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OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda
Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Bhatnagar/Miller-Young

THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment approve the Agenda.

CARRIED

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of May 2, 2018
Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Aliramezani/Varnhagen

THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment approve the Open Session Minutes of May 2, 2018.

CARRIED

3. Comments from the Chair
The Chair welcomed new and returning members. She provided updates on activities around learning outcomes and experiential learning. The Chair spoke about the work that would continue in the coming months on teaching evaluation. A member asked about evaluation of graduate students who teach, and also evaluation of supervisors of graduate students.

4. Welcome and Committee Member Development and Orientation
Presenter(s): Marion Haggarty-France, University Secretary and Meg Brolley, Secretary to GFC and Manager of GFC Services

Ms Haggarty-France and Ms Brolley gave a presentation on the structure of academic governance at the University of Alberta and the recommendations of the GFC _ad hoc_ Committee on Academic Governance
Including Delegated Authority. They highlighted the recommendations that had been completed to date and gave an overview of GFC Principles for Delegation of Authority, GFC Principles for Standing Committee Composition, GFC Roles and Responsibilities of Members, GFC Meeting Procedural Rules, and the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment terms of reference including mandate and areas of responsibility.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

5.  **2017 University Survey of Instructor Teaching Practices and Support, Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL)**

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Janice Miller-Young, Academic Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning

**Purpose of the Proposal:** The proposal is before the committee because of the information it contains about our learning environment. After feedback from this committee, CTL will complete a final report as well as a highlights document which will both be available to the broader institution, and is interested in hearing from committee members about what should be highlighted and/or investigated further.

**Discussion:**

Dr Miller-Young provided an overview of the survey noting that results would inform CTL on future initiatives.

The committee discussed and provided comments on: educational technology, teaching practices, how the survey was distributed, whether the data was available on a Faculty specific basis, the effectiveness and use of peer consultation and evaluation processes, and OER (open educational resources).

6.  **Updates**

   **A. Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL)** – Dr Miller-Young reported on orientation sessions for new professors and those new to teaching. She noted that the Blanket Exercise scheduled for September filled up quickly and an additional session has been scheduled for November.

   **B. Information Technology** - There was no update.

   **C. Learning Services** – Dr Askey reported that Debbie Feisst received a scholarship offered by ACRL (the Association of College and Research Libraries) to attend OpenCon 2018, a major international open access advocacy event organized by the Right to Research Coalition and SPARC. By virtue of this, she was also offered and is also accepting an appointment for a 2-year term on ACRL’s Research and the Scholarly Environment Committee. He noted that Michelle Brailey was named to the 2018-2019 cohort of the SPARC Open Education Leadership Program, a group intended to help professionals drive open educational resource initiatives at their institutions. Dr Askey also mentioned that he would be bringing the university’s Copyright Act submission and research data management to the committee in the coming months.

   **D. General Faculties Council** – Dr Lemaire noted that GFC would have its first meeting of 2018/2019 on September 24.

   **E. Student Success Centre** – Dr Desjardins noted the unit had changed its name to the Academic Success Centre and that the Dean of Students was re-visioning services to make them more accessible; the costs for workshops and consultation would be reduced and more services would be offered free of charge.

7.  **Question Period**

There were no questions.
INFORMATION REPORTS

8. Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings
   There were no items.

9. Items Approved by the Committee by E-Mail Ballots (non-debatable)
   There were no items.

CLOSING SESSION

10. The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM
**Agenda Title:** Draft Tri-Agency Research Data Management Policy

**Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by</th>
<th>Dale Askey, Chief Librarian and Vice Provost, Learning Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Geoff Harder, Associate University Librarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Libraries, Vice-President Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The Purpose of the Proposal is**

**(please be specific)**

Information/Discussion. The university has provided feedback to the Tri-agencies with regards to their draft Tri-Agency research Data Management Policy posted here: http://www.science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h_97610.html

**Executive Summary**

On behalf of the University of Alberta, the Provost and Vice-President Research have submitted institutional feedback to the Tri-Agencies in response to their call for consultation on the [Draft Tri-Agency Research Data Management Policy](http://www.science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h_97610.html) and FAQs (see letter as attached). The feedback from the University of Alberta was generated from:

1. An electronic survey of Faculty, students and staff across the University of Alberta.
2. A working group involving cross-campus representation from administration, research ethics, research grants, libraries, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows.

The feedback letter is attached to this summary.

This Tri-Council RDM policy is important because it has implications for individual and institutional responsibilities and requirements around managing research data associated with Tri-Council research awards. The policy extends to all types of quantitative and qualitative data—as well as non-electronic data. The policy may also have implications for the inclusion of data management plans in funding applications, institutional resources, and technical and cultural changes in data handling practices.

It is expected that the university will engage in further consultation and planning exercises to develop an institutional strategy for research data management support, including necessary services, training, and infrastructure.

