



**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."<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

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

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 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”<sup>2</sup> 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 Impact<sup>3</sup> 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 Research<sup>4</sup>, 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.

---

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

<sup>3</sup> Report of The CCR Subcommittee on Research Impact:

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

<sup>4</sup> 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).

## **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 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>)<sup>5</sup>

### **How to capture (and report on) Artistic research?<sup>6</sup>**

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

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> *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>

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).

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 research<sup>7</sup>**

---

<sup>7</sup> 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.

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 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)<sup>8</sup>. 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)<sup>9</sup>. 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)<sup>10</sup>.

According to the literature (see for example Janzen, Ochocka & Stobbe, 2016<sup>11</sup>; 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.

---

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

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

<sup>11</sup> 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.

According to Beckman, Penney, and Cockburn (2011)<sup>12</sup>, 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 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)<sup>13</sup> report - Approaches to Assessing Impacts in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

<b>Indicators of Research Outcomes in Community-Based Research Projects</b>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
<b>Greater mobilization of knowledge</b>	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.
<b>Greater mobilization of people</b>	<b>Evidence of Short-term mobilization</b>
	Faculty serving advisory roles and/or holding board memberships in community-based organizations

<sup>12</sup> 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.

<sup>13</sup> 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-ideas.ca/sites/default/files/impact\\_report\\_en\\_final.pdf](http://www.ideas-ideas.ca/sites/default/files/impact_report_en_final.pdf)

	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
	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).
	<b>Evidence of Long-term Mobilization</b>
	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](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?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>