

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Main Contact Information

Institution Saint Mary's University			
Contact Family Name Vessey		Contact Given Name Kevin	
Contact Position Associate Vice President Research		Contact Department Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research	
Contact Telephone number Area Code 902	Number 420-5089	Extension	Contact E-Mail address at institution kevin.vessey@smu.ca

## Financial Contact Information

Financial Contact Family Name Morrison		Financial Contact Given Name Gabrielle	
Financial Contact Position Vice President, Finance and Administration		Financial Contact Department Financial Services	
Financial Contact Telephone number Area Code 902	Number 420-5409	Extension	Financial Contact E-Mail address at institution gabe.morrison@smu.ca

## Statement of Account

<b>Total Indirect Costs Funds available in 2013-2014</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>\$1,201,368</b>
--	----------	--------------------

## Expenditures incurred in 2013-2014

<b>Facilities</b>	<b>\$159,655</b>
<b>Resources</b>	<b>\$398,782</b>
<b>Management and Administration</b>	<b>\$518,425</b>
<b>Regulatory Requirements and Accreditation</b>	<b>\$72,288</b>
<b>Intellectual Property</b>	<b>\$52,218</b>
<b>Total Indirect Costs expenditures incurred in 2013-2014</b>	<b>B \$1,201,368</b>

<b>Outstanding Commitments</b> (The expenditure was incurred but the invoice was not paid in the period ending March 31, but was paid before June 30. Be sure to include the commitments in the appropriate area(s) above.)	<b>\$0</b>
---	------------

## Health Research Affiliates

For organizations with health research affiliates only: for each area of priority, indicate the actual amount of your 2013-2014 grant that was spent by your health research affiliates.

Facilities	\$0
Resources	\$0
Management and Administration	\$0
Regulatory Requirements and Accreditation	\$0
Intellectual Property	\$0

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section I - Facilities

### Expenditures

**Was your grant invested, completely or partially, in any of the following ways?**

Note that A and B are not exclusive (i.e. for any given category, if you have covered both existing and new Expenditures, you would check both A or B).

Expenditure category	A) The grant covered existing expenditures	B) The grant covered new expenditures (not previously covered by grant)	C) The grant did not cover this category	In which category was the largest proportion of your 2013-2014 grant invested?
1. Renovation and maintenance of research facilities (excluding expenditures incurred to meet regulatory requirements - see Section IV)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Upgrade, operations and maintenance of equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Operating costs (custodial, security, maintenance, utilities, leasing, capital planning, insurance on research space)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Technical support for laboratories, offices and other facilities (excluding technical support for animal care - see section IV)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section I - Facilities (continued)

### Impact Statement

Please explain how the expenditures made in this priority area have allowed your institution (and its health research affiliates, where applicable) to maintain and/or enhance the capacity of its research enterprise. The following questions can help guide your answer:

- what difference have your grant investments made?
- are there significant changes from the previous year?
- why are these investments vital for researchers?
- why are these expenditures vital to the university research administration?
- what would have happened if expenditures hadn't been possible?
- what are the major cost drivers in this category?
- what percentage of your O&M expenditure supports CFI-funded equipment?

The ICP funds directed towards Research Facilities in 2013-14 was proportionally similar to that expended the previous year (i.e. 13.3% of the total ICP grant). Given that our ICP grant was slightly larger in 2013-14 compared to the previous year (i.e. by 3.6%), the absolute amount of ICP funds used in Research Facilities was slightly lower (by approximately \$9,000). The University chose this year to put a greater proportion of its ICP grant into Resources and Management/ Administration (see below) compared to 2012-13. However, it should be noted that due to labour cost increases, the actual costs of the Research Facilities were greater in 2013-14 than the previous year; the University choose to draw from other revenue sources than the ICP grant of to cover these increased costs.

