CIHR University Delegate Meeting (July 13, 2017)
Notes prepared by Jennifer McGrath (Concordia University Delegate)

- Introductions (Adrian Mota)
- Acknowledgement of attendance at recent UD face-to-face meeting
- Reminded UD members of Project Grant Competition announcement that was released earlier this week.
  - Martine Lafrance reviewed the Project Grant competition decisions (from announcement posted July 13, 2017)
  - There will be webinars regarding the application process (more than 10 to be scheduled) – for both applicant and reviewers
  - Applicants select 2 panels (1st, 2nd choice)
  - Nominated PI may only submit 2 or fewer applications to Project competition in the Fall
  - Structured Review format will continue (with weighted categories)
  - Individuals may apply to both Project & Foundation; however, the applications may not be the same.
  - Chair & SO recruitment is already underway
  - Summary of Proposal at registration phase is incredibly important – this is largely the basis of how panel decisions are made and how panels are staffed (Yes, it can change to hone writing, but basis of research should not)
  - Urge research community to agree as reviewers if invited to participate

- There is distinction between being asked to review (reviewer for Project competition) – and being invited to be member of College of Reviewers
- There has been much positive feedback from research community re: Rod McIntnes (CIHR Acting President) message
- Anticipate announcement for Foundation competition will be on August 3rd.
- There will be another announcement in next week (likely Monday?) from the President Office regarding the upcoming process.

- College of Reviewer Update (Stephanie Robertson) – so far, pleased with response from those who have agreed. Wave 1 enrollment has gone forward based on those who met recruitment criteria (this is available online). ~2000 applications were sent out, with >1500 accepted.
  - Welcome package for College Reviewers will be sent out and launched next week.
  - Wave 2 will focus on those who are Nominated PIs and those who have been nominated by their Institutions.
  - Universities will receive list updated regarding who has been invited, who has accepted, etc.
  - College aims to be peer-reviewing resource for all competitions (open competitions & doctoral awards, etc)
  - UD members raised questions regarding some confusion about lists, where to send recommendations? Role of UD giving input regarding identification of high quality reviewers.

- Data Management Plan (Jessica Mankowski)
  - Presentation about importance and role of data management (research excellence, dissemination, impact, best practice)
  - Many agencies around the world are requiring researchers to have data management plans at outset, and to share data / make available
  - Many “players” involved in data management landscape
  - Outlined history of development of policy (Tri-council)
  - 2016 Statement outlines expectations – but does not have any mandates currently
  - Continuing to engage with others as policy development proceeds: (Portage, SSHRC, Polar Data Canada, Leadership Council for Digital Research Infrastructure, Research Data Alliance, Research Data Canada, and others)
  - Tri-Agency Policy is being put together for multiple reasons:
    - Strong data management signifies research excellence;
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regular feature in conduct of research
- More Canadian datasets cited; valued product of research in tenure, promotion, peer review
- Canadian researchers equipped & ready to engage in international collaboration, where data management requirements are norm
- Canadian institutions support management of data their researchers produce
- Increased ability for research data to be archived, found, responsibly reused; fuels new discovery/innovation

- Currently in “pre-consultation phase” – prior to release of policy. Draft will be posted in Fall and open for comment & discussion. Will then have phased-in implementation.

- Proposed Policies: Institutions, Researchers x 2 (Data Management & Deposit):
  - Institution – required to have institutional research data management strategy; posted online
  - Researcher Data Management – have data management plan (DMP) submitted to institution for release of funds; may be submitted to agency and be considered in adjudication process
    - Researchers in NSERC anticipated this being challenging and burdensome, but realized it was helpful to do at the outset and led to insightful thinking thru
  - Research Deposit – already a deposit requirement for publications (PubMed Can); may soon be required to also deposit data and code to ensure preservation, curation, and access (if applicable); there is wiggle-room for rationale if deposit or sharing would not be appropriate (sensitive etc)

- Keen to receive community feedback; many conversations are ongoing.

- Better Data, Better Decisions Conference in September 2017 (Montreal)