are also trying to modify reporting to better reflect EDI, based on declarations.)*

**Dr. Kevin Fitzgibbons, Acting Vice-President, Communications, Corporate and International Affairs**, gave an update on policy and planning highlights. In relation to EDI, NSERC is piloting the NSERC Student Ambassador program, for which Indigenous student applications are accepted over and above NSERC USRA quotas (the overall USRA budget increased by \$2 M). NSERC is proposing a new research partnership program to encourage joint funding for Indigenous groups and researchers and are working towards a better sex, gender and diversity analysis.

Finally, he reminded leaders of the Science Promoted January 18 deadline soon approaching in 2021.

**Dr. Marc Gervais, Associate Vice-President, Strategy and Transformation**, reminded us again for the strategic planning of NSE research and training in Canada (*discussed at the fall NSERC Leaders meeting*). They will begin with an 18 month (Fall 2020 – Spring 2022, with most of the activity in 2021) pre-planning effort, seeking input on the strategic planning process and methodology. The end result of this process (2030) is intended for the entire community, including universities, where many changes are afoot, as major stakeholders. They are planning a Council of Canadian Academies assessment, outreach, and an environmental scan of national/international NSE priorities. (*At the October meeting, one astute NSERC leader wondered why the planning is following a 10 y trajectory, and why they are not trying to be more agile, in light of a changing world, and work with shorter terms.*)

In the short- and long-term, there will be efforts at NSERC to strengthen international relationships, Indigenous capacity and government relationships.

**Dr. Michael Lamb, Chief Data Officer**, represents a new position to cover an area where NSERC has not been excelling, using data as a creative resource, and analytics to inform decision making. The intention is to make NSERC a leader in supporting research, allowing



these former researchers to engage their ingenuity, and make sure that NSERC is agile and responsive in their continued efforts to support and serve us.

This fall NSERC announced a new research portal to help researchers safeguard data during collaborative efforts: [https://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/Media-Media/NewsDetail-DetailNouvelles\\_eng.asp?ID=1135](https://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/Media-Media/NewsDetail-DetailNouvelles_eng.asp?ID=1135)

#### **NSERC Leader Presentations on How COVID-19 is Impacting our Research.**

**Drs. Julia Baum, Graham Gagnon, Alex Morris and Ana Tavares** each gave presentations on how research has been impacted. These presentations highlighted how researchers were experiencing the pandemic differently, depending on gender, care giving duties, field of study, location-specific restrictions, level of researcher (MSc, PhD, PDF, RA or PI) and other factors. There was consensus that we need to allow researchers to fully document how the pandemic personally impacted them in a dedicated section of grant applications.

It was clear that some researchers and their HQP could capitalize on the pandemic, while others were left without access to field equipment that is accordingly falling into disrepair. There was a sense that MSc students, in general, were suffering more than PhD students, who often looked at the pandemic as a new opportunity (again, this is discipline specific). Interestingly, there seemed to be two major fates for PDFs and RAs, either becoming laboratory super heroines/heroes with accelerated involvement on many projects, inflated publication rates and greater responsibilities (this one was a major focus in presentations), while others were relegated to care giving as they struggled to maintain their CVs for the impending job market (*the focus of Dahms' presentation at the October meeting*). Further, those PDFs/RAs currently outside of programs are facing unique struggles, with pandemic-related hiring freezes just when they are ready to enter the work force. In some cases, PDFs were forgotten, but the case for childcare at Dalhousie was critical to their success.

Consensus was that working conditions were non-ideal, with fatigue, delays in deliveries etc., and it was tough for young professors just starting out. Hiring new PIs, in particular those requiring VISAs, was complex, and the establishment of their research was slow going, with funding announcements delayed and difficulties recruiting good students. The upside of this is that it forced many to think outside the box.

