

**SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Friday, November 4th, 2011 at 10:00am**

**Meeting Room C410**

**MINUTES**

Chair: John Belshaw

Present: Vivian Feng, Ian Humphreys, Wanda Pierson, Scott Plear, Kelly Sveinson, Tomo Tanaka (new committee member), Margaret Lerer (Notes)

Regrets: Stan Copp, Janet Douglas, Martin Gerson, Margaret Heldman

---

**Opening Remarks:**

It was confirmed that the more than five members required for a quorum were present and J. Belshaw called the meeting to order at 10:05 am.

**1. Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved by consensus.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

A review of action items ensued and it was confirmed that all of the action items had been completed. The draft minutes of October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011 were approved.

**3. Review of Intellectual Property Policies**

J. Belshaw drew the committee's attention to the Draft LC Intellectual Policy (IP) and the SFU IP policy and provided an overview of why an IP policy is required. J. Belshaw and J. Russell preferred the SFU "ownership" language.

K. Sveinson asked for confirmation of the intention – in general if a person gets release time to develop a project and in the course of release time they invent something what is the intention?

J. Belshaw replied that if the release time is granted with the intent to create a "widget" (under a contract to create a widget) and you also create a wind turbine that is entirely separate as that invention is off the contract, but felt we could get into these little rankles, i.e. if Innovation A leads to Innovation B then how much of innovation B is owned by the institution given they paid to develop A.

K. Sveinson clarified that generally when you get release time there is no contract so generally whatever you do is your own. So what you are trying to specify is the unusual scenario where the College has a contract to produce a particular product.

In summary there are some issues around ownership –not the only one that matters –but the principle clause in these policies.

It was noted that if the College owns the copyright then they will have control over how it is distributed – in effect from an academic perspective that's a restriction on academic freedom. J. Russell felt that the SFU language used would be appropriate.

Ian Humphrey questioned that as most of the larger institutions and universities would also have industry liaison officers that are actually in place to commercialize IP, is it our intention at any point to actually look at that? One of the things that the institutions bring to the table, and he believes what actually gives them some of these rights, is the fact that they are the ones who actually commercialize the research.

Members of the committee thought that the institution should be as permissive as possible and if it really wants an interest in IP it should assist in the actual commercialization and should do the deal with the researcher – then they work it out in a contract so both sides have something to gain.

J. Belshaw noted that with the issue of when you do partnerships with industry which is part of that CCI-IE process they bring a contract to the table too. The partner says "we are partnering on this and we expect to get our cut", so you wind with tri-party or multi-party contracts.

There was general agreement that 5.1 of SFU's IP Policy is a good place to start. It was agreed that the committee would review the SFU IP Policy sections mentioned for rewording and inclusion in the draft LC IP Policy to be brought forward to the next SASC meeting.

**ACTION ITEM#1:** Review SFU IP Policy, under Heading 5. Ownership 5.1, 5.1.1 – 5.1.3 for rewording and inclusion in a revised LC Draft IP Policy.

**ACTION: All  
AGENDA**

J. Russell noted that the wording is very specific on page 3 of the Draft LC IP Policy under the heading 2. College Employees. *"The College owns the intellectual property in all works created by the College Employees unless otherwise provided for at law or by a written agreement approved by the College"*.

J. Belshaw voiced some concerns regarding the phrase "College Employees" in the Draft LC IP Policy under heading 2. College employees is basically administrator exempt, so if any administrator comes up with a bestselling text it is not clear what is done.

J. Russell agreed and referenced the way in which SFU has dealt with this issue as interpreted as 2.8 of the SFU IP Policy, in the phrase "University Member" which he interprets to mean faculty member and non-academic employees.

I. Humphreys agreed that in the Draft LC IP Policy, Item 2. College Employees the description was too broad.

J. Russell thought that I. Humphrey's point is dealt with in 2.8 (of the SFU IP Policy) as well *"...who use facilities, resources or funds administered by the University in the course of University-related research and other creative activities"*.

J. Belshaw noted that with respect to students, on page 4, paragraph 1 (the draft LC IP Policy) there is also has an obligation to share with the students, which ties into our Integrity in Research and Conflict of Interest Policies.

J. Russell was inclined to feel that students should be treated like everyone else and again if we have a policy especially, if we hire a student to work on an environmental project and they come up with an applicable plan that makes a little bit of money.

J. Belshaw proceeded to introduce T. Tanaka, the new committee member, and advised them that Scott Plear has stepped down as his schedule would not allow him to attend the meetings for the next year. He added T. Tanaka can speak with some authority on the issues around the creation of art.

