



Faculty of Education

St. John's, NL, Canada A1B 3X8
Tel: 709 864 3404 Fax: 709 864 2345
www.mun.ca

AS PART OF A REGULAR SERIES OF PRESENTATIONS FOR FACULTIES, MS. ELIZABETH MCCORMACK, SEXUAL HARASSMENT EDUCATOR, WILL GIVE A 20-MINUTE PRESENTATION TO MEMBERS OF FACULTY COUNCIL ON THE NEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REGARDING SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON CAMPUS AT BEGINNING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL, FACULTY OF EDUCATION
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2012, 12:30 P.M. ROOM E2030B (MCCANN CENTRE)

AGENDA

1. **Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting**
 - Minutes of Regular Meeting of December 13, 2011 (attached)
2. **Business Arising**
3. **New Business**
4. **Correspondence**
5. **Notice of Motion**
6. **Reports of Committees**
 - i) Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Research and Development Committee Processes and Procedures
Final Report of Committee (attached)
 - ii) Ad Hoc Primary/Elementary Post-Program Review
Update on Progress of Committee – Dr. Edith Furey, Chair
7. **Associate Dean's Report – Undergraduate**
8. **Associate Dean's Report – Graduate**
9. **Dean's Report**
10. **Other Business**

Bernadette Power, Secretary
Faculty Council, Faculty of Education

Attachments (2)

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL, FACULTY OF EDUCATION
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2011, 12:30 P.M.

Chairperson: Dr. K. Anderson, Dean

Apologies for Absence: Dr. J. Brown, Dr. T. Doyle, Dr. M. Gardner, Dr. T. Fletcher,
Dr. R. Hammett, Dr. R. Joy, Dr. S. Penney

1783. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was **moved** by Dr. M. Glassman, seconded by Dr. W. Okshevsky, that the Agenda be approved as distributed.

CARRIED.

1784. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

It was **moved** by Dr. G. Galway, seconded by Dr. B. Roberts, that the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of Faculty Council held on November 1, 2011, be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

1785. **NEW BUSINESS**

The Chair presented two options of the Strategic Plan for Faculty Council's consideration.

It was **moved** by Dr. Okshevsky, seconded by Dr. A. Rose, that Option A be approved with the following amendments: a) Cover page should read "Mission, Vision, Core Values and Principles, Goals, and Objectives"; b) p. 3. Last line should read "The Province - the Faculty recognizes its special obligation to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador".

CARRIED.

It was agreed to place the approved new Mission Statement in the University Calendar.

1786. **CORRESPONDENCE**

- a) **Memorandum from Secretary, Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUGS) to the Dean, Faculty of Education**

SCUGS expressed concern about the "continuing general trend towards very high grades assigned in Education courses as well as the discrepancy in the

grades assigned in Education courses offered at the St. John's Campus vs. Grenfell Campus and through Distance Education".

Dr. K. Goodnough, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs, stated that she felt the Faculty had already provided several reasons why the grades are as they are. Discussion ensued and the following points were expressed:

- The Faculty provides excellent teaching;
- The Faculty should have a thorough discussion about this;
- The Faculty has to back up their grades in accordance with the definitions in the University Calendar;
- Compare the grades of 2nd degrees of other units to 2nd degrees in the Faculty of Education;
- Set up a committee to look at all facets of our evaluation;
- The Faculty of Education provides continuous feedback to students which helps them excel;
- This is not only a problem at this University;
- Marks identified as "high" indicate good learning;
- Invite SCUGS to the Faculty for a discussion.

The Chair agreed to strike a committee to have discussions with various entities concerning the grading issue.

b) Correspondence from Chair, Senate Committee on Course Evaluation

This correspondence related to a review of the Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) form. The Committee is suggesting a pilot study that would give students the option of completing online CEQ forms. The Committee invited the Faculty of Education to become one of three units to conduct this study. This is on a volunteer basis.

1787. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

a) Nominating Committee

It was **moved** by Dr. X. Li, seconded by Dr. J. Hesson, that the slate of membership as circulated to Council be approved.

CARRIED.

b) Committee on Undergraduate Studies, Faculty of Education

- i) It was **moved** by Dr. Galway, seconded by Dr. B. Roberts, that Part I changes to the 2012-2013 Calendar be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

- ii) It was **moved** by Dr. Galway, seconded by Mr. R. Kelly, that Part II changes to the B.Ed. (Primary/Elementary) Program for the 2012-2013 Calendar be approved as circulated.

CARRIED. (1 abstained)

- iii) It was **moved** by Dr. Galway, seconded by Dr. Murphy, that Part II changes to the B. Ed. (Intermediate/Secondary) and B. Ed. (Secondary) Conjoint with the Diploma in Technology Education be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

- iv) It was **moved** by Dr. Galway, seconded by Dr. N. Hurley, that Part II Changes to the B.Ed. (Post-Secondary) First and Second Degree, Diploma in Post-Secondary Education, Diploma in Adult Teacher Education be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

1788. **REPORTS OF ASSOCIATE DEANS**

a) **Report of Associate Dean (Undergraduate)**

- B. Ed. (Primary/Elementary) Degree
 - A committee is up and running to review the Primary/Elementary Program.
- B.Ed. (Intermediate/Secondary) Degree
 - The changes for the Intermediate/Secondary Program will be reviewed
 - by Senate today;
 - We are looking at options for the delivery of the Teacher Development Seminar;
 - We have invited faculty to express their interest in developing modules
 - for this Program.
- We are offering Education 2730 in Corner Brook next semester;
- A Committee has now been established for the selection of internship supervisors; we are in the process of assigning intern supervisors for the winter term;
- The Associate Dean is an active member of the Teacher Certification Committee;
- We are actively involved in recruitment strategies;
- We look forward to renovations to the Science/Technology labs which is due to start early spring.

b) Report of Associate Dean (Graduate)

- PhD Program
 - We continue to consider the PhD Review Report;
 - We have six doctoral graduates to date with one student about to defend his thesis;
 - We anticipate 3-4 more students to defend in the next six months.
- Darlene Flight is our new staff member replacing Renee Mercer; faculty members are invited to drop by and introduce themselves.