As in previous years, the ICP funds directed towards Research Facilities in 2013-14 were focused on covering the salaries and benefits for Research Instrument Technicians within our Departments of Biology, Chemistry and Geography. These Technicians provide support for our researchers in the utilization of electron microscopy, chemical analysis, and geographical information systems research facilities, respectively. These technical support positions originated from an NSERC Research Capacity Development in Small Universities Grant (\$1.5M over 5 years) to help increase research capacity in the natural sciences and engineering disciplines. Saint Mary's was one of only seven Universities in Canada awarded these grants. The grant was fully expended in 2009-10. As part of this grant, these three new permanent research technician positions were created (Saint Mary's has assumed the salaries and benefits over the life of the grant) and the ICP Grant now partially covers the salary and benefits of these positions. Much of the instrumentation in these three research facilities was purchased through CFI awards. The investment in these technical positions has greatly leveraged the use of these facilities as well as provided significant support to our researchers, enabling them to be more efficient and productive in their research pursuits.

Without the support from the ICP for these research technicians, our ability to maintain and efficiently utilize these facilities at Saint Mary's would be severely hampered. Without the positions, research students and faculty would have to operate and maintain these facilities themselves. Not only would this greatly increase the risk of damage to the very expensive instrumentation in these facilities, it would also mean that valuable time and resources of faculty would be expended in the training of students and in the actual running/analysis of samples by the instrumentation. Research productivity has been positively affected by the establishment of these Research Instrument Technicians.

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section II - Research Resources

### Expenditures

**Was your grant invested, completely or partially, in any of the following ways?**

Note that A and B are not exclusive (i.e. for any given category, if you have covered both existing and new expenditures, you would check both A or B).

Expenditure category	A) The grant covered existing expenditures	B) The grant covered new expenditures (not previously covered by grant)	C) The grant did not cover this category	In which category was the largest proportion of your 2013-2014 grant invested?
1. Acquisition of library holdings (journals, books, collections, periodicals, Canada National Site Licensing project, etc.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Improvements to electronic information resources (access to databases, telecommunications systems, information technology systems, and research tools) (excluding technology to track grants and to provide financial services - see Section III)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Library operating costs and administration (custodial, security, maintenance, utilities, leasing, capital planning, staff salaries)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Insurance on research equipment and vehicles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section II - Research Resources (continued)

### Impact Statement

Please explain how the expenditures made in this priority area have allowed your institution (and its health research affiliates, where applicable) to maintain and/or enhance the capacity of its research enterprise. The following questions can help guide your answer:

- what difference have your grant investments made?
- are there significant changes from the previous year?
- why are these investments vital for researchers?
- why are these expenditures vital to the university research administration?
- what would have happened if expenditures hadn't been possible?
- what are the major cost drivers in this category?
- what proportion of the acquisitions and operating budget of the library is covered by the Indirect Costs Program?
- do you participate in inter-institutional consortia or partnerships to assist in cost reduction in this expenditure category?

In 2013-14, a slightly greater proportion (i.e. 33%) of our ICP Grant went to support Research Resources compared to the previous year (31%). These funds were spent to help fund expenses associated with our partnership within the Canadian Research Knowledge Network (CRKN), and the increase reflects the increased costs of contracts and licensing agreements for access to scholarly books, journals and databases through the CRKN. While these funds were extremely important in helping to maintain our library resources for research, it should be realized that the total cost of library acquisitions in 2013-14 was \$1.5M.

The CRKN is dedicated to expanding digital content for the academic research enterprise in Canada. Through the coordinated leadership of librarians, researchers, and administrators, CRKN undertakes large-scale content acquisition and licensing initiatives in order to build knowledge infrastructure and research capacity in Canada's universities. CRKN collaborates with 75 university members and provides access to over 900,000 researchers and students. The CRKN is CFI and University funded.

The importance of the CRKN on the research activity at Saint Mary's cannot be overstated. From researcher's office computers, they now have access to dozens of scholarly databases and thousands of research journal issues, volumes and monographs, and increasingly, e-books. This increased access to the scholarly literature is helping to increase the research activity at Saint Mary's.

Libraries holdings and access to research literature are core features necessary for the research enterprise. Without the ICP support, the impact on our overall ability to support the library resources for research would be severely undermined.

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section III - Management and Administration

### Expenditures

**Was your grant invested, completely or partially, in any of the following ways?**

Note that A and B are not exclusive (i.e. for any given category, if you have covered both existing and new expenditures, you would check both A and B).