Many HQP were not only impacted through infection of themselves/family, but also through their mental health. At INRS, motivation was quite low, with a great deal of uncertainty for PhD students abroad and away from their families. In response, the INRS added a psychologist to support students, and NSERC is creating EDI programming for further support, a CGS-D virtual conference, and could adapt the Alliance program to be more innovative in response to the pandemic.

In most cases, the Universities stepped up to bridge funding gaps, for example those funded by companies that were suspended as a result of the pandemic.

On the upside, some experienced fewer distractions (no travel), enjoyed some constraints, increased productivity in the short-term, with the caveat that the impacts of lower research productivity are yet to come. Institutes that had collective mobilizers to help people move forward and which formed a community in relation to planning, scheduling and future actions, tended to thrive.

As most institutions have figured out, flexibility is the key to their student, faculty and staff success. It was pointed out that teaching classes online is impacting research, and so will have a huge impact on future research output. Further, we expect more surprises in the months to come, as other issues arise as a result of climate change and continued or new pandemics. As such, it was suggested that there needs to be a mechanism to allow researchers to communicate individualized plans for research grants in light of our respective situations.

#### **Joint SSHRC-NSERC Leaders Session, Friday, 4 December 2020**

This was the first occasion that NSERC and SSHRC Leaders met jointly. The session began with a lively discussion by Alejandro Adem, President of NSERC, and Ted Hewitt, President of SSHRC. Questions were posed by the moderator from questions that had been posted prior to the meeting, although a few questions were posted in the live chat. Several items/questions had been identified as being of particular interest to SSHRC and NSERC Leaders, including considerable discussion of getting research knowledge into the public domain in an era of fake news, post-truths, and mis-information. Both Funding Councils have made open access and getting research knowledge/outcomes to the general (informed) public a priority. While peer-review publications remain important, open access and new data management regimes are becoming increasingly so. Questions around funding relating to new forms of knowledge mobilization were posed and both Presidents acknowledged that their councils were aware of the additional financial burdens of open access. Both Presidents also stressed how they had dealt with the COVID-19 pandemic and noted that finding ways to support graduate students and post-doctoral fellows were important. There was also some concern about the move to the Common CV but neither Presidents provided much information, noting only that it remains a work in progress.

Other sessions during the Joint Meeting were directed to Institutional Programs, such as the Canadian Research Chairs, New Frontiers Grants, and Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, and Research Training Programs. There were various questions from Leaders about EDI (how universities who are struggling to determine best practices to meet Tri-Council goals can get Tri-Council assistance), about Canada 150 Chairs (have they been effective and met their objectives), doctoral fellowships (why do applicants have to specify an institution in their



application in the fall and often don't make a choice where to go until later), and support for undergraduate research by CIHR and SSHRC (don't expect this to happen soon for SSHRC).

One of the items that emerged out of those joint sessions was growing concern for what was term "the research ecosystem." Although it was not explained to the group what precisely this means, (we believe) the concept of the "research ecosystem" emerged in 2017 from Professor David Naylor's report *Investing in Canada's Future: Strengthening the Foundations of Canadian Research*. The report was prepared to assess the impact of federally funded research in Canada. Professor Naylor used the terms "research ecosystem" and "lifecycle approach" in his report as a framework to analyze the current research landscape in Canada but the structure of the ecosystem was not fully explained in his analysis. It became clear, however, that Professor Naylor found that the research ecosystem was not particularly healthy in Canada. It is highly competitive, there are insufficient funds for good researchers, and Professor Naylor suggested that funding usually went to established researchers with strong track-records and those without such records continued to struggle. Moreover, he found there was considerable precarity with young scholars in long-term or rotating post-doctoral positions and in SSHRC they are often engaged in the search for teaching positions, often on a short-term basis. This is a great opportunity for both SSHRC and NSERC to improve the situation of PDFs and RAs but it was given little focus in the discussion, except perhaps to acknowledge greater support is needed for associated fellowships.

