

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
Friday, September 2nd, 2011 at 10:00am
Meeting Room C410
MINUTES

Chair: John Belshaw

Present: Janet Douglas, Vivian Feng, Martin Gerson, Margaret Heldman, Scott Plear, John Russell,
Kelly Sveinson, Margaret Lerer (Notes)

Regrets: Stan Copp, Ian Humphreys, Wanda Pierson

Opening Remarks:

J. Belshaw welcomed the members back and called the meeting to order at 10:05 am. He added that we are in a good position to move forward leading into the new academic year.

J. Belshaw then advised the committee members that Stéphane Guerras has stepped down from the SASC and added that we will be working on finding a replacement, preferably from the School of Management.

S. Plear informed the committee that he will have to miss a few Friday meetings as he will be teaching Friday mornings and he is on the Search committee.

J. Russell noted that he too will have some time conflicts as he is also on the Search Committee.

1. Approval of Agenda

J. Belshaw brought the committee's attention to the agenda and asked if there were any changes and/or additions.

M. Gerson requested that we add a new agenda item under Other Business – **Chairs Workshop, October 12th**.

Under Agenda Item #10. Outstanding Items/Other Business "**a) Chairs' Workshop–October 12th** M. Gerson" was added.

2. Approval of Minutes

J. Belshaw called for a review and approval of the minutes of July 22nd, 2011.

M. Heldman noted that her name had been omitted from the list of regrets.

Action Item #1: Add M. Heldman's name to the Minutes of July 22, 2011 under the list of "Regrets". **M. Lerer**

A follow-up on action items of the minutes of July 22ndⁿ, 2011 followed:

J. Belshaw confirmed that the majority of the action items involved editing of policies, all of which had been completed.

J. Belshaw noted that Action item #23 – obtain the President's Letter for inclusion in the NSERC Application for Eligibility – has of course been done. J. Belshaw then referred to Action Item #29 – With respect to the Scholarly Activity website – I. Humphreys will verify exactly where the Scholarly Activity information is going to be located. We will also review on-line documents with I. Humphreys when he arrives.

J. Belshaw noted that Action Item #31 – Review the Policy on Conducting Investigations with I. Humphreys to be brought forward to the next meeting as there had not been a chance to review this document. J. Belshaw then asked M. Heldman if she had been a part of the review of the Policy on Conducting Investigations. It was agreed that M. Heldman, I. Humphreys and J. Belshaw would review this document.

Action Item from Minutes of July 22, 2011 Meeting:

Action Item #31: Review the policy on Conducting Investigations : Humphreys/M. Heldman/J. Belshaw

After a review of the minutes, a motion was made by S. Plear and seconded by M. Gerson that the amended minutes of July 22nd, 2011 be approved. The amended minutes of July 22nd, 2011 were approved by consensus.

3. Review of Application for NSERC Eligibility

J. Belshaw advised the committee that the attached hard copies of the NSERC Application for Eligibility were for the members' own files and noted that the application had been couriered to Ottawa on August 4th, 2011 (confirmed date as- August 8, 2011 and received on August 9th, 2011).

J. Belshaw then proceeded with an update on the NSERC Application for Eligibility and SSHRC. He advised the committee that he'd had a series of conversations with SSHRC and had earlier been advised that according to the SSHRC website the process for application for eligibility was a carbon copy of NSERC but after further discussions with SSHRC the amount of work involved appeared to be increasing until following several e-mail exchanges he finally spoke to someone by phone at SSHRC and received confirmation from a very helpful individual at SSHRC that an e-mailed copy of the NSERC application to SSHRC would suffice. J. Belshaw added that this was the most service oriented call he had ever had with SSHRC. An Application for Eligibility has been e-mailed to SSHRC (duplicate of the NSERC application for Eligibility) by J. Belshaw.

J. Russell congratulated J. Belshaw on a splendid application.

J. Belshaw expressed his thanks and added that we now have a document available to consult and there are still some things that we need to cover off, such as some policies that still need to go to Langara Council, and some policy gaps which we will need to cover. He then asked if there were any questions.