T. Tanaka offered to research fine arts policy on ownership of students' works at other institutions of learning.

J. Belshaw asked if there is an industry standard, cross programs, at Douglas etc.

I. Humphreys added that with regards to the Langara's art auction we made the assumption that the art was owned by the student because they are getting half of the money.

T. Tanaka replied yes even if the College owns the copyrights to the photographs, the department would allow that to happen – if the student produced photographs outside of the College on their own time on their own equipment then it is theirs.

J. Russell said he was not sure how the College owns the copyright - how that is a protection for the students.

T. Tanaka replied that sometimes students, despite our trying to persuade them from doing commercial work, will say I need a camera to do this shoot for a company and the company has overly hefty demands on the student's time or fees the student negotiated are not forthcoming, then the College has some say – you cannot abuse our students this way. We outline that. He further noted that there have been instances of where a simple job blossomed into a huge demand on the student's time – so it is about protection - it is not much but it is outlined very well at orientation.

T. Tanaka agreed to research other Fine Arts Departments at other institutions of learning and provide samples of policies, i.e. Emily Carr

**ACTIONITEM #2:** Research Fine Arts Departments at other institutions regarding policy on students' ownership of fine arts projects.

**ACTION: T. Tanaka  
AGENDA**

It was agreed that the draft LD IP policy and the SFU IP policies would be reviewed and members would have focussed discussion regarding IP policies at our next SASC meeting. It was also noted that by that time we would also have Tomo's information which will help. Then in January we can decide who is going to take it on and perhaps have a draft by late January.

I. Humphreys noted that in many places in SFU's IP policy and the draft LC IP there are references to contracts between institutions and researchers and felt it might clarify things if we could actually see what a contract between an institution and a researcher looked like.

J. Belshaw agreed that he would contact SFU's IO and also ask them if they have new version of this policy as this one is 8 years old.

**ACTION ITEM #3:** Contact Simon Fraser's Innovation Office to request samples of contracts between their institution and researchers. Also clarify that the SFU IP Policy dated 2008 is the latest version of their IP policy.

**ACTION: J. Belshaw**

K. Sveinson added that just as an aside Emily Carr's IP Policy is 2 pages long.

**ACTION ITEM #4:** Send a copy of Emily Carr's IP Policy to M. Lerer

**ACTION:** K. Sveinson

**ACTION ITEM #5:** Forward the Emily Carr IP Policy to the SASC.

**ACTION:** M. Lerer

#### 4. Implementation Plan

J. Belshaw advised the committee that he and M. Heldman had made some changes that were identified last time.

K. Sveinson commented that this was a very good plan.

One of the items in the minutes of October 13<sup>th</sup> was to set a schedule for when this Implementation Plan has to be refreshed – at least once a term was suggested.

**ACTION ITEM #6:** Send out schedule for updating of Implementation Plan to the SASC

**ACTION:** M. Lerer

It was agreed that the committee will review the Implementation Plan, firstly for inaccuracies, secondly to fill in any blanks. J. Belshaw informed the committee that he and J. Russell had a conversation with D. Ross about how we would take this forward. M. Gerson has the lead on this, but who is going to educate the board is still open so some of these are going to be TBD's for awhile

K. Sveinson noted that under 4. Grants - b. ii. under the heading Timelines – Deadline should read April 2012

J. Belshaw then informed the committee that the CCI-IE Sub-Committee had met and looked at all of the applications with one really solid application, so it is K. Sveinson's project that we are going to get behind.

K. Sveinson's added when he looked at applying for an entry-level grant there is no requirement to submit a letter of intent, you go straight to the application phase and that application deadline is April 25, 2012 - project NSERC

J. Belshaw added that this would give us a bit of breathing space.

**ACTION ITEM # 7:** Amend Implementation Plan – under 4. Grants, B. ii– Timelines – ~~delete 25 November~~ and insert **25 April 2012.**

**ACTION:** M. Lerer

K. Sveinson added that the other part of the research tools deadline is November 2011.

W. Pierson asked K. Sveinson what his research project was.

K. Sveinson replied that it is on converting renewable resources into useful materials such as Biochar.

J. Belshaw suggested that it might be useful if K. Sveinson provided the committee with a summary of his project at the next meeting.