The notion of a healthy "research ecosystem" and a "lifecycle approach" to research might be particularly important to researchers at the University of Regina and, especially to those that fall within the SSHRC community of scholars, because in a healthy "research ecosystem" a researcher passes through several cycles and they should never be marginalized as a researcher and always allowed to find a way back into the ecosystem. It seems that both SSHRC nor NSERC realize that they need to give greater consideration to the "life-cycle" of researchers to consider such factors as precarity of new PhDs, issues of family commitments and gender. We suspect this is an issue that both NSERC and SSHRC Leaders will pursue in future meetings.

In a tri-council question and answer period with **Serge Villemure, Director, Scholarships and Fellowships, NSERC, Roxanne Dompierre, Acting Director, Research Training Portfolio, SSHRC, and Julie Conrad, Manager, Awards and Vanier-Banting Secretariat, CIHR**, the issue of USRAs was revisited. Since NSERC has raised the USRA value by 25%, the number of awards was reduced by 7%. SSHRC supports the idea of supporting undergraduate training, and they have done the background work, but need additional funds to make it happen, as is the case for CIHR. Each actively discussed EDI approaches, at all levels, towards removing biases, which is encouraging.



The session on **anti-Black racism and discrimination in research systems** with **Sophia Stone, Professor of Biology, Dalhousie University, Wendell Nii Laryea Adjetey, Assistant Professor, Department of History and Classical Studies, McGill University, Christian Edem Kokou Agbobli, Vice-Chancellor, Research, Creation and Dissemination, Université du Québec à Montréal**, underscored the impact of racism on researchers. Each spoke from direct experience of subtle racism: not being heard, being dismissed, ignored or not included, bypassed internally, not to mention imposter syndrome resulting from racialized scholarships. Discussions are one thing, policies another, and whether or not the latter trickle down and are actually incorporated into the fabric of an institution is quite another. Furthermore, there is bias during the publication process, which needs to be recognized and acknowledged in granting.

It was the opinion of the panel that anti-racism in general which does not specifically identify Black people, will harm Black people and academics. In order to facilitate diverse hires, search committees must also be as diverse as possible. Our colleagues pointed out that the Tri-Council Agencies need to examine the structure of our grants. For example, if a company must be involved (i.e. Alliance), they too will have biases that will favour certain groups. All of these colleagues had the experience of needing to convince potential collaborators of their worth, so if that is the case, this impacts their involvement programs such as NSERC CREATE, Strategic Partnerships and CRDs. Since these researchers often attract more diverse trainees but are less able to compete in large funding opportunities, there is then less opportunity for those mentees.

Supervisors have a responsibility to give students contracts and research experiences, which is undermined by the absence of CIHR and SSHRC USRA programs, which would allow diverse students to consider graduate school as an option. We need to eliminate, rather than insert barriers for these students. We should consider Tri-Council scholarships for international students, which is a current barrier and also speaks to retention of HQP trained in Canada.

Our colleagues also articulated that giving more access to Black scholars should not take away from other groups, for example our Indigenous colleagues. If the different experiences of the discriminated groups are not explored, then there is the danger of homogenizing diversity, and presumably this was the rationale for focussing only on anti-Black racism in this meeting, and not other clearly disadvantaged groups (i.e. Indigenous students and colleagues). It was emphasized that all groups experiencing discrimination need to be named, with clear definitions for each, to be able to understand their individual and common challenges. We were warned to be ever vigilant in terms of class analysis, since EDI is already becoming tokenized, certain groups are elevated and other diminished. Without understanding class across equality-seeking groups, EDI will lose its authority. EDI initiatives make it possible to diversify, generate awareness workshops, which could lead to an organizational/cultural shift, perfectly normalizing EDI. All Universities need to develop a

diversity declaration similar to Tri-councils, since the evolution of an inclusive work environment will benefit everyone.

