

Policy dialogue on recognition and reward of Canadian university faculty involved in international research collaboration for development

Summary of outcomes

January 28, 2008



Note to reader

This report does not represent a verbatim account of the policy dialogue proceedings but is instead a synthesis of key themes and issues discussed. We have attached the policy dialogue agenda to provide information on the structure of the dialogue and to introduce the discussants.

The following documents are attached as appendices: a list of the policy dialogue participants and their affiliations, and AUCC's background paper on recognition and reward at Canadian universities for faculty members who engage in international research collaboration for development.

© 2008 AUCC
ISBN 978-0-88876-264-X

Deposited with the National Library of Canada
Printed in Canada

Established in 1911, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada represents 92 Canadian public and private not-for-profit universities and university-degree level colleges. Our mandate is to foster and promote the interest of higher education, both within Canada and abroad.

Table of Contents

1.	Executive summary	4
2.	Introduction	4
2.1	Rationale for the policy dialogue	4
2.2	Faculty recognition and reward within Canadian universities' broader university internationalization mandate	5
2.3	The need for broader definitions and conceptual frameworks to support faculty recognition and reward	5
3.	Faculty-led strategies to foster increased engagement in international research collaboration for development.....	6
3.1	Research partnerships for development enrich teaching.....	7
3.2	Coalition building among researchers	7
4.	Institutional strategies to foster increased faculty engagement in international research collaboration for development.....	7
4.1	Effecting change in institutional culture	7
4.2	Developing model tenure and promotion clauses	8
4.3	Fostering departmental ownership of internationalization efforts	9
4.4	Fostering faculty engagement while in the field.....	9
5.	Funder strategies to enhance support for international research collaboration for development.....	10
6.	Looking forward.....	11
7.	Appendix A: Agenda.....	14
8.	Appendix B: List of participants of the policy dialogue of January 28, 2008.....	16
9.	Appendix C: AUCC background paper.....	19

1. Executive summary

The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) have had a long-standing partnership to foster the understanding of and engagement by Canadian universities in international research collaboration for development.

In setting priorities for the current IDRC-AUCC partnership, the time arose for an introspective analysis and discussion of institutional issues and topics significant to Canadian universities' engagement in international research collaboration for development.

The following report brings together the outcomes from the first topic explored: recognition and reward of Canadian university faculty involved in international research collaboration for development. It includes the background paper, which served to surface issues and questions, which were discussed during a January 28, 2008 policy dialogue (agenda and participants' list in Appendices A and B). The key findings from the policy dialogue are summarised with a view to articulating several emerging strategies - at the faculty, institutional and funder levels - that seek to promote greater faculty involvement in international research collaboration for development. This report is intended to further the understanding of this complex issue and dialogue among institutional stakeholders as well as funders and policymakers.

Both the background paper and the policy dialogue were made possible thanks to IDRC's generous support. AUCC greatly values IDRC's commitment to partnership with Canadian universities and acknowledges its important contribution to this initiative.

2. Introduction

2.1 Rationale for the policy dialogue

Since 1978, AUCC and IDRC joined forces to explore the increased understanding of and engagement by Canadian universities in international research collaboration for development. Over the years, and as a result of this important partnership, AUCC has been able to undertake a series of research, communications and outreach activities designed to support this overall goal.

AUCC has examined external factors and challenges related to international research collaboration for development through such activities as a national roundtable in 2003 entitled *Research without (Southern) borders: The changing Canadian research landscape*. More recently, AUCC has sought to achieve a better comprehension of the process and outcomes of international research collaboration for development, with a particular focus on its multiple impacts. Activities supporting this goal include convening a research colloquium in June 2005 (*Highlighting the impacts of North-South research collaboration among Canadian and Southern higher education partners*), and conducting a research project based on 11 case studies of Canadian university research partnerships in developing countries, which led to the publication of *Profiling the impacts of North-South research collaboration for development*.

These past initiatives helped bring attention to institutional barriers to engagement in such collaborative research endeavours, notably recognition and reward of Canadian university faculty. AUCC's background paper helped enhance the knowledge base on this subject by achieving a better understanding of related formal (hiring, tenure and promotion policy) and informal institutional policies and practices (i.e. a variety of measures that convey to faculty that what they do is valued) to address faculty recognition and reward. Furthermore, the paper gathered a sample of current innovative and diverse approaches Canadian universities have adopted to overcome barriers. It also promoted a deeper understanding of the recent

evolution in the relationship between the external research funding landscape and the institutional toolbox for recognition and reward.

Drawing on AUCC's background research to help frame the discussions, the January 28, 2008 policy dialogue brought together 30 participants from across the country, including Canadian university faculty members and senior administrators, along with external stakeholders from IDRC and the federal research granting councils. The policy dialogue was intended as a forum to discuss the various dimensions of faculty recognition and reward in the context of international research collaboration for development, and to learn from each other through peer exchange.

2.2 Faculty recognition and reward within Canadian universities' broader university internationalization mandate

The following sections capture the key threads of the overview discussion, which aimed to develop a common understanding of the various dimensions of this issue. What became clear is that formal measures for faculty recognition and reward are in themselves not enough to address the broader issue of increased engagement of Canadian university faculty in international research collaboration for development. These measures are important but several other enabling factors have a role to play and the discussion of strategies below - at the faculty, institutional and funder levels - attest to this interplay of considerations.

Recognition and reward for faculty engaged in international research collaboration for development must be viewed within the broader context of Canadian universities' internationalization efforts. Faculty play a central role in the international activities of universities, such as building an international dimension to the curriculum, fostering greater student mobility, involving students in international research collaboration projects, etc. The recognition and reward of faculty is an important tool that helps shape the composition of the university's academic staff.

In fact, what an institution values will be one of the factors reflected in the choices hiring committees will make. Subsequently, the department will communicate what is deemed important for faculty to spend time on, which is one factor that helps shape the development of a researcher's career.

The dialogue touched upon many other topics related to internationalization of Canadian universities that have an indirect but important cross-cutting influence on faculty recognition and reward issues. For example, the challenge of engaging young researchers in international research collaboration for development early in their careers was raised, as was the importance of fellowships and graduate student training that help foster a global mindset. The examples suggested included double-degrees, co-tutelle dissertations or sandwich programs. Participants underlined the importance of such programs and discussed availability of appropriate funding.

2.3 The need for broader definitions and conceptual frameworks to support faculty recognition and reward

As profiled in the attached background paper, most Canadian university faculty members are bound by a collective agreement negotiated between the faculty association or union and representatives of the university's administration, which usually clearly define the institution's tenure and promotion policy. Hiring policies (and, by extension, the composition and activities of hiring committees) are generally decentralized. In terms of informal mechanisms, the research highlighted the importance of communicating the value of international research collaboration for development through a variety of means. These included seed funding to support university research partnerships with developing countries, and/or creating university awards that recognize excellence in international research, teaching

and service. Additionally, the paper highlighted a range of innovative and diverse approaches Canadian universities have taken to address the barriers to faculty recognition and reward for those engaged in international research collaboration for development. A common thread among the examples was the recognition and inclusion of a broader definition of research results and scholarly activities that included academic and research efforts carried out in an international development context.

Policy dialogue participants agreed on the value of research “by and with” not “on and for” Southern partners. The important question raised is how to be inclusive of non-traditional research projects and outcomes while maintaining the rigorous definition of research excellence. Discussions focussed on what constitutes an acceptable academic dossier for tenure/promotion/hiring decisions. Though some openness can be granted towards accepting certain outcomes of projects related to international research collaborations for development (e.g. a report to CIDA) it was generally agreed that an academic dossier that was exclusively focussed on these reports would be “incomplete” with respect to recognition and reward at Canadian universities.

Discussions also looked at whether the time has come to move beyond the traditionally defined peer review process, and to explore other innovative alternatives. Peer review seeks to ensure the quality of academic work. Broadening the definition of a peer to include practitioners, for example, is one option. In peer reviewed journals, the approach places importance on peers working as a collective to assess the quality and contribution of new academic research to a particular discipline. New possibilities, including open access journals, will require a certain trial time to prove they ensure rigorous standards appropriate to each field.

Dr. Michael Clark, IDRC’s Director of Information Communication Technologies for Development, spoke to the principle of ‘open development’ and one of its central values being that “knowledge has no value until it is given away.” This principle of sharing knowledge is frequently a part of development projects. Researchers often endeavour to facilitate access to research findings for populations at times illiterate or having low-level literacy skills involved in the research project. Such realities suggest that the means used and the ends achieved via research outreach should be kept in mind when assessing the merits of an academic dossier for faculty recognition and reward. Further, certain participants suggested that the process of obtaining a grant to conduct international research collaboration for development constituted a form of peer review, and as such, should receive the same esteem linked to other peer review processes.