M. Heldman suggested that perhaps we could contract out our expertise to other institutions to generate some revenue. M. Gerson thought it might be a good idea to wait for approval.

M. Gerson reiterated what a terrific job J. Belshaw had done on the application and thanked him.

J. Belshaw replied that it had been a team effort and we have come a long way since January and the committee has all done a lot of work to get here.

4. Call for Proposals for the Ninth Competition of the Innovation Enhancement Program

J. Belshaw drew the committee's attention to Agenda Item #4 – Call for Proposals for the Ninth Competition of the Innovation Enhancement Program. He noted that although his name was next to this agenda item it was to be passed on to M. Gerson and M. Heldman.

J. Belshaw informed the committee that the acronym CCI has been changed to IE (Innovation Enhancement) perhaps because people seemed to have difficulty remembering what CCI stood for. At ACCC meetings, for instance, individuals would be unsure what the acronym stood for, and Innovation Enhancement (IE) just seems a lot easier to remember.

J. Belshaw added that the process includes submission of a letter of intent, with some funding following that - some grant money to proceed. If your letter of intent is accepted then you go on to the next level which is the real application to IE, but you have to get the letter of intent in and that has to show some ability to build a collaboration with a small to medium sized employer. You have to be able to show what that means. Roughly speaking, our collaborator or partner is going to be able to come to the table with X amount of money or provide resources of some kind. The goal is to produce this specific kind of innovation at the end of the day or something very much like it. J. Belshaw added that this will be "fleshed out" in the next stage. As November 25th will be upon us in virtually no time at all, J. Belshaw thought perhaps a way to address how we will proceed or advance would be the following two tracks:

1. Survey – web based form, which is still coming
2. Call for proposals – which merely mirrors the process that has been done with respect to the Langara Research Committee.

J. Belshaw asked M. Gerson if he wanted to address this topic. M. Gerson invited M. Heldman to speak to the Call for Proposals for the Ninth Competition of the Innovation Enhancement Program.

M. Heldman posited that with NSERC eligibility application in the mail, she feels it is important for the college to put together a letter of intent for the Innovation Enhancement program and because this is our first submission it has to be excellent and has to have the best possibility of being funded. Also, because it is the first proposal coming out of this institution we must ensure transparency in the process. M. Heldman added that she and J. Belshaw had talked a bit about this a few times and thought that if we post this draft message to the chairs list a couple of times - say at the very start of the school year (Tuesday) and a couple of weeks later - we will alert the college community to the Innovation Enhancement program. The criteria for applying would be on the website and would ask for submissions. Those submissions would come to M. Lerer to collate and by the end of the month a committee would be struck to rank the submissions, to meet the proposers and to learn what those particular submissions are about. This was brought to the SASC for discussion as a way to proceed. There may other preferred methods and we are certainly interested in hearing about them. M. Heldman then opened the floor to discussion.

J. Douglas asked, that as she had been away for the summer she may have missed the discussion of application eligibility, what was the process with NSERC and the timeframe anticipated approval for eligibility.

J. Belshaw replied that he is hopeful that it would be by the end of September 2011.

M. Heldman added that her understanding was that if we have another proposal submitted for consideration, such as an Innovation Enhancement proposal, then NSERC tends to provide a quick decision.

J. Douglas replied that she had been thinking that it was in the area of six months.

J. Belshaw said that the batting order is important –and proceeded to clarify. If we had come up to the letter of intent deadline and had not submitted the NSERC eligibility they wouldn't look at it– but because we have submitted our NSERC eligibility forms –they will look at the letter of intent. We have the sequence right and it is the same with SSHRC – we could begin the process now for applying with SSHRC, not that we have anything that we currently could do with SSHRC right now but we do have everything lined up.

K. Sveinson added that there are really four pockets under the CCI banner:

1. Innovation Enhancement (IE); {formerly CCI grants}
2. Applied Research and Development (ARD);
3. Applied Research Tools and Instruments (ARTI); and,
4. Technological Access Centre (TAC).

K. Sveinson said that first three are relevant for Langara and did not know if we are relying on the interested individuals to sort of ferret out an understanding of what the responsibilities are or if we should lay out a summary because it takes a lot to go through all of that and to understand that there are three pockets and three pockets' objectives and those three possibilities might generate different interests if they understood what the three possibilities are.

