



Leslie Harris Centre of Regional Policy and Development

St. John's, NL Canada A1C 5S7
Tel: (709) 864-7963 Fax: (709) 864-3734 www.mun.ca/harriscentre

**Memorial University Fishery Policy Meeting
November 14, 2012, 9:00 am to 10:00 am
McCann Centre, Education Building**

In attendance:

- 1. Mike Clair
- 2. Ian Fleming
- 3. Doug House
- 4. Morgan Murray (note taker)
- 5. Lynne Phillips

Record of Discussion:

This meeting picked up where the previous meeting (October 11, 2012) left off, with discussion of the group mandate draft document prepared by Mike. The meeting began with a quick review of the first six-and-two-thirds slides of the document, which were dealt with in the previous meeting. Pausing on the third point of Slide 7, which had been left unresolved in the previous meeting.

Slide 7 – Mandate of the Group

To share information among the group and to discuss issues – even the most contentious – in a respectful and collegial manner, so that we may all learn from each other.

To promote the study of the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador from a variety of perspectives in order to bring clarity to complex interrelationships.

To share information with the public and with decision-makers in order to inform public policy

There were issues last meeting with whether or not this group will share information publicly, or whether it should be up to other entities (e.g. The Harris Centre, CURRA, “Too Big To Ignore,” etc.) whose members participate in this group, to share information publicly.

While the general sentiment of those present was that the group should not speak on anyone’s behalf, it may be useful if the group were to discuss knowledge mobilization activities or strategies related to group activities (presentations, etc.) to help members with sharing information publicly on their own, as was discussed with Slide 9.

Slide 9 – Focus on fishery policy

The group is composed of people at Memorial University who share an interest in the fishery; the group will not seek funding under its own name nor advocate for any issue (except for basing fishery policy on an open, non-partisan, informed and respectful discussion)

Being an *ad hoc* group, it is agreed that this group will not seek funding, nor will it speak on anyone's behalf. This, it was felt, reflects the diversity of views, backgrounds, and interests that make up the group—there is no unified view or message.

Along with this diversity comes the decision to not advocate any particular position or policies. This, notion, however, raised a few questions around the table, primarily to do with if this group doesn't advocate, who will? The group, it was felt, would be for information gathering and sharing amongst members, and it would be up to those members how they would personally like to represent their views publicly.

While it was lamented that individual advocacy is far weaker than advocacy from a strong group position. It would be ideal if this group could strike some sort of balance between the opposite extremes of institutional advocacy and individual advocacy. Nevertheless, it was agreed that this group could not, and probably should not, do advocacy work.

It was reiterated, though, that other groups or organizations whose members are part of this group (e.g. CURRA, etc.), and/or potential collaborations that emerge out of this group, may advocate. And perhaps encouraging collaboration and knowledge mobilization could be an activity of the group, but not expressed in its mandate. Which is a point included as part of the "Agenda of a Typical Meeting" on Slide 18.

It was recommended that since "knowledge mobilization" is not as strong of a term as "advocacy," perhaps the third point of Slide 7 "*To share information with the public and with decision-makers in order to inform public policy*" could be rephrased to something along the lines of "considering strategies for knowledge mobilization around issues" instead.

Slide 11 – Valuing differing viewpoints (2)

Conflicts will arise based on knowledge gaps, the interpretation of facts and differing values; unresolved conflicts are acknowledged explicitly, as they reflect differing points of view in the fishery

The group is a safe place to discuss controversial issues without fear of attribution outside the group

The second point from Slide 11 remained unresolved from the previous meeting. When it was revisited during this meeting it was reiterated that, were the proceedings of these meetings made public, participation may be hindered out of fear of being misrepresented publicly.

Thus it was agreed that the second point of the slide be adopted to ensure a safe place for open dialogue and debate. The group also acknowledged that if something arises worth sharing the group could discuss if and how it could be shared.

Slide 12 – Draft composition of the group

Active faculty and staff, retired faculty and staff, and graduate students of Memorial University.

