

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 Number Extension 902 420-5089	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 Number Extension 902 420-5409		Financial Contact E-Mail address at institution gabe.morrison@smu.ca

Statement of Account

Total Indirect Costs Funds available in 2014-2015	A	\$1,205,909
Expenditures incurred in 2014-2015		
Research Facilities		\$119,705
Research Resources		\$399,037
Management and Administration		\$530,380
Regulatory Requirements and Accreditation		\$104,527
Intellectual Property		\$52,260
Total Indirect Costs expenditures incurred in 2014-2015	B	\$1,205,909
Outstanding Commitments <small>(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.)</small>		
	\$0	

Health Research Affiliates

For organizations with health research affiliates only: for each area of priority, indicate the actual amount of your 2014-2015 grant that was spent by your health research affiliates.

Research Facilities	\$0
Research 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 2014-2015 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 Research Support Funds directed towards Research Facilities in 2014-15 represented 10% of the total RSF grant, down from 13% the previous year (i.e. a decrease of \$39,950 or 25% year-over-year). It should also be noted however that due to labour cost increases, the total costs of the Research Facilities were greater in 2014-15 than the previous year, resulting in the University having to pay for more of these expenses from other sources.

The RSF funds directed towards Research Facilities in 2014-15 were focused on salary 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 RSF 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 RSF 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 2014-2015 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 2014-15, a proportionally similar amount from our RSF Grant went to support Research Resources compared to the previous year (33%), but due to the increased size of the grant, this equated to a very slight increase in the amount of the RSF grant spent on Resources (i.e. an increase of \$255 or 0.1% year-over-year). These funds were spent to help fund expenses associated with our partnership within the Canadian Research Knowledge Network (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 2014-15 was \$1.5M.

The CKRN 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 1.2M researchers and students through 52 licenses and over 2,600 institutional agreements costing over \$88M per year, but saving its members over \$130M per year if done individually. The CKRN is CFI and University funded.

The importance of the CRKN on the research activity at Saint Mary's cannot be overstated. Researchers now have access to dozens of scholarly databases and thousands of research journal issues, volumes and monographs, and increasingly, e-books, directly from their office computers. 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 RSF 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 2014-2015 grant invested?
1. Institutional support for the completion of grant applications / research proposals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 RSF grant at Saint Mary's in 2014-15 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%)
- Research Grants Officer (100%)
- Graduate Studies Officer (50%)
- Two Research & Grants Accountants - Financial Services (one 100% and the other at 100%)
- Secretary, Institute of Computational Astrophysics (100%)
- Manager, Gorsebrook Research Institute for Atlantic Canada Studies (100%)
- Director, Labrador Project (50%)

Over \$0.5M of our RSF grant, or approximately 44% of the total award, was used to support these positions. This is a similar amount and proportion of our RSF award over the previous year.

The top six positions indicated above make up the "core" of our administrative support for the research enterprise at Saint Mary's. Virtually all of the research grant/contract 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 RSF grant of the above detailed staff and administrator positions are 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 RSF 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 2014-2015 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 RSF grant in 2014-15 was used to help support salary and benefits of our Occupational Health and Safety Officer (10%), our Science Safety Officer (50%), and our Research Ethics Board Officer (100%). The RSF funds directed towards Regulatory Requirements and Accreditation in 2014-15 represented 8.7% of the RSF grant compared to 6% the previous year.

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 RSF grant continued in 2014-15. 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. Starting in 2014-15, Saint Mary's also hired a 1.0 FTE Safety Officer specifically for the Faculty of Science which is now 50% supported by the RSF grant. This position was absolutely necessary given the majority of our research and lab-oriented safety issues lie in the Faculty of Science. Without these in place, the research activities of the University would be highly compromised and could be halted if the University has found to be not in compliance with the Act.