3. Faculty-led strategies to foster increased engagement in international research collaboration for development

Dr. Martha Crago, former Vice-Rector, International and Student life, Université de Montréal and incoming Vice-President Research, Dalhousie University (effective July 1, 2008) provided examples of strategies employed by the university’s faculty members involved in international research collaboration for development to successfully thrive in this field. One strategy adopted by researchers to address the pressures of the “double burden” of their subject matter (international) and their methodology (often interdisciplinary) was to conduct and publish their research findings as reports to funders and in academic journals (i.e. to “double publish”). Overall, participants agreed that the composition of an academic’s dossier must show the appropriate mix in terms of reports to donors, peer-reviewed journal publications and communication products for the end user of the project.

3.1 Research partnerships for development enrich teaching

Dr. Sheryl Bond, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, Queen's University related the issue of faculty engagement in international research collaboration for development to the broader process of internationalizing Canadian universities. The links between the multiple roles faculty play in teaching, conducting research, and mentoring students and younger faculty were discussed. Dr. Bond underlined the transformative benefits (faculty, students, research, program of study) of fostering faculty exchanges, given the potential educative impact returning faculty can have on their students in the classroom. This potential has been minimized due to the absence of recognition of the importance of international experience and expertise by peers/colleagues in departments and in hiring promotion and tenure procedures. Changing the academic culture that has privileged the program-at-home over what can be learned abroad will require open discussions and a substantive valuing of the institution example through awards and reduced teaching load to internationalize courses.

3.2 Coalition building among researchers

Over the course of the policy dialogue, many participants expressed the view that issues related to faculty recognition and reward in the tenure and promotion system were not exclusive to international research collaboration for development. In fact, Canadian university researchers involved in non-traditional research activities, such as community-based research, also face similar challenges. A possible strategy is to broaden consideration of this issue and related strategies to address it to other types of research partnerships such as research with industry leading to technological developments and patents; research leading to reports, commissions and consulting for public agencies or government; research with aboriginal communities; and health research focussed on end-users.

Faculty involved in international research collaboration for development could engage like-minded researchers in other fields to broaden internal institutional dialogue related to the issue of recognition and reward. A coalition inclusive of a broad range of researchers could facilitate raising the credibility of the issue on campus, and could foster the creation of solutions to maintain rigorous research excellence standards while being open to new research trends in the consideration of appropriate faculty recognition and reward measures.

4. Institutional strategies to foster increased faculty engagement in international research collaboration for development

4.1 Effecting change in institutional culture

The institutional culture at Canadian universities is an important factor in determining its resulting policies with respect to faculty recognition and reward. In the background paper, highlights of the 2006 AUCC internationalization survey findings were presented. One of the findings was that the majority of Canadian universities recognized faculty interest as being one of the most important organizational factors for integrating an international dimension into their institutional activities. Among other considerations, successful internationalization requires an institutional choice as to the most strategic approach to integrate the international dimension into the university's endeavours in order to effectively engage faculty. One of the important choices that institutions must address is whether international activities are grouped within a separate office or integrated within other administrative units such as the office of research activities or student services.

Dr. Ted Hewitt, Vice-President, Research & International Relations, University of Western Ontario, spoke to the importance of integrating the international component within the broader research activities and infrastructure on campus. He described how the University of Western Ontario eliminated the “international research office” and folded international research activities into the mandate of the research office. He also provided a useful example of how a designated faculty member can mentor other colleagues interested in engaging further in international research collaboration for development. The position of international project development officer recently created at the University of Western Ontario is staffed by a faculty member and consists of guiding interested faculty to discover and act on international research opportunities, as well as navigate the research funding landscape. This “peer to peer” approach is simple to implement and helps foster network building.

The discussion of institutional culture touched upon a number of other factors. For example, it was suggested that an institution’s size can affect the process of creating an enabling environment for faculty recognition and reward. It is possible that a smaller institution can engage in consultation with its faculty, administration and students with greater ease than larger institutions. This can allow for a broader-based dialogue, as well as expedite the speed at which institutional change can occur.

The issue of institutional communications, to highlight the value of international research collaboration for development, was underscored as highly important. Institutional values are communicated at various levels. There is internal institutional communication as well as a dialogue between an institution and its broader community. University presidents can set the tone, as to what an institution values, through their speeches and special visits. Promoting the value of international research collaboration for development is a key message that can be emphasized in university presidents’ speeches, institutional websites or publications (that can profile such activities).

Internally, institutional messages and values can permeate the various levels of the university, and be reflected in the actions of vice-presidents (academic and/or research), and deans. Clear communication of the value an institution places on international research collaboration for development helps establish a broader supportive framework for faculty engaged in such activities. Researchers and university communications staff can also work collaboratively to share breakthroughs with the larger community, including a broad range of audiences.

4.2 Developing model tenure and promotion clauses

Dr. Sheila Embleton, Vice-President Academic, York University, provided an overview of the complexity of the issue of faculty recognition and reward and its many facets. She underlined the importance of examining both formal and informal mechanisms. She also underlined the role faculty can play in molding these measures, as these mechanisms are mostly “governed by ourselves.” She advised participants to look into a common approach to model tenure and promotion clauses, which could be shared via such bodies as the Canadian Association of University Teachers. A related suggestion was made to complement the training of university hiring committees by sharing material from AUCC’s research as well as publications on the value of international research collaboration. Broadening the training of hiring committees to effectively assess and consider international skills and competencies could be an effective way of influencing the decision-making process similar to the equity training currently provided to such committees on many campuses.

Another internal communication strategy raised was to bring the issue of faculty recognition and reward for international research collaboration for development to Senate in order to raise its profile and cultivate strategic senior-level discussions. This allows for the issue to be covered in the Senate’s minutes thus creating a permanent institutional record of the debate.

The participants discussed what constituted the most appropriate wording for model tenure and promotion clauses for collective agreement negotiations. Debate centred on the issue of whether the word “international” needs to be included in collective agreements. A review of 58 Canadian universities collective agreements (excluding the Quebec university system), revealed that only the University of Prince Edward Island makes specific reference to recognition of academic work with an international component. However, it is important to note that a number of universities determine criteria for promotion at the faculty and/or departmental level, which would therefore not be captured in this review of institutional-level collective agreements.

Participants debated the fact that providing freedom of evaluation of international work at the departmental level can offer certain benefits and certain limitations. When university administrators, such as deans, are given margins for interpretation, these interpretations are not institutionalized practices. This flexibility in the process means that a change in university administration could reverse or alter the direction of the department in regard to how international work and its value are assessed.

Another way to address the issue is to include wording, which allows flexibility for interpretation within each discipline, for example “research/publications that are appropriate to the individual’s discipline.” This also allows for coalition building beyond international research collaboration for development with other researchers encountering similar challenges in having their collaborative work recognized. Participants highlighted examples of non-traditional community-based research with partners that include aboriginal communities and industry.

4.3 Fostering departmental ownership of internationalization efforts

Dr. Vianne Timmons, formerly Acting Registrar and Vice-President of Academic Development, University of Prince Edward Island, incoming president and vice-chancellor of the University of Regina (effective July 1, 2008) underscored the importance of having an institution-wide engagement in internationalization that is well-embedded to ensure sustainability. According to Dr. Timmons, measures must go beyond recognition in the tenure and promotion criteria.

For example, the University of Prince Edward Island has created a fund that faculty can apply to for support in the development of international research collaboration projects with other universities. Decisions regarding how this “prospecting fund” is allocated are shared between the university administration and faculty deans or chairs. In fact, the dean or chair must match up to fifty percent of the institutional support provided to the faculty. This helps ensure that the work is of value to the entire department and fosters ownership by all faculty members.

4.4 Fostering faculty engagement while in the field

Dialogue participants discussed strategies to offset disadvantages for faculty due to absences from departmental activities on campus to conduct research and/or development project work abroad. Compressed teaching terms emerged as a more viable option than release time, which is problematic due to the costs and additional resources it entails. Fostering a collegial spirit and open communication with other departmental faculty is also important. For example, absences from departmental business and campus life more generally must be managed to ensure the faculty member is kept abreast of developments within his or her department and involved in any decision-making, if possible. Documentation circulated in the faculty member’s absence should be shared to ensure the individual can contribute even from abroad.