M. Gerson clarified with K. Sveinson that the Innovation Enhancement is not the College and Community Innovation Program (CCI) renamed but it is now one of the four grants available under the CCI banner.

K. Sveinson replied yes that is correct that there are four kinds of grants.

M. Gerson asked if all four of these grants are targeted towards community college applied research.

K. Sveinson and M. Heldman replied that yes they were.

M. Gerson then inquired if there are four different objectives for each of them and four different granting - committees.

J. Belshaw replied that there will be a lot of overlap, for instance- ARD and ARTI.

M. Gerson enquired which committee D. Ross was on and if it was the larger CCI committee that oversees the whole package.

J. Belshaw confirmed that David Ross is on the larger CCI committee.

S. Plear asked where Creative Arts fits into this?

J. Belshaw replied added that it comes under SSHRC

M. Heldman addressed K. Sveinson and got back to his point- that part of the purpose of this is to begin letting people know that this is where we are going, and what kind of pots are available and just to increase the general knowledge that faculty have around applied research. If we added a sentence to this opening paragraph about NSERC and the CCI program and the four different grants that are available - would that meet your concerns? M. Heldman added that there is a very tight timeline here and did not think that there are very many faculty members that could receive the message on Tuesday and have a proposal together, ready to submit in October. Also the only thing that we are trying to target here is the Ninth Competition of the IE. The other deadlines are probably different.

K. Sveinson replied that yes the ARD deadline is anytime and he did not know what the other deadlines were.

K. Sveinson then noted that he reference made by M. Heldman – the page on his website is not the same as the one she is referring to.

Action item #2: Send his referenced higher level site on CCI and ARD link to M. Heldman (higher level)

K. Sveinson

M. Heldman advised that she would draft something up once she received this link.

Action Item #3: M. Heldman to draft additional wording to the “Call for Proposals” message. **M. Heldman**

J. Russell felt that simply what we want is some type of set of criteria for the Innovation Enhancement program.

K. Sveinson replied that the interested people are going to read it.

J. Russell replied “If you sent this to me I really would not know what I was supposed to think about in terms of preparing a proposal so I would ignore it. So if you have something very brief, say one page, about what the criteria are for IE from NSERC and that was prominent in the beginning then I think people would know how to take it forward. Now they could do that too by clicking on the link but that would be one more step that we are having people do.

M. Heldman added that she thought that the idea that you have to end up in the bulleted points, about midway down that the third one which says that “you have to identify current and potential small to medium sized private enterprises” pretty well telegraphs to people that we are not talking about some public art project somewhere, and it is NSERC and the phrase applied research is used and at the bottom of the page we do make a reference to community based research and if they need more information to call me.

J. Russell agreed that all of that stuff is right but asked if the specific goals of the program could be set out more clearly.

J. Belshaw referenced the website and recited the following language as a start on tweaking the message to make it more comprehensive - **“The objective of the IE grant is to increase innovation at the community and/or regional level by enabling Canadian colleges to increase their capacity to work with local companies, particularly small to medium sized enterprises. They support applied research in collaborations that facilitate commercialization as well as technology transfer, adaptation and documenting technology.”**

J. Russell replied that he felt adding that paragraph to the message would help.

Action Item #4: Add the highlighted paragraph above to the document entitled “ Call for Proposals for the Ninth Competition of the Innovation Enhancement Program” **M. Heldman**

J. Douglas asked if there is a link to a list of projects that have been funded in the past.

K. Sveinson replied that it was under the CCI umbrella

J. Belshaw replied that yes there is a link to previously funded projects, which he sent to everyone after the last meeting. There is site where you can see what is going on and what has gone on.

J. Belshaw added that the programs were quite diverse and the descriptions vary from very highly technical to “we thought we would build a better mouse trap” really very basic descriptions. In part he thought it reflects the differences in which the students conceptualize from one province to the next.