**Questions for CLE consideration include:**

1. Do you agree with the feedback? What points have been missed? What are priority opportunities or concerns?
2. Campus planning to date has been mostly ad hoc and could be described as a “coalition of the willing.” How do we most efficiently and effectively coordinate these efforts?
3. How do we adequately resource our plans? What is the responsibility of the University? Funding agencies? Government

Next steps: The working group will meet again to discuss options for how
to proceed with the development of a draft institutional strategy for research data management and stewardship. Timelines will be impacted by the pace for which the Tri-Agencies adopt new policies. However, global trends appear to indicate a reasonably high likelihood that a version of this policy, however modified, is likely to move ahead. Therefore, it would be prudent for the university to engage in planning in anticipation of new and evolving expectations in the area of RDM support.

Worth noting, Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) Portage initiative is developing a strategy template and guidance, which may prove helpful to UAberta's local efforts.

### Engagement and Routing (Include proposed plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation and Stakeholder Participation</th>
<th>The feedback from the University of Alberta was generated from:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. An electronic survey of Faculty, students and staff across the University of Alberta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. A working group involving cross-campus representation from administration, research ethics, research grants, libraries, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment with For the Public Good</th>
<th>Objective 11 (research excellence), Objective 12 (signature research and teaching areas), Objective 13 (enable researchers to succeed and excel), Objective 17 (interdisciplinary and cross-unit collaboration), Objective 18 (strengthen and sustain partnerships)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alignment with Institutional Risk Indicator | • [Research Records Stewardship Guidance Procedure](#) (UAPPOL)  
• [Research Records Stewardship Guidance Procedure Appendix A: Research Records Management and Preservation Guidelines](#) (UAPPOL)  
• [Research Data Management](#) (U of A Libraries)  
• TCPS 2 – Chapter 5 Privacy and Confidentiality (contains provisions regarding the safeguarding of information) |

### Supplementary Notes and context

**Engagement and Routing** (Include proposed plan)

Consultation and Stakeholder Participation

The feedback from the University of Alberta was generated from:

1. An electronic survey of Faculty, students and staff across the University of Alberta.
2. A working group involving cross-campus representation from administration, research ethics, research grants, libraries, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows.

GFC Committee on the Learning Environment – October 3, 2018

GFC Academic Planning Committee – October 2018

### Strategic Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment with For the Public Good</th>
<th>Objective 11 (research excellence), Objective 12 (signature research and teaching areas), Objective 13 (enable researchers to succeed and excel), Objective 17 (interdisciplinary and cross-unit collaboration), Objective 18 (strengthen and sustain partnerships)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alignment with Institutional Risk Indicator | • [Research Records Stewardship Guidance Procedure](#) (UAPPOL)  
• [Research Records Stewardship Guidance Procedure Appendix A: Research Records Management and Preservation Guidelines](#) (UAPPOL)  
• [Research Data Management](#) (U of A Libraries)  
• TCPS 2 – Chapter 5 Privacy and Confidentiality (contains provisions regarding the safeguarding of information) |

### Attachments (each to be numbered 1 - <>)

1. Background information/relevant reference documents
   a. Letter - Re: Tri-Agency Research Data Management Draft Policy

**Prepared by:** Geoff Harder, Associate University Librarian, [geoffrey.harder@ualberta.ca](mailto:geoffrey.harder@ualberta.ca)
September 6, 2018

Re: Tri-Agency Research Data Management Draft Policy Review

We are grateful to the Tri-Agencies for the opportunity to provide feedback on the “Tri-Agency Research Data Management Draft Policy.” This policy will mark a key milestone in recognizing the importance of public investment in Tri-Agency funded research and will have far-reaching implications for institutional data management strategies and policies, researcher data management plans and data deposit.

The feedback from the University of Alberta was generated from:

1. An electronic survey of faculty, students, and staff across the University
2. A working group involving cross-campus representation from administration, research ethics, research grants, libraries, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows

Feedback to Tri-Agencies

1) Clarify the Scope of the Policy

How the policy would be applied across the many streams of Tri-Agency funding is unclear. The explicit scope of the policy should be stated. For example, whether the policy will apply to: Tri-Agency scholarships, fellowships, or chairs?

The policy makes no reference to open data. This is a concern given increasing demands for open data during research dissemination. Open data should be overtly addressed in and by the policy.

Many concerns raised in our consultation could be resolved via recourse to different applicable policies, notably the “Principles of Digital Data Management” referred to briefly in the draft policy. As such, either the policy should make clear that its interpretation and application should be done using other Tri Agency policies (and specify which policies), or, a longer and more detailed self-contained policy be developed to provide sufficient clarity and cohesion. For example, by comparison: the Tri Council Policy Statement 2: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (2014) is 220 pages long.