5. Funder strategies to enhance support for international research collaboration for development

Dr. Christina Zarowsky, IDRC's Program Manager, Governance, Equity and Health, highlighted IDRC's mission, which is to help developing countries use science and technology to find practical, long-term solutions to the social, economic, and environmental problems they face. IDRC support is directed toward creating a local research community whose work will build healthier, more equitable, and more prosperous societies. She provided an overview of new funding opportunities, which seek to support Canadian researchers who are directly involved in increasing research capacity in the South.

Dr. Zarowsky spoke of programs such as the Global Health Research Initiative that funds innovative, interdisciplinary research and training programs in Southern countries. She also spoke of the Teasdale-Corti Global Health Research Partnership Program, a recent collaborative health research program developed by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, IDRC, Health Canada and the Canadian International Development Agency – with input from the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. The health sector particularly lends itself to collaborative research, though this is not without its challenges. Even with the introductions of these new programs, the number of meritorious applications submitted is far outstripping the amount of funding available.

Dr. Zarowsky mentioned the innovations IDRC is introducing to contribute to Canadian university faculty being able to better benefit from an IDRC grant in the context of their traditional academic dossier. For example, she indicated that IDRC is seeking to allow Canadian researchers to make allowances at the outset of receiving an IDRC grant to cover the costs of editing, translation and communications related to disseminating the research findings to a broader audience. IDRC is also re-thinking the format of its final technical reports from grant holders to potentially allow them to submit a peer-reviewed article as a technical report to IDRC. More broadly, she also highlighted that IDRC was looking into shared peer review processes with other granting councils.

Dr. Gisèle Yasmeen, Vice-President Partnerships Branch of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council elaborated on the conceptual challenges facing the federal research granting councils with respect to international research collaboration. She described the struggle SSHRC faces between retrofitting programs and launching new ones with a focus on international research collaboration. She provided information on SSHRC's activities, stating seventy per cent of allocations constitute direct support and fellowships. In 2001, foreign co-investigators became eligible to apply for certain joint initiatives such as the Major Collaborative Research Initiative (MCRI) and the International Community-University Research Alliances (CURA). Furthermore, a number of special dedicated funds were launched such as the Special Opportunities Fund and the CURA (in partnership with IDRC). Though the Canada Graduate Scholarship (Doctoral Scholarship) is only tenable at recognized universities in Canada, the SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship is tenable at any recognized university in Canada or abroad provided the award holder has a previous degree from a Canadian university. In the case of the latter, twenty percent do take up the award outside Canada (mostly in the United States, United Kingdom, Europe, Australia and New Zealand).

Denis Leclerc of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada provided an overview of current developments with regard to international collaboration in research and training. He prefaced his remarks by underlining that "science is international" in its very nature. NSERC's chosen approach is to mainstream the potential for international collaboration throughout its current program mechanisms. The focus for incremental investments is being placed on government and NSERC priority sectors to foster system-wide impacts. Similarly to the SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship, the NSERC Postgraduate Scholarships and Postdoctoral Fellowships can be taken up at any Canadian university or eligible foreign university provided the candidate has a previous degree in natural sciences or engineering

from a Canadian university. Currently, NSERC does not allow foreign co-investigators to apply for research grants. However, Canadian recipients can spend three months abroad with full per diem and/or host their collaborator in Canada for up to three months. A recent change allows NSERC grant holders to be outside of Canada for up to six months and maintain their grant. Greater effort is also being placed on fostering international outreach by platforms that represent a critical mass of research activity and institutions, such as NSERC Strategic Networks and the Networks of Centres of Excellence.

Abigail Forson of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research also contributed to the debate by underlining the importance of programs such as the Global Health Research Initiative. As previously stated, the GHRI is a funding partnership among CIHR, Health Canada, CIDA and IDRC, aimed at addressing global health problems in low and middle-income countries through health research capacity development. CIHR also funds international research collaboration via its Open and Strategic Grants programs.

Ms. Forson underlined the importance CIHR attaches to improving Canada's pool of highly qualified personnel by providing a stimulating environment for young trainees to gain international research experience. Through CIHR's Postdoctoral Fellowships Program, Canadian students and fellows are funded to train in research institutions abroad, and conversely, international trainees are supported to train in Canadian universities. She also stated that, through its grant allocation process, CIHR will continue to emphasize the importance of knowledge translation as a catalyst for translating new scientific knowledge created through research collaborations into improved health, and more effective health services and products for Canadians.

As mentioned in the background paper, each federal research granting council has developed an international strategy document to guide its activities. Currently, a review of each council's activities and how best to link them to other council initiatives is ongoing.

6. Looking forward

AUCC and IDRC's partnership has grown out of the shared goals of fostering an increased understanding of and engagement in international research collaboration for development by Canadian universities. Through this exercise, AUCC has sought to surface the multiple facets of recognition and reward for Canadian university faculty involved in international research collaboration for development. The policy dialogue provided a first introspective look at the issue, bringing together a group of university representatives with key research funders and policy makers. Given the complexities and the need for each institution to develop its own responsive approach to discuss and debate key issues, challenges and strategies, this issue will continue to evolve.

AUCC will play an on-going role in fostering further discussion and gathering information to describe current trends and good practice in this area. Staff will present and validate the research findings at various national and international conferences and capitalize on these opportunities to engage in strategic dialogue with different institutional networks, especially Canadian university deans. Peter Boothroyd, Professor Emeritus, Center for Human Settlements, University of British Columbia suggested AUCC also share these findings with Southern partners as they too are grappling with these issues and opportunities for exchange may be of mutual benefit. Moving forward, AUCC will seek to remain abreast of institutional changes in policies and practices resulting from this policy dialogue by evaluating the impact of these discussions and related background material.

Having conducted an introspective dialogue with institutional representatives, AUCC will seek opportunities to foster further dialogue with various external stakeholders, such as the Canadian Association of University Teachers, which has an interest in the issue of faculty recognition and reward. Many participants suggested that reaching out to various federal government departments, such as CIDA, Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada and Industry Canada to share the findings of this project should be a priority. AUCC will continue to underscore the critical role of the federal government and its science and technology strategy in creating a vision and framework for expanding funding mechanisms to enhance Canadian university researchers' engagement in international research collaboration, given the broad benefits to Canadian public policy priorities, as well as Canadian researchers and their partners.

Appendices

Appendix A: Agenda

**Appendix B: List of participants of the policy
dialogue of January 28, 2008**

Appendix C: AUCC background paper

Association of Universities
and Colleges of Canada



Association des universités
et collèges du Canada

7. Appendix A: Agenda

Policy dialogue on recognition and reward of Canadian university faculty involved in international research collaboration for development

Monday, January 28, 2008

International Development Research Centre, 8th Floor, 150 Kent Street, Ottawa

8:00 a.m.
Registration and continental breakfast

8:30 a.m.
Welcoming remarks

- **Ms. Pari Johnston**, Director, International Relations, AUCC
- **Ms. Nina Di Stefano**, Senior Policy Analyst, International Relations, AUCC (Brief presentation of key findings of AUCC issue paper)

9:15 a.m.
The institutional setting

Guiding questions:

- 1) From the perspective of your institution, what is the scope of the issue in recognizing and rewarding Canadian university faculty engagement in international research collaboration for development? What are the main elements/dimensions of this issue?
- 2) In your view, what are the main barriers to recognizing Canadian faculty engagement? How can these barriers be overcome?
- 3) Currently, what general strategies (both formal and informal) are available to institutions to advance the recognition and reward of Canadian faculty engaging in international research collaboration for development?

Lead discussants:

- **Dr. Sheila Embleton**, Vice-President Academic, York University
- **Dr. Martha Crago**, Vice-Rector, International and Student life, Université de Montréal

10:15 a.m.
Health break

10:30 a.m.
The external landscape and factors

Many external factors have an impact on the issue of faculty recognition and reward. This session will focus on the funding landscape by providing an overview of new emerging funding opportunities for international research collaboration for development (including new programs involving the research granting agencies and IDRC) and how they may address the specific challenges and supports needed to conduct international research collaboration for development

Guiding question:

- 1) As institutions or specific departments are guided by their own policies related to the issue of faculty recognition and reward, how might external organizations support and enable strategies linked to both formal and informal institutional changes?

Lead discussants:

- **Dr. Christina Zarowsky**, Program Manager, Governance, Equity and Health, International Development Research Centre
- **Dr. Sheryl Bond**, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, Queen's University
- **Ms. Gisèle Yasmeen**, Vice-President Partnerships Branch, Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

Noon
Networking lunch

1:15 p.m.