Expenditure category	A) The grant covered existing expenditures	B) The grant covered new expenditures (not previously covered by grant)	C) The grant did not cover this category	In which category was the largest proportion of your 2013-2014 grant invested?
1. Institutional support for the completion of grant applications / research proposals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Acquisition, maintenance and/or upgrade of information systems to track grant applications, certifications, and awards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Eligible training of faculty and research personnel (excluding training to meet regulatory requirements - see Section IV)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Human resources and payroll	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Financial and audit costs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Research planning and promotion, public relations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number

P0055

### Section III - Management and Administration (continued)

#### Impact Statement

Please explain how the expenditures made in this priority area have allowed your institution (and its health research affiliates, where applicable) to maintain and/or enhance the capacity of its research enterprise. The following questions can help guide your answer:

- what difference have your grant investments made?
- are there significant changes from the previous year?
- why are these investments vital for researchers?
- why are these expenditures vital to the university research administration?
- what would have happened if expenditures hadn't been possible?
- what are the major cost drivers in this category?
- do you participate in inter-institutional consortia or partnerships that assist in cost reduction in this expenditure category?

The ICP grant at Saint Mary's in 2013-14 helped support the salaries and benefits of the following support staff and administrators of the research enterprise at the University:

- Dean of Faculty of Graduate Studies & Research (50%)
- Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies & Research (50%)
- Secretary, Faculty of Graduate Studies & Research (50%)
- Research Grants Officer (100%)
- Graduate Studies Officer (50%)
- Two Research & Grants Accountants - Financial Services (one 100% and the other at 80%)
- Secretary, Institute of Computational Astrophysics (100%)
- Manager, Gorsebrook Research Institute for Atlantic Canada Studies (100%)
- Director, Labrador Project (50%)

Over \$0.5M of our ICP grant, or approximately 43% of the total award, was used to support these positions. This represents a 3.4% increase in this funding over the previous year and reflects the basic year-over-year increased costs of these positions, plus the addition of a new administrative staff member (i.e. the Assistant to the Dean) in the FGSR. This increased administrative staff in the FGSR was necessary due to the ever growing scope and activities of our Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, the lead administrative unit delivering the indirect support of research at the University. The proportion of the total ICP grant dedicated to Management and Administration in 2013-14 was slightly greater than it was in 2012-13 (43.2% versus 41.9%, respectively).

The top seven positions indicated above make up the "core" of our administrative support for the research enterprise at Saint Mary's. Virtually all of the research grants/contracts applications as well as post-award administration are administered by this group. As well, all graduate student and post-doctoral researchers are admitted and overseen by offices within the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research. The other three positions are strategic placements to support key research initiatives at the University.

The support by the ICP grant of the above detailed staff and administrator positions is extremely important in enabling the University to manage the increases in externally sponsored research and graduate student numbers that fuel the research enterprise at Saint Mary's. Without the ICP grant support, the transformation of Saint Mary's to a research-dynamic institution would be incapacitated.

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section IV - Regulatory Requirements and Accreditation

### Expenditures

**Was your grant invested, completely or partially, in any of the following ways?**

Note that A and B are not exclusive (i.e. for any given category, if you have covered both existing and new expenditures, you would check both A and B).

Expenditure category	A) The grant covered existing expenditures	B) The grant covered new expenditures (not previously covered by grant)	C) The grant did not cover this category	In which category was the largest proportion of your 2013-2014 grant invested?
1. Creation and support of regulatory bodies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Training of faculty and other research personnel in health and safety, animal care, ethics review, handling radiation and biohazards, and environmental assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. International accreditation costs related to research capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Upgrades to, and maintenance of facilities and equipment to meet requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Technical support for animal care, handling of dangerous substances and biohazards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section IV - Regulatory Requirements and Accreditation (continued)

### Impact Statement

Please explain how the expenditures made in this priority area have allowed your institution (and its health research affiliates, where applicable) to maintain and/or enhance the capacity of its research enterprise. The following questions can help guide your answer:

- what difference have your grant investments made?
- are there significant changes from the previous year?
- why are these investments vital for researchers?
- why are these expenditures vital to the university research administration?
- what would have happened if expenditures hadn't been possible?
- what are the major cost drivers in this category?
- to what extent is compliance with Canadian and international regulations required to access research funds from international sources?

The ICP grant in 2013-14 was used to help support salary and benefits of our Occupational Health and Safety Officer (10%), our Animal Care Technician (80%), and our Research Ethics Board Officer (100%). The ICP funds directed towards Regulatory Requirements and Accreditation in 2013-14 decreased to 6% of the total ICP grant from 9% in the previous year. While these costs actually increased in the institution, we choose to cover more of these expenses from other sources within the University.

Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S) is an integral part of any research enterprise at a University and support of the OH&S Officer at Saint Mary's from the ICP grant continued in 2013-14. The OH&S Office as well as the University's OH&S Committee on which the OH&S Officer serves, is highly involved in the oversight and promotion of safety in research-related activities on and off campus. The Officer also sits on the Faculty of Science's Safety Committee. The OH&S Officer and Committee are required under the Nova Scotia Occupational Health and Safety Act. In 2013-14, Saint Mary's also hired a 0.5 FTE OH&S Officer specifically for the Faculty of Science (not covered by the ICP grant). Without these in place, the research activities of the University would be highly compromised and could be halted if the University was found to be not in compliance with the Act.

While Saint Mary's does not have a large animal care unit we have researchers which work on small mammals, birds, and fish. This research requires an Animal Care Technician, and Animal Care Committee (on which the Animal Care technician serves), and compliance with the guidelines and policies of the Canadian Council on Animal Care.

As a consequence of our greatly increasing activity in research involving human subjects at the University, the demands on our Research Ethics Board has increased dramatically. The increase in applications and tracking of certified research has greatly increased the administrative burden of the REB. This was noted in a March 2008 educational site visit by the National Council on Ethics in Human Research. Due to this increased demand, the University's part-time REB Secretary was increased to 25 hours per week in 2007 and to a full-time position in 2008. The ICP grant is used to support the salary and benefits of this position. As of 2009, we have an extremely capable support person to the REB who has considerable experience in research ethics and has been extremely effective at facilitating and improving our research ethics application, approval, and monitoring processes. In 2013-14, in recognition of the increased complexity and demands of this position, the position was reviewed and reclassified from the REB Secretary position to an REB Officer position. There were over 800 applications (including new submission, and post-approval modification, update and closure applications) to the REB in 2013-14. Due to the ever increasing administrative load in managing our ever increasing applications to the REB Office, late in the 2013-14 fiscal year, we have also hired a part-time administrative support person for our REB Office; the funding coming from other sources in the University outside of the ICP grant.

Without the ICP grant to help support the REB Officer, the University's ability to comply with the Tri-Council Policy Statement on the Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans would likely be highly compromised and certainly would limit our ability to increase our research activity in research involving human participants.

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section V - Intellectual Property

### Expenditures

**Was your grant invested, completely or partially, in any of the following ways?**

Note that A and B are not exclusive (i.e. for any given category, if you have covered both existing and new expenditures, you would check both A and B).

Expenditure category	A) The grant covered existing expenditures	B) The grant covered new expenditures (not previously covered by grant)	C) The grant did not cover this category	In which category was the largest proportion of your 2013-2014 grant invested?
1. Creation, expansion, or sustenance of a technology transfer office or similar function	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Administration of invention patent applications	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Support for technology licensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Administration of agreements and partnerships with industry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Administration of agreements and partnerships with the public sector (federal, provincial, municipal governments; including health, education, and social services)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

### Section V - Intellectual Property (continued)

#### Impact Statement

Please explain how the expenditures made in this priority area have allowed your institution (and its health research affiliates, where applicable) to maintain and/or enhance the capacity of its research enterprise. The following questions can help guide your answer:

- what difference have your grant investments made?
- are there significant changes from the previous year?
- why are these investments vital for researchers?
- why are these expenditures vital to the university research administration?
- what would have happened if expenditures hadn't been possible?
- what are the major cost drivers in this category?

Starting in 2007-08 and continuing through in 2013-14, Saint Mary's has used its ICP grant to help support our Industry Liaison Office (ILO). The ILO was established in late 2004 and consists of two positions, a Director of the Industry Liaison Office and an Industry Liaison Coordinator. These positions are supported by the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA), Saint Mary's University, and the ICP. Specifically, \$52,218 of the ICP funds were directed towards helping to support the salary and benefits of the two positions in the office (approximately 33% of the Director's compensation and 44% of the Coordinator's compensation). This amount is very similar in size and proportion to the ICP grant used in the previous year. The ICP funds are critical in the mix of funding sources to support the ILO, especially during these early years when the Office is still in the maturing stages.