2) Increase Clarity of Key Principles and Definitions

There was widespread concern that the draft policy was vague in relation to a number of key aspects of Research and Data Management (RDM), including: The principles underlying the policy, including the policies recommendations. These principles should be stated, explained and justified adequately:
• Concerning the scope of the term “data”, more clarity is needed about whether and how this term encompasses data analyses, outputs and associated documentation/metadata

• Whether and how recommendations are to be extended logistically to very large data sets, relationships to external repositories and data mining

• The definition and characteristics of a ‘recognized data repository” are important but are undefined

Based on the concern that the policy could not be implemented effectively if read in isolation, it was recommended that the policy contain a more exhaustive context addressing its scope, including both support/affirmation for best practices in different disciplines (eg, physics and qualitative research), and potential exceptions around or resulting from intellectual property, human participant data, commercially-sensitive research, as outlined in the Tri-Agency Statement of Principles of Digital Data Management.

3) Increase Detail About Internal Roles and Responsibilities

The policy, as presented, provided insufficient clarity around key aspects of data stewardship and management, notably:

• Institutional versus individual responsibilities for RDM activities, including elaboration of the scope of institutional responsibilities and appropriate approaches to compliance and monitoring

• Recommended windows and timelines for data-handling, particularly around data access and release

• How requests for exceptions around data-sharing should be made and evaluated

• The definition and characteristics of a ‘recognized repository service’

• How data management and archiving for Tri-Agency projects would be funded on an ongoing basis

Additional clarity on these points would strengthen the policy.

While the policy encourages institutions to develop “their own data management policies and standards”, we suggest that institutions be strongly encouraged to harness existing recommended policies and standards that meet best practices, such as the Portage DMP Assistant. This will promote higher continuity, efficiency and quality.

It should be made clearer that Data Management Plans include both storage of data during active phases of research and roles/responsibilities. The latter are integral but are often neglected aspects of data management.

While we recognize that the Tri-Agencies likely prefer to delegate detailed implementation of the policy to individual institutions, there was a perception that the policy contained a combination of comparably vague high-level aspirations for RDM in Canada with very specific recommendations - for example, concerning Data Management Plans. To allow institutions the flexibility to devise specific
implementation strategies and approaches in light of the higher order priorities and responsibilities articulated in the policy, we recommend that the policy recommendations are less prescriptive.

4) Address Resource Implications

Implementation of the policy was seen to have major and diverse resource implications potentially for individual researchers, units, and the institutions that oversee research administration but was vague on how any new requirements would be funded or supported. Concerns were most widely expressed in relation to:

- The time and resource costs of meeting the policy at the individual and institutional levels, notably human resource needs (versus initial capital technology needs) necessary for long term data management

- The time and resource costs of monitoring and ensuring compliance with the policy at the individual and institutional level

- The distinctive and disproportionately high needs and related responsibilities that data sets in some disciplines (eg, astronomy/physics) would exert and whether and how these could be met by general policy. For example, additional code necessary to create, modify, analyze or visualize primary data.

- Sustainability of funding to ensure data are shared for a sufficient length of time

- The adequacy of institutional resources to support the distinctive infrastructure needs of different types of research, particularly given the restrictions institutions face in applying operational funds to costs associated with sponsored research

5) Recognize Implementation in Working Cultures

The policy should more adequately reflect both the cultural as well as the technical challenges of implementation, and contain more specific and resource recommendations in relation to:

- Raising awareness and understanding of the importance of adequate RDM in institutions, for example through training and education

- Promoting individual and institutional accountability

- Protecting, training and supporting of trainees (including but not restricted to: undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral fellows and medical residents, technicians and other research staff) and faculty members around RDM practices and requirements; and ensuring that accountabilities and responsibilities for RDM tasks are vested in the appropriate parties

The intended implementation timeline is not adequately specified, resulting in a lack of clarity for institutions concerning short-term requirements and implementation priorities. If possible, expected timelines for compliance should be stated.
6) **Promote External Congruence**

The policy appeared to view institutions as isolated entities and did not adequately consider the connections between the proposed policy and external environments. The policy should consider and address more overtly:

- The potential for conflicting RDM requirements in data sets shared by international groups of researchers which are governed under different policies. Specifically, consideration should be made for data sharing and deposit in other jurisdictions, including specifying the nature and extent of the responsibilities of Canadian researchers and their institutions in relation to international collaborations.

- The congruence between RDM requirements and infrastructure of different Canadian universities for data sets shared in Canada, including consideration for clarifying individual and institutional accountabilities under the policy for research which is conducted across multiple institutions.

In summary, this draft policy and the related consultations highlight the importance of shared responsibilities of researchers, institutions, and their research partners, participants and communities related to data ownership, control, access and preservation over the data life cycle. We look to the Tri-Agencies to lead and support these important discussions.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this draft policy.

---

Steven Dew, PhD
Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

Matthias Ruth, PhD
Vice-President (Research)