Examples of good practice to foster recognition of faculty engaged in international research collaboration for development

Guiding questions:

In your specific institutional experience, what policies and processes have been put in place to recognize (both formally and informally) faculty engagement in international research collaboration for development?

- 1) Who were the key institutional actors? How were they engaged?
- 2) What were the main challenges? How were they overcome?
- 3) What were the critical success factors that could be replicated?

Lead discussants:

- **Dr. Vianne Timmons**, Acting Registrar and Vice-President of Academic Development, University of Prince Edward Island
- **Dr. W. E. (Ted) Hewitt**, Vice-President, Research & International Relations, University of Western Ontario

2:45 p.m.

Health break

3:00 p.m.

Roundtable dialogue: possible next steps

Given the growing interest and engagement in international research collaboration for development among Canadian faculty and having reviewed the new funding opportunities and institutional efforts to effect policy change to support this growing interest:

- 1) What do you consider to be appropriate mechanisms for support at the institutional level? What more could be done and how?
- 2) What do you consider to be appropriate mechanisms for support at the research funding level? What more could be done and how?

4:15 – 4:30 p.m.

Closing remarks

- **Ms. Pari Johnston**, Director, International Relations, AUCC

8. Appendix B: List of participants of the policy dialogue of January 28, 2008

Béchar, Mélanie

Communications Officer
International Affairs Branch
Association of Universities and Colleges of
Canada
600-350 Albert Street
Ottawa ON K1R 1B1
Tel./Tél. : (613) 563-3961 ext. 306
Fax/Télé. : (613) 563-9745
E-mail/Courriel : mbechar@aucc.ca

Bond, Sheryl

Associate Professor
Faculty of Education
Queen's University at Kingston
312A McArthur Hall
99 University Avenue
Kingston ON K7L 3N5
Tel./Tél. : (613) 533-3031
Fax/Télé. : (613) 533-6584
E-mail/Courriel : slb2@queensu.ca

Boothroyd, Peter

Professor Emeritus
Center for Human Settlements
The University of British Columbia
1933 West Mall
Vancouver BC V6T 1Z2
Tel./Tél. : (604) 822-4155
Fax/Télé. : (604) 822-6164
E-mail/Courriel : peterb@interchange.ubc.ca

Clarke, Michael

Director, Information and Communication
Technologies for Development
International Development Research Centre
150 Kent Street, Room 8500
Ottawa ON K1G 3H9
Tel./Tél. : (613) 236-6163 ext. 2400
Fax/Télé. : (613) 234-7457
E-mail/Courriel : mclarke@idrc.ca

Corlett, John

Dean, Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
Brock University
500 Glenridge Avenue
St. Catharines ON L2S 3A1
Tel./Tél. : (905) 688-5550
Fax/Télé. : (905) 984-4851
E-mail/Courriel : jcorlett@brocku.ca

Crago, Martha

Vice-rectrice, international et vie étudiante
Université de Montréal
CP 6128, succursale Centre-Ville
Montréal QC H3C 3J7
Tel./Tél. : (514) 343-6798
Fax/Télé. : (514) 343-2098
E-mail/Courriel : martha.crago@umontreal.ca

Davis, Eric

Dean of Arts
The University College of the Fraser Valley
33844 King Road
Abbotsford BC V2S 7M8
Tel./Tél. : (604) 864-4632
Fax/Télé. : (604) 859-6653
E-mail/Courriel : eric.davis@ucfv.ca

Di Stefano, Nina

Senior Policy Analyst
International Relations
International Affairs Branch
Association of Universities and Colleges of
Canada
600-350 Albert Street
Ottawa ON K1R 1B1
Tel./Tél. : (613) 563-3961 ext. 280
Fax/Télé. : (613) 563-9745
E-mail/Courriel : ndistefano@aucc.ca

Embleton, Sheila

Vice-President, Academic
York University
Room S939, Ross Building
4700 Keele Street
Toronto ON M3J 1P3
Tel./Tél. : (416) 736-5280
Fax/Télé. : (416) 736-5876
E-mail/Courriel : embleton@yorku.ca

Forson, Abigail

Senior Advisor, International Relations
Canadian Institutes of Health Research
160 Elgin Street, 9th Floor
Address Locator: 4809A
Ottawa ON K1A 0W9
Tel./Tél. : (613) 957-8769
Fax/Télé. : (613) 954-1800
E-mail/Courriel : aforson@cihr-irsc.gc.ca

Gaboury, Jean-Pierre

Executive Director
Canadian Association for Graduate Studies
260 Dalhousie Street, Suite 205
Ottawa ON K1N 7E4
Tel./Tél. : (613) 562-0949
Fax/Télé. : (613) 562-9009
E-mail/Courriel : cags@uottawa.ca

Goddard, Tim

Vice-Provost, International
University of Calgary
A100, 2500 University Drive NW
Calgary AB T2N 1N4
Tel./Tél. : (403) 220-3672
Fax/Télé. : (403) 289-6800
E-mail/Courriel : vpi@ucalgary.ca

Christopher, Dornan

Director, Arthur Kroeger College of Public Affairs
Carleton University
1125 Colonel By Drive
D391 Loeb Building
Ottawa ON K1S 5B6
Tel./Tél. : (613) 520-5760
Fax/Télé. : (613) 520-7559
E-mail/Courriel :
Chris_dornan@carleton.ca

Hewitt, W.E. (Ted)

Vice-President, Research and International
Relations
The University of Western Ontario
1151 Richmond Street
Stevenson-Lawson Building 108B
London ON N6A 5B8
Tel./Tél. : (519) 661-3851
Fax/Télé. : (519) 661-3139
E-mail/Courriel : hewitt@uwo.ca

Idzerda, Leanne

CCGHR Research to Action Task Group
Project Officer
Centre for Global Health Research
Institute of Population Health
University of Ottawa
1 Stewart St.
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5
Tel./Tél. : (613) 562-5800 ext. 2569
Fax/Télé. : (613) 562-5659
E-mail/Courriel : lidzerda@uottawa.ca

Johnston, Pari

Director, International Relations
International Affairs Branch
Association of Universities and Colleges of
Canada
600-350 Albert Street
Ottawa ON K1R 1B1
Tel./Tél. : (613) 563-3961 ext. 253
Fax/Télé. : (613) 563-9745
E-mail/Courriel : pjohnsto@aucc.ca

Jorjani, Hamid

Director, International Research
International Liaison Officer
University of Ottawa
Tabaret Hall, Room 244C
550 Cumberland
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5
Tel./Tél. : (613) 562-5800 ext. 2010
Fax/Télé. : (613) 562-5271
E-mail/Courriel : hamid.jorjani@uottawa.ca

King, Leslie

Vice-President, Academic
Malaspina University-College
900 Fifth Street
Nanaimo BC V9R 5S5
Tel./Tél. : (250) 740-6104
Fax/Télé. : (250) 740-6451
E-mail/Courriel : king@mala.bc.ca

Leclerc, Denis

Gestionnaire
Politiques et relations internationales
Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en
génie
350, rue Albert
Ottawa ON K1A 1H5
Tel./Tél. : (613) 992-3445
Fax/Télé. : (613) 947-5645
E-mail/Courriel : denis.leclerc@crsng.ca

Mougeot, Luc

Senior Program Specialist
Canadian Partnerships
International Development Research Centre
150 Kent Street, Room 8500
Ottawa ON K1G 3H9
Tel./Tél. : (613) 236-6163 ext. 2310
Fax/Télé. : (613) 563-0815
E-mail/Courriel : lmougeot@idrc.ca

O'Brien, David

Senior Program Officer, Innovation, Policy
and Science
International Development Research Centre
PO Box 8500
150 Kent Street
Ottawa ON K1G 3H9
Tel./Tél. : (613) 236-6163 ext. 2502
Fax/Télé. : (613) 567-7749
E-mail/Courriel : dobrien@idrc.ca

Paquette, Sylvie

Senior Policy Analyst
Policy, Planning and International Affairs
Social Sciences and Humanities Research
Council
350 Albert Street
PO Box 1610, Station B
Ottawa ON K1P 6G4
Tel./Tél. : (613) 992-3146
Fax/Télé. : (613) 992-1787
E-mail/Courriel : sylvie.paquette@sshrc.ca

Peers, Douglas

Dean and Associate Vice-President
Graduate
Faculty of Graduate Studies
York University
283 York Lanes
4700 Keele Street
Toronto ON M3J 1P3
Tel./Tél. : (416) 736-5329
Fax/Télé. : (416) 736-5592
E-mail/Courriel : fgsdean@yorku.ca