1789. DEAN'S REPORTa) Reunion 2012

Memorial is planning a reunion of graduates in August 2012. The Faculty of Education is planning a night for Harlow internship graduates. We also plan to have an open event on the Friday night (August 10th). We also hope to have an event for students who graduated from Sir Wilfred Grenfell College. More to come on this.

b) Budget Presentation

A budget presentation is planned for late January.

c) Meeting with New Faculty

A meeting was held with new faculty to discuss their concerns. Dr. E. Murphy and Dr. C. Badenhorst are interested in developing a FAQ for new faculty. Faculty members are invited to send any suggestions to Dr. Murphy.

d) Aboriginal Support Group

The Dean reported that the Aboriginal Support Group has met to discuss Aboriginal issues. They will meet again in January. Anyone interested is welcome to join.

e) STEM Project

The Dean reported we are moving along with the STEM Project. We expect ExxonMobil to make an announcement soon.

f) Crosswalk on Westerland Road

The Dean reported that a student had been injured last Thursday while crossing on the crosswalk on Westerland Road. He noted he is open to bringing attention to the need for lights or other options or other suggestions faculty may have.

1790. **OTHER BUSINESS**

a) Position of Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs

Dr. Karen Goodnough indicated that her term as Associate Dean will finish the end of February. She noted she will not be seeking renewal.

b) Review of CMC

Ms. Beth Maddigan reported that she is planning a strategic review of the CMC. She noted that she would really appreciate faculty input.

ADJOURNMENT

It was **moved** by Dr. C. Mattatall that Council be adjourned. Council adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Chairperson

Date

Secretary

2012-01-27

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Ad Hoc Committee to Consider
Research and Development Committee
Processes and Procedures

FINAL REPORT

**OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE
TO CONSIDER
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES**

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY
JUNE, 2011**

INTRODUCTION

The Research and Development Committee (R&D Committee) is a standing Committee of Faculty Council and reports to Faculty Council. It has been operational since at least 1991. Each year, the R&D Committee issues a call for proposals, adjudicates those received and disperses funds for research (see Terms of Reference in Appendix 1).

The Ad Hoc Committee (AHC) was established at the suggestion of the Chair of Faculty Council, Dr. Alice Collins (see minutes of October 5, 2010) following questions and concerns which arose at the meeting following the report of the 2009-2010 R&D Committee. These concerns stemmed from perceived irregularities which contravened the Committee's Terms of Reference, including (but not limited to) terms of membership, and dispersal of funds.

AHC members were Jean Brown (Chair), Tim Seifert, and Elizabeth Murphy. The AHC's Terms of Reference were determined in consultation with the Chair of Faculty Council (Acting Dean, Alice Collins).

The final Terms of Reference were as follows:

1. To consider the purpose and scope of the R&D Committee.
2. To examine the Terms of Reference of the R&D Committee (See Appendix 1).
3. To review the formation and membership of the R&D Committee.
4. To examine extant Guidelines.
5. To consult with Faculty and Staff.
6. To examine the adjudication process.
7. To undertake other items as appropriate.
8. To report to Dean by February 1, 2011.

This document presents the report of the AHC. The Methods section outlines its activities. The Findings section provides a synthesis of issues identified as a result of its work. The final section of the report details the recommendations proposed regarding future Processes and Procedures of the R&D Committee.

METHODS

Consultations with Faculty, Staff and Others

The AHC made contact with other universities regarding their R&D Committee procedures. It consulted with Financial and Administrative Services regarding budgetary practices. In accordance with its Terms of Reference, the AHC consulted with Faculty and Staff.

The AHC made two calls for input (see Appendix 2). Each call was made using email. Respondents were invited to send their comments confidentially to the AHC via its Chair. The first email asked respondents to provide input "regarding the process and procedures" used by

the R&D Committee. The email invited input from all as follows: "We would like to hear from everyone, whether you served on the Committee, were funded or not funded."

The second email emphasized that all responses would be confidential. The email also indicated that the AHC was willing to meet with interested individuals "face-to-face, as a full Committee" or with individual AHC members. Specific questions asked for input on criteria for adjudicating proposals; the purpose of the R&D Committee and its basic operations. Faculty members were also invited to indicate why they might not have applied to the R&D Committee or, if they had served on this Committee, to identify the challenges and offer suggestions.

Consultation of Documents

In addition, the AHC consulted relevant documents including but not limited to:

- Past minutes of Faculty Council;
- Past correspondence of the R&D Committee;
- Past reports of R&D Committee;
- Records regarding the past formation and membership of the R&D Committee;
- Terms of Reference of the R&D Committee;
- Guidelines used in the past by the R&D Committee;
- R&D Guidelines of other universities;
- Lists of past Committee members;
- Lists of past recipients of award;
- SSHRC Standard Research Grant Guidelines and criteria;
- Vice President's Research Grant Committee documents (Memorial University).

Analyses

The Committee held 10, two-hour meetings in order to interpret documents, categorize respondents' comments and formulate recommendations. In terms of respondents' comments, these were grouped inductively into categories.

In terms of recommendations, where the AHC decided that the status quo should be maintained, for example related to a particular procedure, it did not formulate a recommendation. As part of its recommendations, the AHC formulated a revised set of adjudication criteria for consideration by Faculty Council.

In terms of consultation of documents, it should be noted that the correspondence and reports from past R&D Committees are incomplete. The AHC found no documentation for the years 1996-2000. Thus, information extracted from this documentation, while important and insightful, should be interpreted with caution.

