



**SENATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

Friday 18 March 2022 10:00-11:30 a.m. via Zoom

Attendance

Senators: Guy Faulkner (Chair), James Stewart (Vice-Chair), Robert Boushel, Nancy Ford, Rob Kozak, James Olson, Susan Porter, Anisha Sandhu, Anubhav Singh,

Ex Officio: Greg Martyn

Guests: Moura Quayle, David Shorthouse

Regrets: Benjamin Fischer, Dee Goyal, Merje Kuus, Gail Murphy, Lisa White

Senate Staff: Michael Jud

Call to Order The meeting of the Senate Research and Scholarship Committee (the “Committee”) was called to order at 10:03 a.m. on March 18, 2022 by G. Faulkner, Chair.

Agenda ***THAT THE** Senate Research and Scholarship Committee adopt the March 18, 2022 meeting agenda as presented.*

Moved: G. Faulkner
Seconded: S. Porter
Carried.

Minutes of February 15 2022 The meeting minutes of February 15, 2022 were approved by general consent.

Draft Policy V-300: Research Centres and Research Institutes The Committee welcomed as guests Moura Quayle, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic Affairs and David Shorthouse, Executive Director, Academic Initiatives.

An environmental scan of policies concerning research centres and research institutes at UBC’s peer institutions in Canada was circulated to the Committee in advance. The environmental scan highlighted a number of key issues for the Committee to consider in the process of revising Draft Policy V-300. One particularly challenging key issue involves the administrative status and characteristics of centres and institutes approved under the policy.

The guests shared insights drawn from their experience concerning the establishment and operation of centres and institutes at UBC. It was noted that there has been an apparent distinction whereby institutes require Senate approval

but centres do not. This distinction is consistent with the approach adopted by the Okanagan Senate via Policy O-5.

It was stated that it can be challenging to determine when a centre or an institute represents the optimal administrative form through which to organize research endeavors. Sometimes proponents may wish to establish an institute in circumstances that would be better served by a research cluster. It is also unclear under what circumstances should a research cluster be established as a centre or institute, and what factors should Deans take into account in making this determination. It would be useful to prototype the various policy options and examine their practical effects and flesh out the implications of approval by Senate.

Committee members proceeded to discuss the purposes of Senate approval in this context. It was stated that Senate approval indicates that the approved unit meets certain standards with respect to governance structure, plan for sustainability, reporting obligations, financial accountability, and so on. Approved units should be aligned with the strategies of the Faculty and the wider university, though approval by Senate should not entail a financial commitment to sustain the unit.

Several Committee members indicated that they saw value in the approach adopted by the University of Toronto, whereby “extra-departmental units” are assigned to categories with distinct approval pathways and resulting roles and responsibilities, governance requirements, etc. There are many centres and institutes at UBC and it is neither practical nor desirable for Senate to review and approve all of them.

Committee members agreed that the issue of retroactive application could be a stumbling block for any new policy. The question is whether the forms and requirements of the new policy should be applied to existing centres and institutes. It was argued that this could potentially be quite disruptive as there is a great deal of inconsistency between the existing centres and institutes.

It was suggested that the new policy could be an opportunity to gradually bring existing centres and institutes in line with the rules, requirements, processes, etc. of the policy. It was also suggested that the Committee should consider doing something bold such as creating a new umbrella for the many different types of research collaborations in existence. Several Committee members voiced their approval of this suggestion.

It was noted that fulsome consultation with campus stakeholders will be critical to the development of the policy. It would be useful, for example, to consult with existing centres and institutes to understand how different permutations of the policy would affect them. It would also be helpful to review a list of all existing centres and institutes.

In order to facilitate consultation Senate staff undertook to prepare a draft document outlining the Committee’s positions on the key dimensions of a draft policy. This document will be circulated for comment ahead of the Committee’s

April 22 meeting. Senate staff also undertook to review the record of existing centres and institutes and return to the Committee with a best effort at an accurate comprehensive list.

Follow-up on PWIAS Report

The Committee was reminded of its previous recommendations to the Senate concerning the Peter Wall Institute for Advanced Studies. The Committee recommended, among other things, the creation of a new governance manual for the PWIAS. At present the governance manual is still incomplete, leaving the Committee with a decision on how to proceed.

By general consent, the Committee agreed that the Chair shall send a letter to Gail Murphy and Moura Quayle reiterating the governance manual recommendation and inviting them to address the unfulfilled recommendation to the Senate at its May meeting.

Other Business

Note was taken of the events of Senate's meeting of March 16, namely Senator Menzies' motion from the floor to sever all official partnerships with Russian government institutions on account of that country's ongoing invasion of Ukraine. Given that the motion was referred jointly to the Research & Scholarship and Academic Policy Committees, the Chair is working with the Chair of APC to schedule a joint meeting in the very near future.

Committee members noted that the motion deals with a very complex issue which must be considered fully. Supporting scholars must be the priority, whereas boycotting Russian institutions may not accomplish very much in this regard. Several Committee members noted that they would prefer to support a compassionate and creative undertaking to support the people of Ukraine, rather than a punitive measure with potentially wide-ranging and uncertain impacts.

Next Meeting

The Committee's next meeting will be held on April 19, 2022, 10:00-11:30 a.m.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:29 a.m.