Sankaran, Radha

Administrative Assistant
International Relations Division
Association of Universities and Colleges of
Canada
600-350 Albert Street
Ottawa ON K1R 1B1
Tel./Tél. : (613) 563-3961 ext. 285
Fax/Télé. : (613) 563-9745
E-mail/Courriel : rsankara@uacc.ca

Timmons, Vianne

Vice-President Academic, Development
International Liaison Officer
University of Prince Edward Island
550 University Avenue
Charlottetown PE C1A 4P3
Tel./Tél. : (902) 566-0412
Fax/Télé. : (902) 628-4311
E-mail/Courriel : vtimmons@upei.ca

Van Vlasselaer, Jean-Jacques

Special Advisor to the Vice-President (Research
and International)
Carleton University
510H Tory Building, 1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa ON K1S 5B6
Tel./Tél. : (613) 520-2600 ext. 7876
Fax/Télé. : (613) 520-3945
E-mail/Courriel :
jean_van_vlasselaer@carleton.ca

Yasmeen, Gisèle

Vice-President, Partnerships
Program Branch
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council
350 Albert Street
PO Box 1610, Station B
Ottawa ON K1P 6G4
Tel./Tél. : (613) 947-6938
Fax/Télé. : (613) 992-1787
E-mail/Courriel : gisele.yasmeen@sshrc.ca

Yuill, Alana

Director, Strategic Initiatives
International Affairs Branch
Association of Universities and Colleges of
Canada
600-350 Albert Street
Ottawa ON K1R 1B1
Tel./Tél. : (613) 563-3961 ext. 307
Fax/Télé. : (613) 563-9745
E-mail/Courriel : ayuill@uacc.ca

Zarowsky, Christina

Program Manager
GEH - Governance, Equity and Health
International Development Research Centre
150 Kent Street
Room 8500
Ottawa ON K1G 3H9
Tel./Tél. : (613) 236-6163 ext. 2270
Fax/Télé. : (613) 563-0815
E-mail/Courriel : czarowsky@idrc.ca

Recognition and reward of Canadian university faculty involved in international research collaboration for development

January 7, 2008

**Association of Universities
and Colleges of Canada**



**Association des universités
et collèges du Canada**

Table of contents

1. Faculty recognition and reward: multiple dimension.....	2
2. Institutional context.....	3
2.1 Trends related to international research collaboration for development and faculty engagement.....	3
2.2 Institutional toolbox for faculty recognition and reward.....	4
2.3 Approaches to faculty recognition and reward.....	5
3. External landscape.....	8
4. Questions for discussion.....	12
5. For further reference.....	13

1. Faculty recognition and reward: multiple dimensions

This paper examines the issue of recognition and reward at Canadian universities for faculty members who engage in international research collaboration for development, with emphasis on both the scope of the issue and its various dimensions. Recognition and reward refer to how the outcomes of international research collaboration for development are assessed under the current tenure and promotion system in Canadian universities.

The paper will provide an overview of the key issues, current policies and practices as well as common elements and key actors at the institutional level (i.e., the institutional “toolbox” for faculty recognition and reward). The paper will also examine the funding landscape and its influence on faculty recognition and reward issues, including the availability and structure of external supports for such research endeavours from key federal research granting agencies. It will conclude with key questions for the upcoming policy dialogue to be held in January 2008.

This paper is made possible through a partnership grant from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), which provides an opportunity for the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) to pursue relevant research and communications activities building on the results of previous IDRC partnership grants. This paper is thus part of a succession of AUCC-led activities through which the issue of faculty recognition and reward for international research collaboration for development has been raised.

In May 2003, AUCC and IDRC co-hosted a national roundtable entitled *Research without (Southern) borders: The changing Canadian research landscape*. The roundtable brought together key stakeholders to address the link between developing countries’ science, technology and research capacity and their level of human development. Discussions examined how Canada’s national interests could be served through international research collaboration activities, e.g., the concept of “research diplomacy.” The roundtable found that “the greatest challenge facing universities is the need to properly recognize researchers who are interested in international development research.”¹ In particular, the forum found that many of the issues of recognition and reward were related to the tenure system, and that these challenges were especially present for young faculty members.

From 2005 to 2007, AUCC undertook a series of initiatives focused on raising awareness of the key challenges of engaging in research collaboration for development, as well as highlighting the impacts and value of such research.² AUCC activities conducted during these years brought attention to a number of key issues, including the role that faculty reward and recognition structures play in influencing Canadian university researchers’ engagement in international research collaboration for development.

In December 2006, AUCC released the publication *Profiling the impacts of North-South research collaboration for development*. The central finding of this report is that research collaboration for

¹ *Research without (Southern) borders: The changing Canadian research landscape*, www.aucc.ca/pdf/english/reports/2003/idrc_report_e.pdf, p. 17

² The AUCC-IDRC partnership grant period covering 2004-2007 involved organizing an international colloquium on the impacts of North-South research collaboration for development as well as case study research examining the multiple impacts of specific partnerships. These activities resulted in two publications available at www.aucc.ca/publications/auccpubs/research/colloquium_report_e.html and www.aucc.ca/publications/auccpubs/research/impact_brochure_e.html, respectively.

development results in many high-level impacts that are mutually beneficial to all parties involved. The report further identified a list of good practices and lessons learned that can help foster further successful collaborations, e.g., establishing funding support mechanisms that offer researchers enough flexibility to overcome the challenges of engaging in such projects and providing greater recognition of their contribution to the institution.

Over the course of these recent research and communication activities, stakeholders have raised the issue of faculty recognition and reward for international research collaboration for development, and this paper will focus on this important issue. There are several facets to this issue, including the institutional context for reward and recognition and the funding landscape (i.e., support from such key bodies as the federal research granting councils and IDRC), which in turn influences the institutional context.

2. Institutional context

2.1 Trends related to international research collaboration for development and faculty engagement³

In September 2006, AUCC launched a six-part survey update of member institutions (89 at that time) to gather comprehensive, up-to-date information about the nature and scope of internationalization at Canadian universities. A total of 64 member institutions submitted at least one of the six questionnaires, for an overall response rate of 78 percent. The cross-section of respondents reflects the diversity of Canada's universities. AUCC last conducted a major survey of this magnitude in 1999 and published the results in *Progress and Promise: The AUCC Report on Internationalization at Canadian Universities (2000)*.

The 2006 survey provides a snapshot of the current trends in internationalization at Canadian universities. One section of the survey was devoted to gauging the level and type of engagement in international development, with several questions related to North-South research collaboration. Fifty-six institutions responded to this section of the survey. Overall, most universities recognized faculty interest as being one of the most important organizational factors for integrating an international dimension into their institutional activities.

The survey findings demonstrated that, among Canadian universities, there is greater interest in international collaboration and in engaging in research on global issues than there was six years ago.⁴ The sectors of interest most frequently identified include the environment, health, governance, private sector development, education, agriculture and rural development, and the top countries of interest are China,

³ For the purposes of this paper, scoping of the institutional context will draw heavily on the recent results from AUCC's 2006 internationalization survey. Other sources that speak to this issue include Howard C. Clark, *The Dilemma of Institutional Structures*, Chapter 5 (www.idrc.ca/en/ev-29565-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html) and Yves Gingras, Benoît Godin and Martine Foisy, *The Internationalization of University Research in Canada*, Chapter 4 (www.idrc.ca/en/ev-29564-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html) and are drawn upon where relevant.

⁴ Survey results revealed that nearly two-thirds of responding institutions noted an increased level of interest since 2000 among their faculty members to engage in research on global issues that impact developing countries and Canada, as well as an increased interest in engaging in research collaboration with developing country partners.

India, Mexico and Brazil. Furthermore, within their institutional strategic plans for internationalization, 73 percent of respondents placed a high or medium priority on engaging with developing countries.

The survey also helped identify key barriers and challenges to the involvement of faculty in international research collaboration for development. These factors include the availability of funds and, to a lesser extent, faculty recognition and reward for such research endeavours. It was most common for institutions to identify the lack of research grants/funds (75 percent) as one of the top three barriers to faculty engagement in research collaboration with developing country partners, whereas institutional factors such as lack of faculty reward and recognition and lack of internal institutional support were the second and third most common factors identified among the top three barriers (with 47 percent and 39 percent, respectively). Other challenges, as highlighted in the joint AUCC-IDRC 2003 roundtable report, *Research without (Southern) borders: The changing Canadian research landscape*, and more recently at the Scotiabank-AUCC workshop on excellence in internationalization at Canadian universities, include managing competing institutional demands on faculty time and family/personal commitments, especially for young faculty members.