J. Russell suggested that we provide a link at the bottom of the previously funded programs.

Action Item #5: Redistribute to the committee members the link to previously funded projects. **J. Belshaw**

V. Feng referenced, paragraph 5, line 4 “**Each college may submit one proposal**” and asked if it would be clearer if this was moved to earlier in the message.

Action Item #6: Move **Each college may submit one proposal**” from *paragraph 5, line 4* to **paragraph 1, line 2.** (*this will also require further wording changes to next sentence.*) **M. Heldman/M. Lerer**

J. Russell enquired if there are certain people that we should keep our heads up for?

M. Heldman thought that these would be the individuals who have received ongoing funding from Langara Research, perhaps a big project with ongoing funding from LRC, or something under Innovations Fund that the President started last fall, because that would be one of the things that would strengthen a letter of intent.

A member of the committee asked if we have people like that.

J. Belshaw replied that – Kelly is a good candidate and we are hopeful about any proposal he may have. He then added that in the interests of observing our own conflict of interest in integrity in research, he felt that there may be a point at which K. Sveinson may have to excuse himself, but so far we have not discussed anything that would give him or anyone else around the table an advantage.

K. Sveinson said that he was lucky to be sitting on this committee.

M. Heldman addressed J. Russell and said that personally she didn’t think that there are a whole lot of faculty members who are far along the road in this regard for this kind of activity. If it was community based research she would expect Nursing to come forward as there are faculty members there who have been working on a number of projects for years.

M. Gerson added that in community based research there were a lot of other people too for instance – Stan Copp in Archaeology.

J. Belshaw added Jeff Sutland, Gerontology and thought that there were a lot of other people in Social Sciences – it would certainly be much more wide open.

K. Sveinson – once the survey is complete then we will be able to start thinking about this.

J. Belshaw said that the ARD is really ongoing and to get that innovation capital would be a good thing. Belshaw then asked if there were any questions perhaps to clarify any issues around the subcommittee.

K. Sveinson replied that it could be struck later

M. Heldman brought forward a proposed composition of the sub-committee as, three members of the SASC and an LFA for a representative (LFA to be asked).

J. Belshaw described it as a wee “Dragon’s Den” and added that he had never been part of this part of the process before.

M. Gerson suggested that October 1st – deadline should be in bold and be placed somewhere very prominent on the message.

J. Russell added perhaps under the title in parenthesis (Deadline – 1 October, 2011)

Action Item #7: Add deadline to top of Call for Proposals ...*under title* (Deadline: **1 October, 2011**) **M. Lerer**

Action Item #8: Ensure that the **Call for Proposals for the Ninth Competition of the Innovation Enhancement Program** is forwarded to the Chairs List on **Tuesday, September 6th, 2011.** **M. Heldman & J. Belshaw**

J. Belshaw then drew the committee's attention to the next agenda item #5. Scholarly Activity Survey and asked that they skip this item and move on to Agenda Item #6.

5. *Scholarly Activity Survey (Agenda Item to be covered later)*

6. Langara Research Plan - Implementation

J. Belshaw advised that the last pages of the Langara Research Plan – Implementation was missing from the meeting package – it appears that only the first page had printed out. He then noted that no one from the committee had accessed Google Docs to edit this document apart from him. We will have to focus our attention, clearly the CCI IE part is really important, but we have three of the strategies that are around assets but beyond that we have the task of establishing an office in support of scholarly activity. The action is - prepare a proposal for the position of Co-ordinator. J. Belshaw advised that he had a meeting with people from the BC Colleges who are well connected to the ministry still (old ministry hands). Bill Parker was in attendance and what they heard was that Moira Stillwell has submitted to cabinet a formal request for formal funding in support of research at teaching universities and colleges. This is very much due to the lobbying done by the BC Research and Innovation network that Margaret and he attended. Essentially what they are looking to fund is Research Directorships (Director of Research). How it plays out at the teaching universities is that many of them are much further down the path than we are. For the teaching universities this is one of the signs that Victoria accepts the idea that they are going to do research, you are not going to be a pure research university but it is going to happen. So it is a bit of a watershed, no it is a Rubicon, once Victoria accepts that - there is no going back. So if they commit and we made it clear it would be \$1.1 to each of the colleges, \$100,000 that is the salary for a Director of Research and get us the money Alberta, Ontario and Quebec are getting and we are not getting - we are looking at a \$5 million annual amount. I think we would be in a better position if we had a proposal shovel-ready. The Tri Council eligibility stuff is part three of the Implementation Plan and there is nothing there that strikes me as being really urgent. The things that are urgent are moving along. The fourth item of the implementation plan is the grants – we are working on that. Letter of Intent – we are working on that. We had talked about a proposal-writing workshop, a workshop on grantsmanship and I think that is something that the Research Innovation network would likely support on a sector wide process, there are a couple of people who are actually skilled, but that is something that we can add on later than sooner. Finally, there are the community research alliances, part of the proposal is to make sure that those people in the Social Sciences, Humanities, Social Work and Creative Arts do not feel left out of the process either. We need to attend to our NSERC and community based researchers and prepare a proposal for co-ordinator.