FINDINGS

Seventeen responses were received from the two calls for input. The feedback from respondents was grouped into six categories and their subcategories each of which will be addressed separately. Recommendations are provided for each subcategory except where the status quo is maintained. The recommendations are described in detail in the next section of the report. For each category, we present the feedback received from Faculty as well as our findings regarding this feedback. We also provide a reference to the appropriate recommendation that addresses the finding. For example, (R 1i) refers to Recommendation 1, Action i.

1. Adjudication procedures
2. Adjudication criteria
3. Committee membership, role and Terms of Reference
4. Accountability of the Committee and of those receiving funds
5. Budget
6. Priorities for funding (new scholars and contractual employees)

1. Adjudication Procedures

- a) Eliminate any gender bias or bias in favor of senior scholars;
 - b) Provide feedback on applicants' proposals;
 - c) Outline an appeals procedure;
 - d) Do not identify unsuccessful applicants;
 - e) Support and advise new scholars;
 - f) Ensure full transparency of Committee's operation;
 - g) Use academic track record in the adjudication;
 - h) Distribute money more or less equally to all applicants;
 - i) Consult with applicant if there are questions or concerns;
 - j) Outline a means to adjudicate proposals outside the Committee's expertise;
 - k) Include procedures to dissolve disagreements re funding decisions;
 - l) Specify a deadline for spending the money;
 - m) Use external reviewers;
 - n) Promote participation.
- a) *Eliminate any gender bias or bias in favor of senior scholars.* The AHC's analysis did not uncover any evidence to support the claim of a gender bias in funded proposals. Examination of records indicated that, prior to the Fall semester of 2003, more males than females received funding. Since that time, more females than males received funding from the R&D Committee. Over the time period for which records are available, females were not denied funding at a greater rate than males (see Table 3, Appendix 3). However, the AHC did identify a gender bias in R&D Committee membership (see Table 1, Appendix 3). Members of the R&D Committee tend to be males. There are several years in which there are equal numbers of males and females, and one year in which there were more females than males. (See R 7i)

- b) *Provide feedback on applicants' proposals.* Examination of letters sent to applicants revealed that there has been inconsistency in providing feedback. When proposals were funded, the letters most typically included a congratulatory statement. When proposals were not funded, feedback was inconsistent. An examination of the records suggests that information provided to those who submitted proposals is dependent upon the R&D Committee and Chair. In some cases, a detailed explanation of the decision was provided. In other cases, only a single sentence informing the applicant was offered. **(See R 1ii, R 13i)**
- c) *Outline an appeals procedure.* The AHC did not identify any formal appeal process used in the Faculty of Education. The appeals procedure used by SSHRC is as follows:

Decisions may be appealed on the following grounds only:

- *where there is evidence of procedural error in the adjudication process; or*
- *where there is evidence that a committee based its decision on factual error.*

*Applicants may address differences of scholarly assessment with peer review committees and/or assessors in a subsequent application. The council will not accept appeals where the adjudication committee has made a reasonable attempt to judge fairly the merit of an application. Similarly, SSHRC does not permit appeals based on the composition of adjudication committees or on the amount awarded. (SSHRC, Policy section, paragraph 1). **(See R 14i)***

- d) *Do not identify unsuccessful applicants.* The practice of publishing names of unfunded applicants is not standard in any granting Committee that the AHC is aware of. Nor has it been standard practice in the past for the Faculty's Research and Development Committee. The report of 2009-2010 was an exception. **(See R 8i)**
- e) *Support and advise new scholars.* Newly hired faculty receive "start-up" funds; the Guidelines, as approved by Faculty Council (December, 2009) give priority to new scholars (see Appendix 4). Additional resources are available to all Faculty members, such as assistance from the Faculty's Grants Facilitator. It is hard, from the records for the past five years, to argue whether or not new scholars are being given priority. **(See R 9i)**
- f) *Ensure full transparency of Committee's operation.* The AHC determined that the only measures in place to ensure transparency were the R&D Committee final reports. However, these reports did not contain sufficient information to determine whether or not Terms of Reference had been adhered to or if adjudication criteria had been applied consistently and objectively. **(See R 1i, ii, iii, iv)**
- g) *Use academic track record in the adjudication.* The Terms of Reference for the R&D Committee include *to promote research*. Use of the academic record may contravene this Term of Reference by favoring research from already established researchers.

- h) *Distribute money more or less equally to all applicants.* All proposals for funding require a budget and a budget rationale. Criteria used by Committees in recent years consider whether the budget is appropriate for the proposed research. Arbitrarily distributing funding equally to all applicants may compromise accountability.
- i) *Consult with applicant if there are questions or concerns.* Some Faculty members are unsure as to whether they should approach the R&D Committee members with questions, and some R&D Committee members wonder whether they should consult with applicants if they have questions or concerns. **(See R 1v)**
- j) *Outline a means to adjudicate proposals outside the Committee's expertise.* The AHC consulted SSHRC's Guidelines which place the onus on the applicant to write the proposal in clear, plain language that can be understood by Committee members from various disciplines. **(See R 5i)**
- k) *Include procedures to dissolve disagreements regarding funding decisions.* See Finding C above, regarding the appeals procedure.
- l) *Specify a deadline for spending the money.* Requirements regarding when research funds should be spent are determined by Financial Services. Financial Services does not impose a deadline.
- m) *Use external reviewers.* The use of external reviewers was proposed as a means of addressing the problem associated with Committee members being unable to adjudicate proposals outside of their area of expertise (see item j above). It is not common practice to use external reviewers for such small sums of funding probably because of the time and effort in recruiting reviewers. In addition, use of external reviewers could potentially create other issues related to conflict of interest.
- n) *Promote participation.* Calls for submission are not regularly communicated each year, nor are these calls always given with sufficient notice. **(See R 11i, ii)**