### **Conclusion**

The Annual Meeting was held virtually, eliminating the opportunity for discussions and brainstorming with colleagues from across Canada outside the formal events. The agencies mostly offered a one-way communication, with insufficient opportunity for individual Leaders or groups of Leaders to contribute. The primary focus of the meeting, as expected, related to the impact of the pandemic and related supports, continued efforts to operationalize EDI at the Tri-council and institutional levels, and new Tri-council initiatives. A number of other universities similar in size and scope to the University of Regina face similar issues, in addition to those common to most Universities. We will work with other SSHRC and NSERC Leaders to bring those issues to the attention of the SSHRC and NSERC leadership in Ottawa to help address the research issues that will allow us at the University of Regina to continue to enhance and expand our research.

## Care and Use of Animals

Number: RCH-020-005  
Audience: All University Employees  
Issued: May 2010  
Last revised: 25 February 2015  
Owner: Vice-President (Research)  
Approved by: Executive of Council  
Contact: Director, [Office for Research, Innovation and Partnership Research Office](#) - 306-585-4775

### Introduction

The University of Regina is committed to maintaining the highest possible standards of animal care and use in research, [teaching, and testing and education](#). Standards for animal care and use are outlined by the Canada Council on Animal Care (CCAC) and in other guidelines published or endorsed by the CCAC, and are in accordance with the Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions.

Commented [g1]: For consistency with CCAC guidelines

The committee authorized to oversee the administrative aspects of research [and education, teaching, and testing](#) involving animals is the President's Committee on Animal Care (PCAC). It is the responsibility of the PCAC to establish procedures to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. It is not a right to use animals in research, [teaching, and testing or educational activities](#); rather, if demonstrated that it is necessary, and if this necessity can be justified, the privilege to do so may be extended.

Only those who receive approval from the PCAC may bring animals onto University property, [and animals may only be brought on university property for use in research, teaching, and/or testing](#). This includes animals on display for events, animals involved in fieldwork off-campus and animals occupying University space (including [outdoor spaces](#), offices, and leased space) but does not include service [or support](#) animals used by a person with a disability, [which are governed by policy OPS 160-005, Service and Support Animals](#).

Formatted: Font: Italic

[Any University of Regina faculty, staff member, or student intending to work with animals in any capacity as part of their research or program of study both on and off campus is required to receive approval from the PCAC before any work involving animals can be carried out.](#)

Formatted: Font: Verdana

Formatted: Body

### Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to ensure ethical and humane use and responsible care of animals used to conduct research, [teaching, and testing and education](#).



### Scope

~~Given that the use of animals on University property should be primarily related to education and research, t~~This policy applies to all research, teaching, and testing and education involving animals:

1. conducted by University of Regina Faculty, Staff, and Students;
2. undertaken under the auspices of or in affiliation with the University of Regina; or
3. using University of Regina equipment, facilities or resources.

## Definitions

- **Animals** – non-human, living vertebrates and any living invertebrates of the class cephalopoda, including free-living and reproducing larval forms, used for research, education or breeding purposes.
- **Faculty** – an individual employed by the University of Regina who holds an academic appointment.
- **Principal Investigator** – a faculty member or equivalent visiting scholar in charge of a research or education project.
- **Staff** – an individual employed by the University of Regina or an individual employed by a Faculty member.
- **Student** – an individual enrolled in a course and/or program of study at the University of Regina or from another institution visiting the University of Regina and using University of Regina equipment, facilities or resources to conduct their studyprogram of study.

## Policy

### Review for Animal Use

All care and use of animals for research, teaching, and testing or educational purposes must be reviewed and approved by the PCAC prior to commencement to ensure it is conducted in accordance with the standards for the ethical care and use of animals established by the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC). This includes animals brought on campus for educational events.

The PCAC may occasionally review non-Universityexternal protocols for care and use of animals to ensure they meet animal care and use standards, where possible. The PCAC does not approve non-University protocols because the University does not have authority over the work or personnel involved.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Commented [CO2]: Added italics to clarify the distinction between review and approval

Formatted: Font: Italic

### Accountability

Implementation and compliance with policies on the proper care and use of animals in research and education is an institutional responsibility shared by University of Regina administration, the animal facility director, faculty members, staff, students and the PCAC.