Overall, these findings suggest that interest in conducting research activities with developing countries is increasing among Canadian university faculty and that effectively tapping into and cultivating this interest requires adequate financial support for such research and, to a lesser extent, appropriate recognition and reward at the institutional level.

2.2. Institutional toolbox for faculty recognition and reward

To foster a better understanding of what type of policies are helpful to creating an enabling environment for faculty members engaging in international research collaboration for development, the paper provides a brief and illustrative overview of common practices in tenure and promotion, hiring policies at Canadian universities, as well as a select sample of some recent policy changes linked to tenure and promotion policies within certain member institutions.

Most Canadian university faculty members are bound by a collective agreement negotiated between the faculty association or union and representatives of the university's administration. Although the exact steps and details may vary from institution to institution, the overarching principles are very similar. An institution's collective agreement usually clearly sets out the policy for tenure and promotion. The candidate must have been at the university for a specified amount of time prior to being eligible to apply for tenure; this length of time varies depending on the stage of the scholar's career. The time clause is intended to allow sufficient time for the individual to establish a record of scholarly contribution. Once the candidate is eligible to apply, he/she must prepare a dossier that contains information on his/her record of teaching, research and service (which includes service to the discipline/profession, service to the university and service to the broader community).

Tenure decisions are characterized by a multi-layered peer review process, with a varying number of steps and actors depending on the university. Usually, a departmental committee of peers will review the dossier, after which the dean will adjudicate the file. The final signoff on the application depends on the size and institutional culture of the university but may lay in senior offices such as the provost, the university president or, in some cases, the university's Senate.

Assessment criteria for promotion become more rigorous as one progresses from assistant professor to associate professor through to the rank of full professor. Various combinations of internal and external peer assessments are used depending on the criteria set in the collective agreement. The specific wording of the collective agreement thus becomes the blueprint for assessing candidates.

It is also useful to look at the hiring policies and practices pertaining to the recognition of prior international experience of faculty candidates. Processes related to hiring policies and the composition of hiring committees are generally decentralized. There are certain overarching guidelines, but the recommendations are left to the individuals on the hiring committees, usually departmental peers presided by a departmental chair or a dean. The wording of the collective agreement – as well as the current and future needs of the department – help determine the assessment criteria. Final approval resides with senior administrators such as the provost, the president or governing bodies such as the university's Senate.

Although possessing international experience is not expressly stated as a requirement, informal discussions with representatives from member institutions⁵ suggest this experience is increasingly seen as an asset that can become a deciding factor between two otherwise equal candidates. In fact, comments collected through AUCC's 2006 internationalization survey suggest that new faculty members possess more international skills and experience, although generally this is not explicitly stated as a requirement in the recruitment process. When asked whether their institution makes explicit reference, where appropriate, to the recognition of international or intercultural expertise and achievement in the hiring of new faculty, 68 percent of respondents stated they made no such reference.

2.3 Approaches to faculty recognition and reward

The following section highlights some innovative and diverse approaches different Canadian universities have taken to address the barriers to faculty recognition and reward for those engaged in international research collaboration for development. A common thread appears to be the recognition and inclusion of a broader definition of research results and scholarly activities to include academic and research efforts carried out in an international development context. Given the parameters of the paper, this is intended as an illustrative sample rather than an exhaustive list of emerging good practices. AUCC recognizes that many other models exist and aims to gather further examples via the upcoming policy dialogue.

For the purposes of this paper, good practices profiled include:

- amending existing collective agreements;
- building in international development considerations at the outset of new agreements;
- taking a faculty or departmental approach to interpreting the broader collective agreement;
- testing new guidelines related to expanded definitions of what constitutes appropriate scholarship.

In addition to formal amendments to tenure and promotion policy, informal measures of varying types have also proven to be valuable means to recognize faculty. For example, financial measures can include making seed funding available to support the costs related to the initial phase of an international research collaboration for development as well as measures linked to merit pay. Further measures that acknowledge exemplary international efforts include creating university awards that recognize faculty members for excellence in international service, teaching and/or research. Special allowances such as release from teaching duties to enable faculty to spend time abroad is also an effective and concrete way to support and recognize Canadian university faculty members' international engagement in a

⁵ To inform this section on the "institutional toolbox," AUCC conducted a series of phone interviews with several vice-presidents and drew on discussions held at the September 2007 Scotiabank-AUCC workshop on excellence in internationalization at Canadian universities, which attracted more than 100 senior university administrators.

development context. Finally, in terms of communication, mentors and peers can convey positive messages in relation to the importance of international research collaboration for development. Senior administrators can also communicate the value of international research activities and help foster a supportive institutional environment for these endeavours to take place.

At the **University of Western Ontario**, recent changes to the collective agreement have broadened the parameters to include appropriate outcomes of research efforts for the respective area within a discipline/faculty. The amendment respects the collegial spirit of the collective agreement as it is not overly prescriptive. For example, the parameters for acceptable dissemination of research results have been broadened, as articulated by the phrase “appropriate to the Member’s discipline or area of academic expertise.” This nuance means that should a faculty member’s research have been presented in the form of a report to the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and should this type of activity be relevant to his/her field, the report could be considered as part of his/her research dissemination activities. Senior administrators believe that this change will allow faculty to devote more time to building their research expertise related to development projects, as this work will be included in their performance assessment and overall research output. This wording has been added to several articles in the collective agreement, including academic responsibilities of members, which entail an obligation to disseminate the outcomes of research activities, and the annual performance evaluation, which covers a member’s performance in research.⁶ The fact that the amendments do not make explicit reference to an “international” component is of interest, as this means that their impact extends beyond the issue of recognition of international research work. This may facilitate the introduction of such changes into existing collective agreements as their implementation could be interpreted more broadly by faculty who may have other concerns related to research. This change was accompanied by a communications campaign by the vice-president, research and international relations, to underscore the value of international research collaboration among departments.

When the **University of Prince Edward Island** negotiated its first collective agreement, the explicit inclusion of the word “international” was a priority. Possibly, establishing a first agreement may offer the opportunity to define the parameters, whereas making amendments to an existing agreement imposes the burden of making the case as to why changes are needed. At UPEI, “internationalization” was included in the collective agreement. Under the criteria for tenure and promotion, international activities are clearly stipulated as “scholarly international service, where applicable, including, but not limited to: international development work; collaborative research endeavours; coordinating international mobility opportunities for students; international volunteer work.”⁷ Despite this formal inclusion, senior management from UPEI recently underscored the importance of other barriers to participation in international research collaboration for development during the September 2007 Scotiabank-AUCC workshop on excellence in internationalization at Canadian universities (as alluded to earlier, barriers included competing demands on faculty time in terms of teaching, administrative and research duties and family/personal obligations). This points to both the continued efforts and challenges to weaving the thread of internationalization into the fabric of all institutional activities. Informal means to support the broader formal process at UPEI have therefore included encouraging as many faculty members as possible to have international experience and a commitment to keeping internationalization on the agenda of senior management.

⁶ www.uwo.ca/pvp/facultyrelations/relations/Collective%20Agreement/collective-agreement/CollectiveAgreement2002-2006.pdf

⁷ Item E.2.2.1.c)v), p. 64 of the current collective agreement, www.upei.ca/humanres/UPEIFA_CA_05_10.pdf

Other issues to consider with respect to faculty recognition and reward include those influenced by the very nature of international research collaboration for development. The results of research collaboration for development are often co-publications or other end products such as CD-ROMs, web sites or toolkits that are more geared toward an end user or a community. The importance placed on international collaborative research for development and its resulting knowledge dissemination products vs. the traditional prestige placed on single-authored publications in select journals remains an influential factor in faculty choice of research projects and a key factor in considering means to overcome barriers and create a more enabling policy environment. Often the collaborative nature of research for development leads to publications that are co-authored instead of single-authored. Publications in peer-reviewed journals may also not be the desired outcome given the nature of development work and the need to account for results through reports to funding agencies or communications focused on the end user (e.g., the population of the developing country in question via applied research tools such as wikis, blogs, personal and community of practice web sites, open access repositories and journals).

At the same time, the strategies for managing international collaborations and their resulting products vary within the fields of social sciences, humanities, natural sciences and engineering. A key tool to manage these differences is to focus on departmental or faculty-specific tenure and promotion policies. The definition of promotion policies in overarching collective bargaining agreements can be more difficult to change given their central nature. Therefore, one innovative approach is to focus on faculty or department promotion and tenure documents that interpret the broader collective agreement for a specific discipline. The next examples illustrate institutional approaches taken to address the evolving nature and definition of research dissemination and scholarly activities.