2. Adjudication Criteria

- a) Follow SSHRC Guidelines;
 - b) Set criteria that is clear;
 - c) Avoid bias and subjectivity;
 - d) Encourage a diversity of research.
- a) *Follow SSHRC Guidelines.* The R&D Committees have made use of some of the SSHRC Guidelines in the past. However, given that the Faculty goals are different than SSHRC goals, and the amount of funding is much lower for Faculty proposals, these Guidelines are not always appropriate or useful for the Faculty.
 - b) *Set criteria that are clear.* Past calls for proposals have not included the criteria. In addition, although past R&D Committees have used adjudication criteria, these have varied from year to year and have not always received approval of Faculty Council. However, past calls have included directions for structuring the proposal (e.g., Objectives, Context and Background, Method, Budget Rationale), which have remained fairly consistent over the past decades. Guidelines for the R&D Committee were introduced in 2008. Earlier Committees may have had specific criteria, but the AHC could not find records or copies of these. **(See R 15i, ii)**

- c) *Avoid bias and subjectivity.* The AHC did not identify any evidence of bias and subjectivity. However, it did not identify any measure in place to avoid bias and subjectivity such as providing feedback to applicants to show how their proposals were adjudicated in relation to the proposal. Lack of feedback, therefore, makes it difficult to identify if bias is occurring. (See R 13i, 1ii, 5i)
- d) *Encourage a diversity of research.* In its examination of the Processes and Procedures related to the R&D Committee, the AHC determined that the adjudication criteria did not support a diversity of research. The adjudication criteria used in the past emphasized literature reviews and theoretical frameworks which may not be relevant for some forms of research (e.g., creative forms). The AHC concluded, therefore, that a new set of criteria was required in order to support a diversity of research. (See R4 i, ii, iii)

3. Committee Membership

- a) Seek active researchers/publishers;
 - b) Ensure that Committee members have the expertise (particularly in terms of research methods) and represent diverse modes of research;
 - c) Strengthen language about serving on Committee;
 - d) Define "term";
 - e) Committee members should not act as mentors;
 - f) Student members.
- a) *Seek active researchers/publishers.* There has not been a requirement in the past for R&D Committee members to be active researchers. Typically SSHRC and the SSHRC VP Committee at Memorial recruit their members from past or present SSHRC grant holders. Therefore, it is common practice to have active researchers on R&D Committees. (See R 17i, ii, iii)
 - b) *Ensure that Committee members have the expertise (particularly in terms of research methods and represent diverse modes of research).* In terms of the R&D Committee's capability to adjudicate a wide range of proposals, the onus, as in the case of SSHRC, is placed, not on the adjudicating Committee, but on the applicant (see SSHRC, 2010):

Provide a summary of your research proposal written in clear, plain language. It should be written in non-technical terms and clearly understood by scholars with varied areas of expertise (i.e., minimal academic terminology and reference to methodology). (Summary of proposed research section, paragraph 1)

In writing the detailed description of the proposal, avoid jargon, acronyms and highly technical terms. Not all Committee members will have an intimate knowledge of the subject matter of all proposals. (SSHRC proposal instructions, detailed description section, paragraph 1) (See R 5i)

- c) *Strengthen language about serving on Committee.* Two issues concerning membership arise here. First, the wording in recent Terms of Reference states that a member shall not apply for funding during his/her term of membership. This

stipulation has been interpreted in several ways. Some have interpreted it to mean that if a Committee member chooses to resign from the Committee and then apply for funding within that same academic year, the individual will have acted in accordance with the Terms of Reference. Others interpret "term" as meaning the academic year (September 1 until August 31) and therefore, even if the Committee member resigned, he or she would not be eligible to apply in that academic year. **(See R 3i, ii; R 5i)**

The second issue is the length of term for members. Faculty Council (December 10, 2002) approved a motion that no one should serve on a Committee for more than two consecutive years. Examination of past membership of the R&D Committee show that most members serve for one or two years. Two people have served for three consecutive years and one person served for four years. On four occasions in which a member served a second year, the Committee had two new members; on another four occasions the R&D Committee had three new members. It should be noted, though, that funding rates for those individuals who served for more than two consecutive years were not different than other years. **(See R 3ii)**

- d) *Define "term"*. See item c.
- e) *Committee members should not act as mentors*. The Terms of Reference stipulate that the R&D Committee shall "provide support and advice, when requested, to individuals who submit projects" (see Appendix 1). The AHC did not identify any R&D Committees that provided mentoring. However, support and advice could be provided in the form of feedback after adjudication. Part of the Faculty's Grants Facilitator's role is to mentor Faculty members who are applying for funding. The Grants Facilitator could, in addition, be an ex officio (non-voting) member of the R&D Committee. **(See R 1ii; R 13i, ii)**
- f) *Student members*. Currently all Faculty Standing Committees are required to have two student members. Examination of past R&D Committee memberships indicates that there have never been student members. R&D Committees do not typically include students, probably because of their lack of established research expertise. **(See R 17ii)**

4. **Accountability of the Committee and of those Receiving Funding**

- a) Ensure compliance to Terms of Reference and Guidelines;
 - b) Address compliance in the annual report;
 - c) Ensure names of serving Committee members on all annual reports to Faculty Council;
 - d) Publish annual reports (or online publications) by successful applicants.
- a) *Ensure compliance to Terms of Reference and Guidelines*. There have not been measures in place in the past to ensure adherence to the Terms of Reference. There have been no procedures, checks or balances in place to ensure compliance with Terms of Reference. It is likely because of that lack of compliance that the concerns were raised that then led to the need to establish the AHC. **(See R 1j,iv,vi)**

- b) *Address compliance in the annual report.* Past reports have not addressed compliance. However, all standing committees are expected to submit annual reports to the Faculty Council. **(See R 1iv)**
- c) *Ensure names of serving Committee members on all annual reports to Faculty Council.* Past reports have typically included the names of members. However, the AHC's analysis of past reports revealed that names of R&D Committee members were not always included in reports to Faculty Council (sometimes it was just the name of the Chair). **(See R 1vii)**
- d) *Publish annual reports (or online publications) by successful applicants.* Presently, the only requirement for grant holders is that they present to Faculty. However, there have not been measures in place to ensure that grant holders actually do present. SSHRC grant holders as well as VP grant holders must present a 'progress report' indicating how the money was spent and what dissemination took place, etc. The Faculty has not had such requirements in the past. **(See R 1i, 2i, ii)**