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 RSF 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 2014-15, in recognition of the increased complexity and demands of this position, it was review and reclassified from the REB Secretary position to an REB Officer position. The REB Office is currently handling approximately 1200 applications (including new submission, and post-approval modification, update and closure applications) per year. Without the RSF 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 2014-2015 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 2014-15, Saint Mary's has used its RSF grant to help support our Office of Innovation and Community Engagement (OICE; formerly the Industry Liaison Office). The OICE was established in late 2004 and currently consists of 2.4 positions, a Director (1.0 FTE), and Industry Liaison Officer (1.0 FTE) and an OICE Coordinator (0.4 FTE). These positions are supported by the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA), Saint Mary's University, and the RSF. Specifically, \$52,260 in RSF funds were directed towards helping to support the salary and benefits of the positions in the office (approximately 35% of the Director's compensation, 35% of the Industry Liaison Officer's compensation and 100% of the part-time Coordinator's compensation). The RSF funds are critical in the mix of funding sources to support the OICE.

Our OICE is part of the Springboard Atlantic Inc. commercialization network. This network has 13 Atlantic Universities and five Community Colleges as members and its mandate is to support the commercialization of post-secondary research in Atlantic Canada.

The OICE plays an 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 OICE's role in knowledge and technology transfer to outside parties in a manner that maximizes the benefits to the University. The OICE's activities are having tangible results with increases in the size and number of research contracts, patent filings, and funding sources for the University researchers. 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 OICE.

Without the OICE, the ability of the University to forge research partnerships with the private sector and transfer the outcomes of our research for the benefit of Canada would be very seriously diminished. As the opportunities for industry-partnered research is ever increasing in Canada and becoming an more important component of the Saint Mary's portfolio of research activities, the OICE (and the RSF 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 (including five PhD programs) 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 top 50 Research Universities in Canada (researchinfosource.com/top50.shtml). In the latest ranking (2013 fiscal year), Saint Mary's was listed 48th. 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. Even more impressive is Saint Mary's performance in Research InfoSource's "Research University of the Year" (RUY) ranking, which measures not only input of external funding to support research, but also the intensity and impact metrics. In the RUY ranking, Saint Mary's has gone from not being listed among the top 50 Universities in Canada in 2002, to 41st place in 2013. In 2014, Research InfoSource also ranked Canadian universities for International Research Collaborations as measured by the proportion of total publications co-authored by researchers outside of Canada for the period 2008-12. Saint Mary's University was ranked the highest in Canada, with 54% of its publications including overseas researchers.

These objective measures, plus the "on the ground" evidence of the increases in research infrastructure, support and activity, is aiding the University in being able to attract high quality professors, graduate students and post-doctoral fellows. Also, the excitement generated in the research arena at Saint Mary's is helping in the retention of our researchers. The RSF plays a vital role in the achievement these successes by providing the 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 (now the Research Support Fund) 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 2014-15. While there are many factors which have contributed to this remarkable increase in research funding, the RSF grant has been absolutely instrumental and necessary in enabling the University to support the 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.

An impact of the ICP/RSF which may not be evident in the pure accounting for the use of the funds, is the impact it has had on recognition of the research enterprise at Saint Mary's among senior administrators of the institution. Years ago, the research enterprise of the University may have been seen by some as a necessary, but costly component of our activities. While the RSF does not cover all of the indirect costs of our research enterprise, it has helped significantly and has become an important component in our annual budgeting process. As an interesting example of this, the Associate Vice President Research has recently argued for a new research support position in the form of a "Grant Facilitator." One of the important arguments for this new position was the potential impact on the RSF if Saint Mary's researchers do not remain competitive in the Federal Tri-Agency research granting programs.

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.

<http://www.smu.ca/about/research-support-fund.html>

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.

While Saint Mary's has embraced and complied with the efforts of the RSF Program to increase the profile and the understanding of the importance of the Program to research in Canada, we were shocked to learn that the Program could not provide us with their logo so that it could be used by our researchers and students in the acknowledgment sections of their presentation at conferences and workshops across Canada and around the world. While we are encouraged to use the logos of NSERC, CIHR, SSHRC, CFI etc., for these purposes by these agencies, we do not understand why the use of the RSF logo is prohibited for this purpose at this time. This should be address by the RSF Program as soon as possible.