Action Item #9: Prepare a Proposal for Co-ordinator of Research

J. Belshaw

K. Sveinson brought forward the additional policy which we had set aside - Intellectual Property and enquired if that shows up on the list. The policy does show up on the website as a requirement but not as a "should have".

M. Gerson felt that the institution needs to have something in place.

J. Belshaw replied that we might safely postpone this for a month or two as it is not required yet.

It covers what component of the intellectual property belongs to the institution.

M. Gerson asked if "our collective agreement around copyright or patenting is sufficient to cover this?"

J. Belshaw added that at UVic the intellectual property resides with the researcher, at Malaspina it is the institution. Whose policy do we follow?

K. Sveinson added that when he read it - it was in the context of CCI. – collaboration so he had to make a policy that incorporates that.

J. Belshaw felt that this is one of the trickier bits when you are working with a private sector collaborator.

M. Gerson would imagine that the policy might at least have to say that before you can enter into an agreement with the private sector partnership, you have to address, work out and sign off on intellectual property ownership issues, not enter into an agreement and then work out who owns the intellectual property afterwards.

J. Belshaw then advised the committee that that was the end of the editing that he had done.

J. Russell referenced an e-mail message that he had sent J. Belshaw concerning research ethics education for researchers and research ethics board members - the outcome of which would be workshops.

J. Belshaw agreed that it makes sense and he would add this to the Implementation Plan.

Action Item #10: *Add Research Ethics Education to the Implementation.*

J. Belshaw

M. Heldman asked if we would have all of the expertise within the college.

J. Russell replied that he has already talked to some of his colleagues about doing some presentations for us. We should have someone come in to talk about privacy, someone to talk about consent, someone about research on children. We should probably have an ongoing plan in line that once or twice a year we will simply have a workshop in consultation with the Research Ethics Board and come with items for discussion. The obvious one right now is someone to review the TC policy. We could have someone come and talk about Aboriginal research. Also, to some extent, how we frame the workshops depends on the type of responses we get to the Scholarly Activity Survey.

J. Belshaw asked how the committee would like to proceed and suggested that he would proceed by identifying the things that are most urgent and assign tasks out in that regard and perhaps identify means and resources. I think it would be too time consuming to run through the whole thing, identify each piece and who is going to take the lead on it.

J. Russell added that the other thing is that we need to have a timeline for the establishment of a research ethics board. That goes along with the administration staff.

J. Belshaw replied that perhaps that comes under establishment of director of research, office of research activity – more general.

J. Russell stated that it is described in the policy as “office in the support of scholarly activity”.

M. Gerson asked if J. Belshaw was able to make a change on-line and then asked that the word principal be replaced with the word principle.

Action Item #11: *Change the word principal to principle.*

J. Belshaw

J. Belshaw addressed identifying the strengths – Ian Humphreys has that up on the website. He can report out on that at the next meeting.

Action Item #12: *Add “Reporting out on Strengths – I. Humphreys, Item 1 Assets – Actions of the Implementation Plan ” to the next meeting agenda. M. Lerer*

J. Belshaw with regard to set the agenda for the next few months. Perhaps it might be better if people took a look at this and people can edit it accordingly on-line.