5. Budget

- a) Allow funding for release time for teachers and for transcribing;
 - b) Allow conference travel;
 - c) Allow participant incentives;
 - d) Ensure funding is adequate to do the research.
- a) *Allow funding for release time for teachers and for transcribing.* Budget items that are allowed by Memorial's VP Grants Committee include release time for teachers and for transcribing. The general office provides transcribing but only on a limited basis. **(See R 10i, ii)**
 - b) *Allow conference travel.* Budget items that are allowed by Memorial's VP Grants Committee exclude dissemination and conference travel. Those items would normally be funded through professional development grants or through the VP travel grant application process.
 - c) *Allow participant incentives.* This is an allowable SSHRC expense. The VP Grants Committee already allows for participant incentives. **(See R 10iii)**
 - d) *Ensure funding is adequate to do the research.* The Guidelines approved by Faculty (#3, December 2009) limit the assistance to a maximum of \$6000, with the understanding that the awards are "seed money" to initiate projects for which external funding is being sought.

6. Priorities for Funding

- a) Give priority to new scholars;
- b) Allow contractual employees to apply;
- c) Include part-time and sessionals;
- d) Clearly state who can apply for funding;
- e) Use funding as "seed money";
- f) Give priority to a team doing research on a theme.

- a) *Give priority to new scholars.* The Guidelines approved by Faculty (December, 2009) clearly stated that priority will be given to new scholars (as defined by SSHRC). The rationale provided is: “new scholars need seed money to develop their research proposals so that they might be funded from other sources” (see Guideline #5). **(See R 9i)**
- b) *Give priority to contractual Faculty to apply.* Awarding of grants at Memorial is governed by policies from the offices of Financial Services. Financial Services cannot and will not provide funds to a contractual employee whose terms of contract or appointment has finished. The University’s regulations regarding funding those other than full-time Faculty are articulated in the SSHRC VP Research Grant Guidelines as follows:
- *All persons with academic tenure, probationary appointments, and persons on sabbatical leave are eligible. Term contracts other than those on a per course basis are eligible as long as the award is taken up at the time the appointment is held.*
 - *Post-doctoral fellows who hold an appointment with Memorial are eligible.*
 - *Persons on leave without pay from the university for academic reasons must demonstrate that they have no access to research funds in order to be eligible.*
 - *Persons on leave without pay from the university for non-academic reasons are not eligible.*
 - *Adjunct professors, Honorary research Professors and Professors Emeritus are not eligible. (Memorial University, N.D.) (See R 6i)*
- c) *Include part-time and sessionals.* Only persons with academic tenure, probationary appointments, and persons on sabbatical leave are eligible.
- d) *Clearly state who can apply for funding.* Past calls for funding have not indicated who can apply but such information could be included with calls for proposals. **(See R 1viii)**
- e) *Use funding as “seed money”.* The Guidelines as approved December 2009 clearly state (see Guideline #5) that new scholars would be given priority for funding, and that the funding would be “seed money” to begin the process of building a research program that could be funded by other sources (such as the SSHRC Standard Research Grant). Given that the Terms of Reference require that the Committee promote research in education, only funding “seed money” proposals could potentially limit the promotion of research.
- f) *Give priority to a team doing research on a theme.* Past records indicate that the R&D Committee has funded joint submissions at a rate of 50% which is lower than the rate of 76% for individual submissions (see Table 3). **(See R 12i)**

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PRELIMINARY REPORT (FEBRUARY 1, 1011)

Table 1: Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION		ACTIONS		RELATED CATEGORY
1.	Promote greater transparency and accountability in procedures and processes	i.	Create an online site for all relevant Guidelines, Policies and Procedures related to the R&D Committee. Include: Guidelines, membership for each year, lists of successful grant holders and a digital copy of their successful proposals, Terms of Reference and adjudication criteria.	Accountability
		ii.	Ensure that feedback letters to applicants clearly outline how the adjudication criteria were applied to their proposal.	
		iii.	Ensure that all feedback letters include the names of all Committee members.	
		iv.	Address compliance to Guidelines and Terms of Reference in Committee's Annual Report.	
		v.	The Committee may request clarification from the applicant as part of the adjudication procedure.	
		vi.	The Associate Dean responsible for research is an ex officio member of the Committee responsible for ensuring compliance with Terms of Reference and Guidelines.	
		vii.	Include names of R&D Committee members in annual reports to Faculty Council.	
		viii.	Clearly state in call for proposals who can apply for funding.	
2.	Ensure accountability of grant holders	i.	Introduce measures to ensure that grant holders disseminate research to Faculty.	
		ii.	To receive funding, those funded will agree to lead a seminar on the research, use money as approved, and post their successful proposal as a model for those applying in future competitions.	
3.	Enforce Guidelines	i.	Ensure that members serve no more than two years consecutively.	Committee membership