The **University of Calgary** has sought to expand the definition of scholarly activities. It has developed a guide entitled “Developing a Unit or Faculty Recognition Program,” and each faculty fills out a template according to its field-specific needs. For example, the faculty of education states that “interdisciplinarity and international work [in research] are not required of each faculty member but are recognized and valued when they occur”; it also lists as meritorious the “involvement in international projects, including proposal writing, project planning and dissemination of project outcomes.” Under meritorious achievements linked to the service component of the faculty member’s work, it lists “active involvement in the organization of faculty international projects and effective leadership of a team doing international work.”⁸ Under appointment and promotion, it states that for a faculty member seeking a promotion but having a non-typical scholarship pattern because of international experiences, “the emphasis will be placed on the international work accomplished.”⁹

The faculty of medicine, for its part, also mentions international contributions, as long as they are specific and appropriate to the field. References to international work are made in the context of belonging to a community of practice, such as being invited to speak at national and international meetings, being a member of national and international organizations, as well as demonstrating a contribution to national or international societies.¹⁰

⁸ <http://education.ucalgary.ca/dean/htdocs/displayAttachment.php?id=3>, p. 17

⁹ <http://education.ucalgary.ca/dean/htdocs/displayAttachment.php?id=3>, p. 23

¹⁰ <http://files.myweb.med.ucalgary.ca/files/125/files/unprotected/Forms%20&%20Policies/CFT03.pdf>

As noted earlier, new information and communication technologies have created new means of disseminating research results, and anecdotal evidence suggests that these research dissemination tools have been especially prevalent in the context of international research collaboration for development. As researchers reach beyond traditional audiences via new communication mechanisms, the way in which these tools transform and/or enhance academic activities needs to be considered. These new venues and audiences have a considerable impact on redefining the meaning of scholarship. The most important focus and outcomes of development work are to reach an end user through an accessible/applicable research end product. Should these results not be considered as appropriate “research outcomes,” faculty members’ involvement in such research activities may be impeded given the possible repercussions on their career advancement. Nonetheless, the quality of the work being done requires a peer review assessment by sector experts to ensure academic rigour and relevance.

At the **King’s University College**, where faculty members are not bound by a collective agreement, new “Guidelines for the development and evaluation of scholarship”¹¹ have been approved by the Faculty Council and Senate and are currently undergoing a two-year trial. Based on the principles of Ernest Boyer, author of *Scholarship Reconsidered, Priorities of the Professoriate*, the guidelines reflect four categories of scholarship: scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of application and scholarship of teaching.¹² The document is the result of a institution-wide consultative process aimed at better reflecting the equal value placed on different types of scholarly activities conducted by faculty. Of interest to this paper are broader definitions of publications that constitute acceptable research dissemination. For example, peer-reviewed publications include those where peers are defined more broadly, i.e., as “scholars and/or practitioners considered knowledgeable within the specified field.” In addition, publications “esteemed within the field” include agency reports and web-based publications, now considered acceptable vehicles for dissemination of research outcomes from development work.¹³ Although peer-reviewed publications still have more weight in the ranking of publications, the broadening of what is considered to be acceptable research dissemination is noteworthy. As these new guidelines redefining scholarship at King’s are applied through their trial period, new candidates for hire will also be assessed in relation to their awareness of the guidelines and their commitment to the values they promote.

3. External landscape

Since many external factors have an impact on the issue of faculty recognition and reward, this section will focus on a brief overview of the Canadian funding landscape for international research collaboration for development, with particular attention to new significant opportunities through new innovative partnerships between the federal research councils and IDRC.

For some time, adequate funding to support international research collaboration for development has been identified as an issue of concern. In fact, over the past few years, various AUCC-led initiatives such as the 2003 roundtable, the 2006 internationalization survey and, most recently, the September 2007 Scotiabank-AUCC workshop on excellence in internationalization at Canadian universities have seen this

¹¹ www.kingsu.net/files/VP%20Academic/Guidelines%20for%20Evaluating%20Scholarship.pdf

¹² Boyer, Ernest (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered, Priorities of the Professoriate*, The Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching.

¹³ www.kingsu.net/files/VP%20Academic/Guidelines%20for%20Evaluating%20Scholarship.pdf, p. 6

issue surface among stakeholders. A sense of urgency as to the need to address this situation is growing within universities. Until relatively recently, funding for international research collaboration for development in the Canadian federal research landscape has been, for the most part, fragmented and modest. Although the landscape has changed and new opportunities have been created, this issue remains important and salient to Canadian universities in light of the growing interest among Canadian faculty to engage in such research endeavours.

Given the role of the **Canadian International Development Agency** in providing development assistance, it is necessary to look at its involvement. The agency's stated mandate is to support sustainable development in developing countries, to reduce poverty and to contribute to a more secure, equitable and prosperous world. CIDA's most significant effort linked to universities in recent years has been via the University Partnerships in Cooperation and Development (UPCD) program. Administered by AUCC, this program funds knowledge partnerships between Canadian universities and higher education organizations in developing countries in Africa, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, Asia and Latin America. Up to 50 percent of Canadian faculty time can be recovered through the program, whereas Canadian universities and partner postsecondary institutions in developing countries provide in-kind contributions. Since 1994, CIDA has invested \$220 million in the UPCD program, enabling 150 partnerships between Canadian and Southern universities. Universities have topped up this investment with \$144 million of their own funds. The UPCD program's core activities are intended to focus on capacity building. The program limits the research that can be conducted: the research must be applied, linked to capacity building within the developing country's local community and cannot exceed 12 percent of the allocated budget (including infrastructure and equipment). Canadian researchers involved in international research collaboration for development find that these limitations result in a lost opportunity to embrace the results of development work through relevant research.

The availability of flexible funding mechanisms to support international research collaboration for development activities is critical to the recognition of these activities. Whether made available from within the institution or from the federal research granting councils, IDRC or other relevant funders, this funding must support the specific requirements of international research collaboration for development. Seed funding to kick-start partnerships seems increasingly important to support researchers in the initial exploratory phase of the partnership, as this phase is crucial to assess potential partners and set up research parameters to ensure a successful project.

As mentioned above, the AUCC-IDRC-led roundtable documented in *Research without (Southern) borders: The changing Canadian research landscape* provided useful viewpoints on the funding issue. It underlined the extent to which "university practices that reward researchers who obtain grants from Canadian granting councils – which currently focus on domestic priorities – discriminate against researchers who pursue international research."¹⁴ The report also pointed to the need for clear government policy for funding allocations to support priorities in the area of international research collaboration for development. The value of such a policy was articulated by making reference to a case study involving the University of Bergen, Norway, and the University of Makerere, Uganda. One of the key lessons

¹⁴ *Research without (Southern) borders: The changing Canadian research landscape*, www.aucc.ca/pdf/english/reports/2003/idrc_report_e.pdf, p. 24

learned through this partnership was that “the long-term commitment to scientific collaboration is viewed as a greater benefit than the size of the investment.”¹⁵

AUCC’s 2006 internationalization survey showed that 67 percent of responding institutions make funds or seed grants available for international teaching, study, research or attending conferences or meetings under which international research collaboration for development would be eligible for consideration. Further, when asked to identify specific efforts institutions are making to attract Canadian faculty members to engage in sabbaticals, teach or conduct research in developing countries, the majority of respondents making such efforts cited institutional exchange agreements with developing countries as their chosen mechanism. Release time for sabbaticals was second in importance in terms of efforts being made. Informal efforts buttress an institutional culture that supports international research collaboration for development, and they complement changes in formal policies.

The federal government considers it important that research and innovation conducted in Canada be linked to cutting-edge international research networks. Both Budget 2007 and the recent federal science and technology strategy made reference to the need to encourage international research partnerships.¹⁶ However, although they point to an overall acknowledgment of the importance of international research collaboration, these documents are relatively silent on the extent to which these partnerships should be focused on development issues.