K. Sveinson agreed to provide a summary of the project at the next meeting.

**ACTION ITEM #8:** Produce a summary of his IE project for distribution at the next SASC meeting

**ACTION:** K. Sveinson

J. Belshaw advised the committee that the ARD is an opportunity to get equipment.

K. Sveinson added that it is a pretty full application process – you essentially have to lay out your whole research plan as if you are applying for the full operating grant.

J. Belshaw said that it is a good practice run but we should start sooner rather than later on that. If you get the ARD it reflects favourably on everything you apply for after.

K. Sveinson referenced item 4. Grants item a. under Outcomes i. and noted that the acronym (ARD) should be added.

**ACTION ITEM #9:** Insert the acronym **(ARD)** to the Implementation Plan under Strategy 4. a following the phrase Strategy and under Outcomes i. **(ARD)**.

**ACTION:** M. Lerer

#### 5. Website Review

There was general agreement that the website was a very good start.

J. Russell advised the committee that the REB will need a website too, perhaps linked to this site.

I. Humphreys told the committee that if there is anything they want updated on this site to just let him know and it could be done very quickly.

## 6. Scholarly Activity Survey (updated)

J. Belshaw said the attached survey is organized by department and is quite fascinating reading. He and W. Pierson also felt that the participants were not aware that this information would be posted on the website.

J. Belshaw suggested that we send e-mail to individuals on the Scholarly Activity Survey and specifically request their permission to post their information on the website and ask that they please advise us if they do not want it posted or would like it posted in a revised format.

J. Belshaw suggested that perhaps the first 4 columns would suffice and J. Russell agreed.

It was suggested that we review the list before we advise anyone.

**ACTION ITEM #10:** Forward individual researcher's survey replies (4 columns) and ask for their permission to post and/or revise the format of their survey submission before posting. **ACTION: M. Lerer**

**ACTION ITEM #11:** Update Survey List.

**ACTION: M. Lerer**

I. Humphreys suggested that C&M link the researcher's name to their bio and further research.

J. Russell suggested that we sort this list by division – HUDV, CADV, Science & Mathematics and Social Sciences & Business Management and asked for I. Humphrey's opinion on how he thought the four columns would look like on the website.

I. Humphreys replied that if we did it on the website we would probably lay it out slightly differently. We would probably have the name then the actual department, something brief and then a link that says more which would link to more in depth information.

J. Russell wondered if rather than just research interests whether we want something more concrete as well, something on recent activity, something very succinct. It was felt that specific succinct examples of their main research activities.

I. Humphreys agreed to look into this and prepare a mock-up to send out to the chair.

**ACTION ITEM #12:** Produce a mock-up of a website showing researchers, their activities with a link to a more complete bio and perhaps a photo (then forward to the Chair) **ACTION: I. Humphreys**

J. Russell related that in his department for example, Dale Beyerstein has created quite a popular podcast on critical thinking. Now those podcasts are available on the web for download. We could link to these.

**ACTION ITEM #13:** Ensure that D. Beyerstein's podcast on critical thinking is linked to the SASC website

**ACTION: I. Humphreys**

## 7. Reporting Out/Committee & Grants

### (a) CCI – Innovation Enhancement Update

J. Belshaw asked I. Humphreys what he felt would be the appropriate timing and procedure to inform the Langara community, re IE process.

I. Humphreys stated that Langara Council is always seen as the place that it should be taken for possible further discussion about what is happening. I. Humphreys advised the committee that this information does not go into "By the Way" and there is the other part of communication – portal needs to be completely redeveloped because it is not serving any useful purpose right now from a communications perspective. He then suggested a Newsletter, perhaps 1 page sent out by semester and noted that C&M has the capacity for direct delivery to everyone who should be reading it at least.

There was further discussion regarding colleagues who might not know about the research projects underway and one would want to avoid a situation where someone 3 doors down did not know that there was an application at all. Some discretion is required.

The president has spoken recently on numerous occasions about the importance of applied research and the significant attention that the federal and provincial governments are now paying to applied research. We really have to get people thinking along those lines as well, and so part of whole idea of a newsletter is that we could actually highlight some of those things as well and point to things outside of our institution which demonstrate the importance of these areas. It would also be nice to talk about some of our own successes as well.

J. Belshaw thought perhaps the ACCC Symposium in February could be included. This gives us an opportunity to report back to the college sector generally, funds that are becoming available, how that landscape is changing and what potential opportunities might be there. Institutional reports could be along those lines, it does not have to be entirely about what is going on here. We want to get to a point where we can produce a pamphlet, brochure, annual report but for the time being – probably education. J. Belshaw then asked how we should manage this and advised that he would be willing to work on this,

also K. Sveinson will soon be quite informed in this area and able to provide us with information about what is going at NSERC and SSHRC.