RECOMMENDATION		ACTIONS		RELATED CATEGORY
		ii.	Change wording in Guidelines to specify that 'term' means academic year and add example to Guidelines (<i>you cannot serve in Fall and apply in Spring in same academic year</i>).	
4.	Promote diverse forms of scholarship (including creative work and development enquiry)	i.	Add under Terms of Reference to <i>promote diverse forms of research</i> .	Adjudication criteria
		ii.	Change format of adjudication criteria to support adjudication of diverse forms of research. (See new criteria attached).	
		iii.	Provide examples of successful forms of scholarship.	
5.	Support adjudication of proposals by Committee members from varying disciplines and research approaches	i.	Add to Guidelines for submission. " <i>Not all Committee members will have an intimate knowledge of the subject matter of all proposals. Write in clear, plain language; avoid jargon, acronyms and highly technical terms</i> "	Adjudication procedures
6.	Allow applications from contractual faculty and term appointees	i.	Require contractual faculty and term appointees to collaborate on application with tenured or tenure track faculty members, unless the funds can be used during the life of the appointment.	Priorities for funding
7.	Promote gender equity	i.	Encourage equal participation on Committee by men and women, where possible.	Committee membership
8.	Ensure confidentiality.	i.	Do not identify unsuccessful applicants.	Adjudication procedures
9.	Provide more opportunity for new scholars	i.	If two proposals (one from a regular and one from a new scholar) are deemed worthy of funding by the Committee but limited funds do not allow funding of both proposals, the priority will be given to the new scholar.	Priorities for funding
10.	Ensure that funds allow for a range of research activities	i.	Allow transcribing.	Budget
		ii.	Allow release time for teachers.	
		iii.	Allow participant incentives.	

RECOMMENDATIONS		ACTIONS		RELATED CATEGORY
11.	Promote participation	i.	Calls for submission would be at the same time each year: November 30 and May 30.	Adjudication procedures
		ii.	These dates would be communicated to potential applicants at least two months in advance.	
12.	Promote collaboration.	i.	Give priority to teams. [DELETED AFTER CONSULTATION. NOTE A NEW #12 IN FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS].	Priorities for funding
13.	Provide encouragement to applicants whose proposals are not funded.	i.	Provide detailed feedback that indicates how proposal can be improved for next funding competition.	Adjudication procedures
		ii.	The Faculty's Grants Facilitator provides one-on-one assistance, in order to explain where the weaknesses were and how to improve for the next competition.	
14.	Allow an appeals procedure.	i.	Where there is evidence of procedural error in the adjudication process, or where there is evidence that a Committee based its decision on factual error, the applicant can make an appeal in writing to the Dean of Education.	Adjudication procedures
15.	Use adjudication criteria consistently.	i.	Include criteria with calls for proposals.	Adjudication procedures
		ii.	Have Faculty Council approve criteria.	
16.	Ensure credibility of R&D Committee membership.	i.	Use a nomination and election procedure for choice of R&D Committee members.	Committee membership
		ii.	Revise Faculty's constitution to exclude students from the Faculty's R&D Committee membership.	
		iii.	Seek active researchers/publishers.	

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM FINAL REPORT (JUNE, 1011)

The preliminary report was presented to the Dean in February, 2011. The report was subsequently made available to all faculty. On April 19th, a meeting was held with Faculty to allow them to have input and suggest changes. A second meeting was held on May 12th. Based on the feedback from the two meetings, changes have been incorporated into Recommendations and Actions. The result is this Final Report and Final Recommendations.

Table 1: Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION		ACTIONS	RELATED CATEGORY
1.	Promote greater transparency and accountability in procedures and processes	i. Create an online site for all relevant Guidelines, Policies and Procedures related to the R&D Committee. Include: Guidelines, membership for each year, lists of successful grant holders Terms of Reference adjudication criteria, and, with permission of grant holders, a digital copy of their successful proposals (in a password protected site).	Accountability
		ii. Ensure that feedback letters to applicants clearly outline how the adjudication criteria were applied to their proposal.	
		iii. Ensure that all feedback letters include the names of all Committee members.	
		iv. Address compliance to Guidelines and Terms of Reference in Committee's Annual Report.	
		v. Proposals shall be received by the Office of Graduate Studies and Research (Education). The Office may contact the applicant if there appears to be missing pages, corrupt files, or simple calculation errors, such as in the budget. Committee members may not directly contact applicants. All contact during the adjudication process will be through the Office of Graduate Studies and Research (Education).	
		vi. The Associate Dean responsible for research is an ex officio member of the Committee.	
		vii. Include names of R&D Committee members in annual reports to Faculty Council.	

RECOMMENDATION		ACTIONS		RELATED CATEGORY
		vii i.	Clearly state in call for proposals who can apply for funding.	
2.	Ensure accountability of grant holders	i.	Introduce measures to ensure that grant holders disseminate research to Faculty.	
		ii.	To receive funding, those funded will agree to lead a seminar on the research and use money as approved.	
3.	Enforce Guidelines	i.	Ensure that members serve no more than two years consecutively.	Committee membership
		ii.	Change wording in Guidelines to specify that 'term' means academic year and add example to Guidelines (<i>you cannot serve in Fall and apply in Spring in same academic year</i>).	
4.	Promote diverse forms of scholarship (including creative work and development enquiry)	i.	Add under Terms of Reference to <i>promote diverse forms of research</i> .	Adjudication criteria
		ii.	Change format of adjudication criteria to support adjudication of diverse forms of research. (See new criteria attached).	
		iii.	Provide examples of successful forms of scholarship.	
5.	Support adjudication of proposals by Committee members from varying disciplines and research approaches	i.	Add to Guidelines for submission. " <i>Not all Committee members will have an intimate knowledge of the subject matter of all proposals. Write in clear, plain language; avoid jargon, acronyms and highly technical terms</i> "	Adjudication procedures
6.	Allow applications from contractual faculty and term	i.	Require contractual faculty and term appointees to collaborate on application with tenured or tenure track faculty members, unless the funds can be used during the life of the appointment.	Priorities for funding

RECOMMENDATION		ACTIONS		RELATED CATEGORY
	appointees			
7.	Promote equity	i.	Committee membership reflects the diversity, scope, and breadth of Faculty.	Committee membership
8.	Ensure confidentiality.	i.	Do not identify unsuccessful applicants.	Adjudication procedures
9.	Provide more opportunity for untenured faculty	i.	If two proposals (one from a regular and one from a new scholar) are deemed worthy of funding by the Committee but limited funds do not allow funding of both proposals, the priority will be given to the new scholar.	Priorities for funding
10.	Ensure that funds allow for a range of research activities	i.	Allow transcribing.	Budget
		ii.	Allow release time for teachers.	
		iii.	Allow participant incentives.	