Persons external to Memorial University are excluded.

Participation in the group is voluntary and members may act both within and outside the group (see graphic next page)

It was recommended, and adopted, that “Active faculty” be replaced with “Current Faculty.”

The inclusion of adjunct faculty was brought up, and it was agreed that their inclusion is covered by “current faculty.”

Point two was stricken, as the Memorial-only nature of the group is included in point one, though it was mentioned that the possibility of having individuals or groups from outside Memorial give presentations to the group should be included somewhere in the governance document once it is complete.

Clarification was sought regarding whether this group is a “committee” or a “group”—as it is referred to as both in different places—and it was agreed that, because the group was convened by no authority but is a grassroots collection of interested individuals that “group” is more fitting.

Slide 13 – Possible activities of the group

A group member may work...

... as an individual

- Peer-reviewed publications
- Academic conferences
- Self-initiated knowledge mobilization activities
- Consulting
- Etc.

... as a member of the group

- “Memorial Presents” public forums
- “Synergy Sessions (in camera)
- Sponsored lectures (e.g., Galbraith, Henrietta Harvey)
- Dedicated conferences
- Other knowledge mobilization activities organized by the Forum
- Etc.

It was noted that synergies developed though the group could provide opportunities for work outside the group (e.g. through the Harris Centre).

It was also agreed that “advocacy” should be added to the list of individual activities, as discussed above.

Slide 15 – The Chair of the group

Must be a member of the group, or eligible to become a member of the group

Must have an in-depth knowledge of the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador

Must have demonstrated ability to facilitate meetings within an academic environment

Is elected biannually by secret ballot by a simple majority

It was agreed that point two be stricken, as the depth of knowledge will vary among members of the group, and any members participating in the group would likely have a keen interest in the fishery, which would be enough of a requirement for the chair.

Slide 17 – Coordinating the meetings

Participants may attend meetings in person, by videoconference, or by teleconference

The group may create sub-committees where detailed, complex and/or contentious issues can be reviewed before being brought back to the full group

Because the group is a “group” rather than a committee, the term sub-committees was deemed inaccurate. “Committees” would be a more appropriate term.

Slide 18 – Agenda of a typical meeting

Welcome and introduction by the Chair

Presentations by one or two group members on the findings of their research projects

Discussion about the public policy implications of the research findings

Discussion on the possible knowledge mobilization activities (to the public or to decision-makers)

Identification of presenters for the next meeting

Identification of agenda items for next week

In both point two and three the emphasis on research “findings” was stricken to allow space for discussion of ongoing research, or research ideas among the group. This would allow presenters to get feedback on their work in-progress, as well as encourage or allow multi-disciplinary collaboration among members.

It was recommended that point five be amended to read “Identification of presenters for subsequent meetings.”

The idea of having more short presentations, rather than a few lengthy in-depth presentations, as a means to stir debate on certain topics, was broached. If a meeting was typically two-and-a-half hours long, with an hour earmarked for presentations, an hour for discussion, and a half-hour for discussion of next steps/knowledge mobilization strategies, perhaps there could be three short (15-20 minute presentations, even 5 minute presentations were mentioned) on a common theme from scholars from differing backgrounds—focused on ideas, or kernels of research, rather than findings-intensive presentation—as a means to generate discussion.

The idea of a group website was also raised, as a repository of links to members’ own websites or research, as well as useful fisheries information, presentations, etc. This would be helpful to allow group members to familiarize themselves with one another, as well as provide a central fisheries research repository in the province which is lacking.

The idea of a website was well-received, though nothing was decided. Nevertheless, it was acknowledged that some space for people to share what they do would be useful.

The remainder of the meeting focused on who should give presentations at the next meeting. The group agreed that Barb Neis, George Rose, and Bob Verge would be ideal presenters to give short talks on an aspects of the fishery from their particular backgrounds and generate a very robust discussion.

Mike agreed to try and arrange the three speakers for an early December meeting. If all three speakers were not available, their presentations may be spread over three separate meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 am.