Our ILO is part of the Springboard Atlantic Inc. commercialization network. This network has 18 Atlantic Universities and four Community Colleges as members and its mandate is to support the commercialization of post-secondary research in Atlantic Canada.

The ILO plays an increasingly important role in helping to forge collaborations between university researchers and private-sector partners. This includes the negotiation of research contracts and other agreements. Also vitally important is the ILO's role in knowledge and technology transfer to outside parties in a manner that maximizes the benefits to the University. The ILO's activities are having tangible results with increases in the size and number of research contracts, patent filings, and funding sources for University researchers. In 2013-14 we also saw the establishment of the first spin-off company from research conducted at Saint Mary's University. The fact that the external support of research at Saint Mary's has grown dramatically in the last few years is partially due to the activity of the ILO.

Without the ILO, the ability of the University to forge research partnerships with the private sector and transfer the outcomes of our research for the benefits to Canada would be seriously diminished. As the opportunities for industry-partnered research is ever increasing in Canada and becoming an ever more important component of the Saint Mary's portfolio of research activities, the ILO (and the ICP support thereof) is instrumental in helping us take advantage of these opportunities.

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section VI - Overall Impacts

We strongly recommend that the Vice-President of research (or equivalent) answer the following questions pertaining to the overall impacts of the Indirect Costs grant.

### 1. Attraction and retention of researchers

Has the Indirect Costs grant contributed to the attraction and retention of high-quality researchers at your institution?

Yes  No

If "yes", please provide an explanation.

Saint Mary's has undergone a significant transformation in the last 15 years in its research enterprise. We have moved from a primarily undergraduate teaching institution to one with a healthy mix of undergraduate, graduate and research programs. Research funding and activity has been increasing linearly. For example, in 2002, Saint Mary's was not even ranked in Research InfoSource's Research University of the Year (RUY) rankings (<http://www.researchinfosource.com/pdf/2013RUYAllUniversities.pdf>). In the latest ranking (2012), Saint Mary's was ranked 39th in Canada. The RUY ranking measures not only input of external funding to support research, but also the intensity and impact metrics. Given that virtually all Canadian Universities have increased their research activity over this time period, for Saint Mary's to achieve this ranking is remarkable.

These objective measures, plus the "on the ground" evidence of the increases in research infrastructure, support and activity, are no doubt aiding the University in being able to attract high quality professors, graduate students and post-doctoral fellows. Likewise, the excitement generated in the research arena at Saint Mary's is no doubt helping in the retention of our researchers. The Indirect Costs Program plays a vital role in helping to achieve these successes by providing support in the form of human, library and facilities resources to fuel our research activities.

### 2. Attraction of additional funding

Has the Indirect Costs grant contributed directly to your institution's ability to attract additional funding to support the research environment?

Yes  No

If "yes", please provide an explanation.

Saint Mary's started receiving funding from the Indirect Costs program in 2001-02. Since that time, the level of externally sponsored research funding has increased more than 4-fold from under \$2M annually to over \$8.7M in 2013-14. While there are many factors which have contributed to this remarkable increase in research funding, the ICP grant has been absolutely instrumental and necessary in enabling the University to support the amazing increase in research activity which has accompanied the increase in funding.

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section VI - Overall Impacts

### 3. Redirection of funds

In the case of a number of institutions, the incremental impact of the Indirect Costs Program includes not only the results of investing the grant itself, but also the results of the other investments the institution is able to make by re-directing its own funds away from the areas covered with the grant. These impacts may be in the area of research support or also in the institution's renewed ability to meet the other aspects of its mandate.

**Has your institution redirected some of its own operating funds as a result of the Indirect Costs Program?**

Yes  No

If "yes", please provide an explanation.

### 4. Other overall impacts

**If the Indirect Costs Program has had other overall impacts on your institution, which were not listed in the previous questions, please provide details.**

# Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0055

## Section VII - Public Disclosure Requirement for Institutions

As of June 30, 2012, institutions are required to post a few elements of information on the indirect costs of research and the Program on their website. Please copy and paste below the URL of the webpage where this information is posted.

## Section VIII - Your comments

Describe any problem you have experienced with the Indirect Costs Program, suggest improvements to the program, or highlight particular successes of the program at your institution.