RECOMMENDATIONS		ACTIONS		RELATED CATEGORY
11.	Promote participation	i.	Calls for submission would be at the same time each year: November 30 and May 30.	Adjudication procedures
		ii.	These dates would be communicated to potential applicants at least two months in advance.	

12.	Maximize participation	i.	A principal investigator, or a research team, successful in a funding competition, may not be eligible again for two years. For example, if successful in November 2011, could not apply again until November 2013. Applicants may receive funding as co-investigators in any given competition. Proposals already funded by this or other competitions are not eligible for funding.	Priorities for funding
13.	Provide encouragement to applicants whose proposals are not funded.	i.	The Committee shall provide detailed feedback that indicates how the proposal can be improved for next funding competition. Applicants re-submitting a proposal are encouraged to provide a response to the feedback they received in their earlier proposal.	Adjudication procedures

		ii	The Faculty's Grants Facilitator provides one-on-one assistance, in order to explain where the weaknesses were and how to improve for the next competition.	
14.	Allow an appeals procedure.	i.	Where there is evidence of a procedural error in the adjudication process, or where there is evidence that a Committee based its decision on factual error, the applicant can make an appeal in writing to the Dean of Education. Examples of a procedural error is that part of the proposal was not copied, or a member of the Committee was funded.	Adjudication procedures
15.	Use adjudication criteria consistently.	i.	Include criteria with calls for proposals.	Adjudication procedures
		ii.	Have Faculty Council approve criteria.	
16.	Ensure credibility of R&D Committee membership.	i.	Revise Faculty's constitution to exclude students from the Faculty's R&D Committee membership.	Committee membership
		ii.	Seek active researchers/publishers.	

ADJUDICATION CRITERIA

The activities of the R&D Committee centre around the adjudication process. That process must be guided by criteria designed to ensure reliable and valid appraisals of proposals. At the same time, the adjudication criteria need to be sufficiently flexible in order to uphold the principle of supporting diverse forms of research. Such forms of research may not always hold up well against criteria that are used in standard adjudication processes. These criteria might reference, for example, a theoretical framework, literature reviews, methods, etc.

In relation to Recommendation 4: "Promote diverse forms of scholarship (including creative work and development enquiry)" and recommendation R 4ii "Change format of adjudication criteria to support adjudication of diverse forms of research," the AHC drafted a new set of criteria that could be used to adjudicate proposals. If accepted by Faculty Council, these would be used in all future competitions unless they were revised once again by Council. The new criteria would be: Comprehensibility, Coherence, Feasibility, Accountability, Contribution.

Table 2: Adjudication Criteria

CRITERIA	GUIDING QUESTIONS	COMMENTS <i>(sample comments)</i>
Comprehensibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it clear to the Committee what the proposal is communicating? • Is the proposal written in a language that is understandable to a Committee member not working in that specific area? Is it written in clear, plain language, avoiding jargon, acronyms and highly technical terms? 	<p><i>It is not clear what the purpose is.</i></p> <p><i>The Committee did not understand the technical language in the Methods section.</i></p>
Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a logical match between the study's purpose, its projected outcomes and its methods? • Is it complete -- are all sections present? 	<p><i>There is no information provided on data analysis or how participants will be recruited.</i></p> <p><i>The study proposes to assess students' perceptions yet data collection focuses only on instructors.</i></p>
Feasibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the scope of the study adequate for the amount of money requested? • Does the budget allow for the study to be completed? • Is the timeframe adequate? 	<p><i>The proposal indicates that interviews will be conducted with 40 teachers. The Committee felt that this scope was too large for the budget.</i></p>
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there plans for dissemination? • Is the proposed study likely to have an impact on practice, theory, policy or local knowledge? • Is the proposed study likely to create research capacity (e.g., hiring of new researchers)? 	<p><i>The proposal does not include any opportunity to build research capacity by hiring students.</i></p> <p><i>It is not clear how a tour of schools in France will generate knowledge that will be of benefit to the educational community.</i></p>
Contribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the study fill a gap in the literature or in knowledge? • Why is the study needed? 	<p><i>It is not clear how the proposed study might advance knowledge in the area.</i></p>

REFERENCES

Memorial University of Newfoundland (ND). SSHRC/Vice-President's Research grants Competition Deadlines. Retrieved from http://www.mun.ca/research/researchers/SSHRC_VP_res_grts_app.pdf

SSHRC (2010). Application Form, Standard research Grants (SRG) Instructions (Web). Government of Canada. Retrieved from https://webapps.nserc.ca/SSHRC/Instructions-Help/stdinstr_e.htm

SSHRC (2010). Funding opportunities. Government of Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/policies-politiques/appeals-appels-eng.aspx>

APPENDIX 1**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE (SEPTEMBER, 2007)**

There shall be established by the Faculty Council, a Research and Development Committee whose responsibility it will be to:

- promote research in education,
- provide support and advice, when requested, to individuals who submit projects,
- receive and evaluate specific research projects, and
- subsequently to recommend to the Dean the extent of financial support for approved projects and the administrative arrangements required.

The Committee shall also advise the Faculty Council regarding policy and procedures on ethics in research, including decisions made by the Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research (ICEHR, and the Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Regarding Humans, as appropriate).

Membership

The membership of the Research and Development Committee shall consist of:

- a. A chairperson.
- b. Three faculty members.

Note: Members of the Research and Development Committee are not eligible for funding during their term of membership.