I. Humphreys added that C&M can provide the communications horsepower to actually create it and distribute it.

J. Belshaw addressed V Feng and noted that she seems to have a really discerning sense of this stuff, for instance her piece on best practices and invited her to be a part of the working group. V. Feng agreed.

It was agreed that the working group would consist of– J. Belshaw, K. Sveinson, V. Feng and I. Humphreys and or a communications person.

**ACTION ITEM #14:** Produce a newsletter for distribution

**ACTION** I. Humphreys  
Y. O'Hara  
K. Sveinson  
V. Feng

I. Humphreys noted that they get much better buy-in when people receive something in their mailbox and was wondering whether we might consider a small brochure about scholarly activity. I. Humphreys then agreed that he would work on a Scholarly Activity brochure for distribution to mailboxes.

**ACTION ITEM #15:** Produce a brochure re SASC

**ACTION:** I. Humphreys

## 8. Other/Outstanding Business

### (a) President's Letter - Three policies signed by the Board and sent to NSERC

J. Belshaw read the President's letter to NSERC which provided clarity on the process. It is the president in council that approves these items.

### (b) ACCC Symposium – February 28 – March 1, 2012, Ottawa. ON

J. Belshaw reminded the committee that he had put out a call for statements of interest in attending this symposium, at the last meeting and as he has attended many of these in the past he is okay with not going –but he had received a call yesterday from ACCC asking him to be on a panel on SSHRC so he might be back in.

J. Douglas and M. Gerson have indicated some interest in attending.

K. Sveinson enquired when the BC Applied Innovation Research and Innovation Network meet.

J. Belshaw said that the BC Applied Innovation Research and Innovation Network generally meets one evening before, to find out what is going between the institutions, a great group in terms of sharing, i.e. these IP policies for example. For example, Tim Walzak, Director of Camosun's Centre for Applied Research and Innovation (CARI) is incredibly forthcoming and other IE people who are really good to talk to. The ACCC meeting itself is about two days and there is generally a dialogue around the provinces, who is doing what, who submitted what and where institutional research is going generally.

I. Humphreys advised the committee that the next one is a World Congress.

K. Sveinson advised the committee that it sounds interesting and he would like to attend the ACCC symposium..

**ACTION ITEM #16:** Follow up with K. Sveinson re registration etc.

**ACTION:** M. Lerer

## 9. New Business

### (a) REB

The committee was advised that the President had spoken to I. Humphreys re REB. J. Russell agreed that it had to be someone with hands-on responsibility for making sure that the REB is properly resourced and I. Humphreys has agreed to act as liaison between the President and the REB.

In this capacity I. Humphreys will liaise with the President, make recommendations and will consult with the chair and make sure the REB does things like prepare an annual report. This would also include ensuring that the President is aware of what resources are required by the REB, such as education resources, administrative resources, storage resources, and website resources.

The REB is not yet active, members need to be appointed, there is a need for education sessions for members, as well as storage and administration resources.

J. Belshaw added when it comes to signing off on some of these applications the institution needs to have someone identified with the word research in their title to sign off.

K. Sveinson stated that NSERC currently does have to approve that person as an approver. So something has to go to NSERC saying we want this person to be the approver.

J. Russell confirmed that K. Sveinson is right about that and there needs to be someone at the Divisional or Departmental level who approves the research to go forward - saying for example that the researcher is competent, that the resources are available for the person to be able to do the research if they get the money and that would be the research ethics board. It is not the REB's job to assess the liability of the research. So something this board might want to consider is that there needs to be some type of internal mechanism for approval. There should be something on the research ethics application, i.e. Department of Nursing supports this research to indicate that the department head acknowledges that the researcher has the qualifications to carry out the research.

It was offered that in terms of liability you would probably want to have the dean's approval and it would also be really valuable to have department chair sign-off so that the department chairs know.

J. Belshaw said we should ensure that this person has research in their title before it goes out the door.

There was some reference made to the Ogden Russell case (assisted suicide among people suffering from HIV/AIDS) at KPU and how it pertained to academic freedom.

**ACTION ITEM #17:** Add REB update as item to Agenda of SASC meeting of November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2011

**ACTION: M Lerer  
AGENDA**

**Date of Next Meeting:** Friday, November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2011 at 10:00am – Meeting Room C410

**Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 11:40am,