## Roles and Responsibilities

### President's Committee on Animal Care

- The PCAC will review the proposed ~~research or education~~ animal use protocol ~~involving animals~~ to determine if the proposed use ~~and ethics~~ complies with applicable regulations.
- If the PCAC finds that the proposed ~~research or education~~ protocol is compliant, the protocol may be approved.
- The PCAC will monitor compliance with approved protocols and inspect all animal facilities at least once per year.

### Vice-President (Research)

- The Vice-President (Research) bears executive responsibility for the implementation of the University's animal care and use policy.
- The Vice-President (Research) shall resolve any appeals by applying the PCAC Appeal Provision (PCAC Terms of Reference ~~Section 4.1.2~~).

### Deans and Directors

- Deans and Directors will ensure that those who use, and those who are being trained to use, animals for research, teaching, and testing ~~or education~~ carried out by members in their faculty or department, or in association with their faculty or department, are compliant with applicable University policies and procedures.

### Faculty Members and Principal Investigators

- Faculty Members and Principal Investigators must ensure that work carried out under their supervision is conducted in accordance with University policy on the care and use of animals.
- Faculty Members and Principal Investigators are responsible for designing and carrying out research, teaching, and training ~~or education~~ in accordance with ~~the~~ all applicable requirements.
- Faculty Members and Principal Investigators are also responsible for ensuring students working under their supervision are compliant with all applicable requirements.

### Students

- Graduate and undergraduate students must ensure they follow the animal care and use policy.

### Consulting University Veterinarian

- The consulting Veterinarian(s) or a designated Veterinarian:



- a) provides assistance to all Faculty Members and Principal Investigators using animals for educational purposes;
  - b) provides emergency veterinary services where warranted; and
  - c) remains current on new theories, practices and emerging trends in animal care.
- The consulting Veterinarian or a designated Veterinarian is delegated the authority to:
    - a) terminate any procedure which causes unnecessary pain or stress to animals or which deviates from approved protocols; and
    - b) euthanize any animals believed to be in pain or distress that cannot be alleviated.

#### Facilities

- The University will acquire and maintain only the number and type of animals that can be accommodated in existing facilities in accordance with applicable regulations.
- If space is unavailable, research may need to be modified or rescheduled or funds may need to be allocated for modification or expansion of existing facilities.
- Approval of a protocol, authorization of a research grant, or receipt of a contract does not guarantee the University will be able to acquire, house and care for the research animals specified under the terms of the project if, at the time the work proceeds, the capacity of the University's facilities is otherwise fully used or space is unavailable.

## Consequences for Noncompliance

- Conducting animal research that has not been reviewed or approved by the PCAC is considered noncompliant.
- Acquisition of animals for ~~education and research~~, teaching, and testing that has not been approved by the PCAC is considered noncompliant.
- ~~Cases of suspected noncompliance will be investigated by the PCAC and appropriate actions will be taken. Appropriate actions may include but are not limited to the misconduct procedures as outlined in [Policy GOV-022-025 Research/Scholarly Misconduct](#).~~ the Procedures for Reporting and Investigating Scholarly Misconduct.
- Once approval from the PCAC has been granted, failure to adhere to the conditions of the approved protocol constitutes noncompliance.

Formatted: Font: Verdana

Formatted: Font: Verdana

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" +  
Indent at: 0.5"

## Related Information

- [PCAC Terms of Reference](#)
- [GOV-100-005 Health and Safety Policy](#)
- [GOV-022-025 Research/Scholarly Misconduct](#)

Formatted: Font: Helvetica Neue

- ~~Misconduct Policy and Procedures~~
- [Canadian Council on Animal Care](#)
- [Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions](#)
- [OPS 160-005 Service and Support Animals](#)

Field Code Changed