APPENDIX 2**COPY OF FIRST E-MAIL MESSAGE SENT TO FACULTY**

Reply To: Jean Brown <jbrown@mun.ca>
Date: Fri, 5 Nov 2010 09:54:38 -0330
To: <EDUC-FACULTY@CLIFFY.UCS.MUN.CA>
Subject: Ad Hoc Committee R&D

The Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Research and Development Committee Processes and Procedures met for the first time on Wednesday, November 3, 2010. We reviewed our Terms of Reference, and suggested an addition -- #3. The Acting Dean agreed and the Terms of Reference, as revised, are attached.

As part of our mandate to consult with Faculty, we are interested in hearing from you regarding the process and procedures we use in this Committee. We would like to hear from everyone, whether you served on the Committee, were funded or not funded.

We would welcome your replies as soon as possible. We plan to meet weekly for the next three weeks.

DO NOT REPLY TO THIS E-MAIL AS IT WOULD GO TO THE ENTIRE FACULTY AND WE ARE NOT ENCOURAGING AN E-MAIL DISCUSSION. SEND REPLIES DIRECTLY TO ME, AS CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE:

jbrown@mun.ca

Jean Brown

COPY OF SECOND E-MAIL MESSAGE SENT TO FACULTY

Reply To: Jean Brown <jbrown@mun.ca>
Date: Mon 2010-11-15 5:56 PM
To: EDUC-FACULTY@CLIFFY.UCS.MUN.CA
Subject: Ad Hoc Committee Re R&D

Memo: Faculty of Education Members
From: Ad Hoc Committee to Consider R&D Processes & Procedures
Subject: Request for Input

So far we have received few responses to our earlier call for input into the work of this Committee. We are appealing to you again to consider having input into our work. We welcome your written submissions (through e-mail or hard copy). Your responses will be confidential. We

are also willing to meet with you face-to-face, as a full Committee or, if you prefer, one-to-one with any one of us who are on the Committee.

We would welcome your comments on specific questions such as:

- * What criteria would you like to see used in adjudicating proposals?
- * What is the purpose of this Committee? Is it to be solely for adjudication and dispersal of funds? Should we be re-visioning the basic operations of this Committee?
- * If you have not applied to this Committee for funding, why not?
- * If you served on this Committee, what are the challenges that you see, and what suggestions do you offer?

The success of our work depends on hearing from you. Please take a few minutes and let us know what you think!

PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO THIS E-MAIL AS IT WILL GO TO THE WHOLE FACULTY. IT IS NOT OUR WISH TO ENGAGE IN A FACULTY-WIDE DISCUSSION. PLEASE REPLY TO ME AT MY E-MAIL ADDRESS SHOWN BELOW. Jean

Committee:

Jean Brown, Chair -- jbrown@mun.ca

Elizabeth Murphy

Tim Seifert

APPENIDX 3

Table 3: Funding Awarded by Gender, and R&D Committee Membership by Gender

	Funded			Not Funded			Committee	
	F	M	Joint	F	M	Joint	F	M
2010-2011	2						1	3
2009-2010	2	2	1	4	2			4
2008-2009	2		1			1	2	2
2007-2008	5	2			1		2	2
2006-2007	1	1	1			1	1	3
2005-2006	1	1				1	3	1
2004-2005	4	1	1	1		1	2	2
2003-2004	5	1	1			1	1	3
2002-2003		2		2	3		1	3
2001-2002	1	3					2	2
2000-2001	1	6			1		3	1
1997-1998		2					2	2
1994-1995	2	4	1	1	2	1	?	?
1993-1994	1		2				?	?
1992-1993		3	2				?	?

APPENDIX 4

GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE APPROVED DECEMBER 2009

1. To ensure continuity between committees from year to year, the Chair of the outgoing Committee will call a joint meeting of the outgoing Committee and the new Committee as early in the fall as possible.
2. The Committee will adjudicate applications twice a year -- the Fall deadline will be November 30 and the Spring deadline will be May 31.
3. The Committee will normally provide assistance to a maximum of \$6000 towards short-term research projects undertaken by Faculty members in disciplines supported by SSHRC. As much as possible, awards will be "seed money" to initiate projects for which external funding is being sought. Where warranted and when funds are available, the Committee can recommend up to \$7,000.
4. All persons in the Faculty of Education with academic tenure, probationary appointments and persons on sabbatical leave be eligible for funding. Term contracts other than those on a per course basis are eligible as long as the award is taken up at the time. Post-doctoral fellows who hold an appointment with the Faculty of Education are eligible. New scholars will be given preference for funding. A new scholar is someone who has not yet had the opportunity to establish an extensive record of research achievement, but is in the process of building one.

Applicants requesting consideration as a new scholar must demonstrate that they have not applied successfully, as principal investigator or project director, for a grant from any of the following SSHRC programs: Standard Research Grants, Major Collaborative Research Initiatives, or Strategic Grants.

In addition, they must meet at least one of the following criteria:

1. completed their highest degree no more than five years before the competition deadline (SSHRC considers only the date of completion of the first doctorate);
or
2. held a tenured or tenure-track university appointment for less than five years;
or
3. held a university appointment, but never a tenure-track position (in the case of institutions which offer tenure-track positions);
or
4. had their careers significantly interrupted or delayed for family reasons.

The rationale is that new scholars need seed money to develop their research proposals so that they might be funded from other sources (i.e., SSHRC Standard Research Grant).

If this recommendation is accepted, priority for funding would be: new scholars, faculty researchers who are beginning a new research program, and then established researchers with funding.

5. Following the regulation for the SSHRC/Vice-President's Research Grants, ineligible expenses will be: faculty members' thesis work, faculty professional development activities, faculty curriculum development, preparation of textbooks and **conference travel**, or normally for the purchase of capital equipment. It should be noted that the Faculty and the SSHRC/Vice-President's Research Grants provide money for conference travel.
6. Faculty members will receive only one grant per two academic years under this program. Collaborative applications which include someone having received an individual grant will not be excluded from consideration, as long as there are people who have not received previous funding.
7. Those receiving awards are expected to give a faculty seminar on their research. The Dean's Office will provide support for the seminar and schedule them as appropriate.