M. Gerson had a few questions on Google doc.

J. Belshaw added that only one person can make a change at a time.

M. Gerson and J. Douglas questioned whether a change was permanent and if someone makes a change can the next person just change it back if they don't like the edit. It was suggested that perhaps we could all edit in a different colour. S. Plear chose red. J. Belshaw mentioned track changes in Google Docs.

J. Russell asked J. Belshaw how he wanted us to proceed.

K. Sveinson suggested that we come back to the table with priorities.

M. Heldman agreed and added that most people have to sleep on it.

J. Belshaw referenced raising the profile of the Scholarly Activity showcase and felt that this would be something that we farm out. Somebody puts together a committee, a sub-committee and we are off to the races. That is also part of the issue of raising awareness across the institution.

J. Belshaw invited the committee to feel free to review the Implementation Plan and listed this as an action item for all.

Action Item #13: *Review Implementation Plan for additions and amendments.*

All

M. Gerson noted that in Google Docs there is something called "Revision History" under the "File" icon in colour.

J. Belshaw said that this was better than "Track Changes".

It was agreed that this "Google Doc" discovery was a little victory.

8. Website

J. Belshaw informed the committee that I. Humphreys was taking the lead on the website. As I. Humphreys was unable to make it to the meeting J. Belshaw proceeded to report out on this agenda item. He reviewed his meeting with I. Humphreys and Yvonne O'Hara and added that one of the first things they wanted to talk about was policies. Y. O'Hara will populate the website with the policies, research plan and terms of reference along with any other pertinent documents.

M. Lerer advised the committee that she had sent the following SASC documents to Y. O'Hara:

Policies, minutes, terms of reference, implementation plan, membership list, NSERC Application for Eligibility, and Scholarly Activity Survey.

Action Item #14: *Ensure that Yvonne O'Hara receives the documents that have been amended at this meeting.*

M. Lerer

J. Belshaw advised us that he had suggested to I. Humphreys that a nice feature to have would enable Langarans doing scholarly activity, when someone completes a Ph.D. or a Master's degree we could highlight that on a Scholarly Activity site. If they are doing consultancy or working in a partnership with a non-profit – they could link back to the Langara App – the "What's On" sort of thing. So that is the state of the website. We are hoping to have something up by next week - the survey.

J. Belshaw then drew the committee's attention to Agenda Item 10. Other/Outstanding Business a) Chairs Workshop – October 12th, 2011 and invited M. Gerson to report out on this.

M. Gerson advised that Chairs Workshop committee has decided that they want to focus on research at Langara and have a panel from this committee speak at the Wednesday, October 12th meeting. They have asked S. Plear, J. Russell, and M. Gerson to be on the panel. In principle M. Gerson is fine being on that panel but he might not be available on that date and felt that it should be somebody from this committee.

K. Sveinson asked what they were trying to communicate.

J. Russell relayed to the committee that the idea for the panel was to present an opportunity for the leaders of the scholarly community - what is on the agenda and what is coming up. I think that would be crucial right now. The communication is occurring right now. There was also going to be an opportunity for some faculty, chairs and program heads to say something about resources they would like for research, track. What we probably need to do at some point is to work out a more precise list of priorities to present to that meeting. I think that would be welcomed by the chairs.

J. Belshaw asked if we could do that right now.

J. Russell thought that we would want to do an overview of the committee and what they see as its role in the coming years, and how it is going to change the institution and how it is going to affect faculty. The short answer is the institution is going to encourage more research and more opportunities to do more research at Langara. So we will have to have an infrastructure here to facilitate that happening, tell them how we are taking those initial steps and ask them also to tell us what is happening.

S. Plear thought there was also an element of translation. In his area, for example, he rarely uses the word “research”. In his area it has a broader meaning than what it might be perceived as in Sciences. Collaborative, we never think of that word, although he has worked with several groups, cooperatives, colleges to put something together but it has never even thought of it as collaboration. S. Plear felt that there is a bit of a translation issue – “I speak their language, especially Creative Arts”.

J. Russell thought that S. Plear was absolutely right and since we spent a fair amount of time talking about what counts as scholarly activity - one of the things that we should make crystal clear is that we want to explicitly acknowledge that scholarly activity is not narrowly scientific.