The three federal research granting councils – the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) – are focusing on new international initiatives and exploring ways to integrate an international dimension within other existing programs. Of particular interest to this paper are the councils’ new initiatives in partnership with IDRC to address the North-South dimension in funded research activities. The highlights of these new opportunities are provided below.¹⁷

The **Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council** has clearly set out its priorities and objectives in its *International Policy and Strategy*.¹⁸ One of its key international endeavours includes the joint SSHRC and IDRC initiative to invest up to \$6.27 million over the next six years to support international research

¹⁵ *Research without (Southern) borders: The changing Canadian research landscape*, www.aucc.ca/pdf/english/reports/2003/idrc_report_e.pdf, p. 34

¹⁶ *Mobilizing Science and Technology to Canada’s Advantage* underlines the importance of fostering “national and international partnerships” and makes a commitment for “additional scholarships, fellowships, Chairs, and awards for researchers through the Granting Councils: [of] \$437 million.” However, this is viewed through the prism of economic competitiveness and does not include developing country partnerships ([www.ic.gc.ca/cmb/welcomeic.nsf/vRTE/PublicationST/\\$file/S&Tstrategy.pdf](http://www.ic.gc.ca/cmb/welcomeic.nsf/vRTE/PublicationST/$file/S&Tstrategy.pdf), pp. 36 and 47, respectively). The Budget Plan 2007 states that for Canada to have global leadership in key areas, “the councils [must] adopt a more strategic approach and increasingly support multi-disciplinary collaborative research to address complex issues and create a real advantage for Canada.” In support, the budget provides \$85 million a year in new resources for the granting councils (www.budget.gc.ca/2007/pdf/bp2007e.pdf, p. 202).

¹⁷ Further details of the granting councils’ other international programs can be found on their main web sites: www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca, www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca and www.cihhr.ca, respectively.

¹⁸ www.sshrc.ca/web/about/publications/international_policy_e.pdf

alliances via the International Community-University Research Alliances program.¹⁹ The aim is to encourage strategic research in four areas: environment and natural resource management; information and communication technologies for development; the impact of science, technology and innovation policies on development; social and economic policy related to poverty reduction, growth, health and human rights. University-based experts from Canada and from lower- and middle-income countries will be invited to submit research proposals. Up to nine proposals will receive seed funding – as much as \$30,000 each – to develop a research alliance that involves researchers and community partners from both Canada and lower- and middle-income countries. Three alliances will then be funded to a maximum of \$2 million each over five years. All proposals will be selected through international peer review to ensure they meet the highest standards of excellence.

The **Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council** currently devotes five percent of its annual budget to international activities. In fall 2005, the NSERC governing council approved the creation of an advisory committee to further the development of its international strategy. This strategy will provide the framework that NSERC will use to act on international opportunities. In an effort to advance mutual priorities, NSERC and IDRC held an exploratory workshop in March 2007 (also involving CIHR, SSHRC and Natural Resources Canada) to look into climate change adaptation research. The strong potential for international research collaboration for development in this area is currently being assessed and a joint approach is under development.

The **Canadian Institutes of Health Research** have devised *A Framework for International Relations and Cooperation*, which addresses international research collaboration comprehensively.²⁰ With respect to international research collaboration for development, a flagship partnership is the Global Health Research Initiative involving CIHR, Health Canada, CIDA and IDRC in support of global health research. The mandate is to support more egalitarian partnerships between Canada and low- or middle-income countries with the aim of improving Canada's ability to both investigate and intervene in the underlying forces that challenge global health. The awards are for a maximum of \$60,000 a year for up to three years. A key program under this partnership is the Teasdale-Corti Global Health Research Partnership Program, which funds collaborative research teams consisting of researchers from Canada and from low- and middle-income countries.

Another CIHR program of note is the Summer Institute of the Canadian Coalition for Global Health Research, which provides mentorship and research capacity-building opportunities. Through the program, leaders in global health research from Canada and around the world share their expertise and experiences with new global health researchers. Teams of two researchers – one from Canada and one from a low- or middle-income country – already working on a joint project apply to attend the institute. The program is noteworthy given its focus on practical, hands-on work and the priority placed on young or first-time participants in research collaborations.²¹

The International Partnership Initiative was formed between IDRC and the **Networks of Centres of Excellence** in 2006. It provides \$7.1 million to internationalize existing research networks and \$2 million directly from IDRC to enable the participation of low- and middle-income country researchers. So far,

¹⁹ www.sshrc.ca/web/apply/background/cura2001_background_e.pdf and www.sshrc.ca/web/apply/program_descriptions/cura_idrc_e.asp

²⁰ www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/30920.html

²¹ www.ccghr.ca/default.cfm?content=si&lang=e&subnav=summer_institute

selected partnerships focus on peer-to-peer relations to address common challenges. One example is the National Initiative for the Care of the Elderly, which will involve partners in China, South Africa and India to look into the emerging impacts of aging populations in transitional and developing countries.

IDRC and the **Canada Research Chairs Program** have just launched the International Research Chairs Initiative. They issued a call for proposals in December 2007 to award up to five IDRC research chairs at universities in eligible developing countries. In partnership with existing Canada Research Chair holders, the recipients will implement a joint research, training and research mobilization project.

Given the complexity and costs of engaging in such partnerships, it is advantageous to pool resources and build longer-term, sustainable partnerships. Joint initiatives such as those noted above exemplify the growing practice, within the Canadian funding community, of leveraging funds and expertise to maximize the impacts of research collaboration for development. The interplay between the external funding landscape, especially the new opportunities presented here, and the institutional toolbox for recognition and reward will be an important topic for discussion at the policy dialogue, particularly in regard to examining how the structure of the new allocations can accommodate the specific challenges of international research collaboration for development. Further, the extent to which funding is confirmed as a long-term commitment will influence the impacts and results of these partnerships.

4. Questions for discussion

This paper presented the broad strokes of the various dimensions of faculty recognition and reward in Canadian universities in the context of international research collaboration for development. It offered an overview of the institutional context, typical tenure, promotion and hiring policies, as well as some informal processes of recognition and reward. This overview was supplemented with examples of innovative and recent policy changes within member institutions, ranging from amending the collective agreement and drafting a first collective agreement to taking a departmental approach to the issue and redefining scholarship to recognize different scholarly activities of equal value to the institution. These examples were followed by a profile of the funding landscape in Canada, with particular regard to new initiatives linking IDRC and the research granting councils.

The issues raised in this paper are complex and require an approach that is tailored to the institutional context and relevant to specific disciplines. Where changes are necessary, they require not only a change of policy, but also changes in institutional culture to ensure a sustainable enabling environment. These processes occur over time and need to be re-evaluated as society evolves and, consequently, as demands on universities change. In view of this complexity, this paper has sought to provide background to inform and foster discussion among key stakeholders at the upcoming policy dialogue to be held January 28, 2008.

The following questions are put forth for further consideration and reflection in order to help inform the discussion at the policy dialogue:

1. From the perspective of your institution, what is the scope of the issue in recognizing and rewarding Canadian university faculty engagement in international research collaboration for development? What are the main elements/dimensions of this issue?
2. In your view, what are the main barriers to recognizing Canadian faculty engagement? How can these barriers be overcome?

3. Currently, what general strategies (both formal and informal) are available to institutions to advance the recognition and reward of Canadian faculty engaging in international research collaboration for development?
4. As institutions or specific departments are guided by their own policies related to the issue of faculty recognition and reward, how might external organizations support and enable strategies linked to both formal and informal institutional changes?
5. In your specific institutional experience, what policies and processes have been put in place to recognize (both formally and informally) faculty engagement in international research collaboration for development?
 - a) Who were the key institutional actors? How were they engaged?
 - b) What were the main challenges? How were they overcome?
 - c) What were the critical success factors that could be replicated?
6. Given the growing interest and engagement in international research collaboration for development among Canadian faculty and having reviewed the new funding opportunities and institutional efforts to effect policy change to support this growing interest:
 - a) What do you consider to be appropriate mechanisms for support at the institutional level? What more could be done and how?
 - b) What do you consider to be appropriate mechanisms for support at the research funding level? What more could be done and how?

5. For further reference

- AUCC (2006). *Profiling the impacts of North-South research collaboration for development*, www.aucc.ca/pdf/english/publications/casestudy_web_e.pdf.
- AUCC (2003). *Research without (Southern) borders: The changing Canadian research landscape*, www.aucc.ca/pdf/english/reports/2003/idrc_report_e.pdf.
- Bond, S. L. and J.-P. Lemasson, eds. (1999). *A New World of Knowledge, Canadian Universities and Globalization*, International Development Research Centre.
- Boothroyd, P. (1998). *Social Policy Assessment Research: The Establishment, the Underground*, <http://idrinfo.idrc.ca/archive/corpdocs/113279/socdev.htm>.
- Boothroyd, P. and L. Angeles, eds. (2003). Canadian Universities and International Development: A Critical Look, *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, Volume 24, Number 1.