S. Plear added that we could meet to review this.

J. Russell added that he will contact Denise Panchysyn and invite her to attend the September 23rd meeting.

Action Item #15: *Invite Denise Panchysyn to attend the September 23rd SASC meeting.* **J. Russell**

J. Russell thought it would be perfect timing to have Denise Panchysyn attend the September 23rd meeting.

M. Heldman thought it would be a good idea to flush out what we want to present to the Chairs Workshop and suggested this as an agenda item for the September 23rd meeting.

Action Item #16: *Add to agenda for September 23rd meeting Review with D. Panchysyn*

Priorities for presentation to the Chairs Workshop scheduled for October 12th & 3rd panel member- All

M. Lerer

J. Russell thought it is a really important opportunity for this committee to let the faculty know what it is we are doing which is arguably one of the most exciting things that has happened at the college.

J. Belshaw reviewed some of the items we might focus on at the September 23rd meeting even though he won't be here. These included some sense of priorities, what we might be presenting, what we might focus on, the overview of the committee, what its goals are, where this is likely to take Langara as an institution, undergraduate education as part of that at the forefront. We have all probably had this experience when we talk to faculty they are focussed on the obligation to do research and/or publish. We have to keep reassuring them that this will not become a “publish or perish” institution. Getting the language right is certainly part of it as Scott said. Find out what the faculty needs.

M. Gerson added then we can decide who from this committee will be the third person on the panel (Chairs Workshop panel).

J. Russell noted that the Survey should read SASC not LC-REB in the title.

Action Item #17: *Delete LC-REB from Scholarly Activity Survey and insert Scholarly Activity Steering Committee* **M. Lerer**

M. Heldman suggested that J. Belshaw send his questions to M. Heldman as he is going to be away on September 23rd.

Action Item #18: *Send questions to M. Heldman.*

J. Belshaw

J. Russell asked if the chairs would receive this information.

J. Belshaw replied that notice would be sent out to the Chairs List notifying them that this is on the website. They would be alerted that this is in the By The Way portion of the Langara site or whatever location is decided upon.

M. Heldman asked when this would be launched on our website.

J. Belshaw replied that it could be today but he will go upstairs to talk to Yvonne O'Hara after he leaves this meeting.

Action Item #19: Advise the Chairs that the Langara Scholarly Activity Survey is on our website ready to complete, once Yvonne O'Hara has confirmed this. **J. Belshaw**

J. Belshaw referred to the Scholarly Activity Survey and that it needed to be faculty member and this is something he needed to address. – So Item 1 should read **Name** - delete of faculty member.

Item 3. *Should read* Areas of teaching/**employment**.

Action Item #20: Amend Item #1 to read **Name** and Item #3 to read **Areas of teaching/employment**.
M. Lerer

J. Douglas asked J. Russell if he recalled a discussion that you had to hold a faculty position for funding .

M. Heldman said that we could layer it with some faculty to be eligible, because part of the job here is - matchmaking.

J. Russell offered that what we want to know is what researchers are here – scholarly activity – so the broader net we cast the better it is.

J. Belshaw asked rhetorically “wouldn't it be nice if we got four responses from corners of all divisions”.

J. Russell suggested that we change areas of teaching to areas of teaching/employment **See Action Item #19**.

V. Feng asked who is going to receive the survey responses.

J. Belshaw advised that it will come back via the website.

M. Heldman replied that as we did for the curriculum survey it would be the office of the Academic Deans and Associate Vice President.

J. Russell thought it would be a good if the chairs could receive a copy of this survey information also. If we could funnel it back or find a way for the chairs to receive a copy that would be useful.

M. Heldman advised that the chairs would be copied.

Action item #21: Ensure that the Chairs receive a copy of the **collated survey information**.

M. Lerer/M. Heldman

J. Russell said that an alternative might be to send a reminder out to chairs that they ask their faculty to forward a copy. The chairs will have to be informed at some point as there may be vetting problems.

M. Gerson added that we are asking people who fill out the survey to identify their department.

The meeting adjourned at 11:25am,