

CINP Board Meeting Minutes

July 6, 2023, 14:00 Atl/13:00 East/12:00 MB/11:00SK+AB/10:00 BC

Present: Garth Huber, Gwen Grinyer, Rituparna Kanungo, Liliana Caballero, Russ Mammei, Thomas Brunner (minutes)

Excused: Greg Hackman, Chris Ruiz (leave of absence)

1. Introduction of new Board Members

Round of introductions where current and new group members introduce themselves. (Order: Gwen, Ritu, Thomas, Liliana, Russ, Garth; Garth introduces Chris Ruiz and treasurer Greg Hackman in absence)

2. Approval of Agenda

Ritu motions, Thomas seconds.

3. Approval of May 9/23 Minutes

Gwen motions to approve, Ritu seconds.

4. Appointment of Officers for 2023-24

The discussion emerges around who would be willing to stand for the officer positions. Russ volunteers as VP. Gwen and Thomas agree to continue in their functions as President and Secretary, respectively.

Ritu motions to appoint officers as listed below, Liliana seconds.

a) Officers appointed from the Board:

- President: Gwen
- Vice-President: Russ
- Secretary: Thomas

b) Board representative to the J.Sci. Evaluation Committee (the other two members are the Executive Director, and the Chair of the Education & Training SWG).

History: Chris Ruiz served in this capacity for 2022-23. The JSci Committee made their decisions by email discussion. Chris requested a leave of absence from the Board, which was approved by the Institutional Members at their meeting in May, so is not available right now.

Liliana inquires what this committee membership entitles. Garth explains that this committee is to evaluate applications for travel support for students and postdocs. The committee meets as applications arrive and until the travel budget is gone. Other members on the committee are Garth and Juliette. Liliana agrees to join the committee.

5. Finance Report (documents supplied by Greg)

Garth reports on Greg's behalf.

a) status of NSERC and Private accounts

Garth walks through the spreadsheet and goes through approved conference support and outstanding commitments. Undergraduate scholarships have not been invoiced yet. One of the two grad fellowships have been invoiced. Left over is projected to be \$63k at the end of the year for NSERC.

Russ asks if we can have a surplus on the NSERC account by the end of the year. Garth explains that we can have carry forward similar to research grants. The large carry forward is due to COVID and the lack of travel grants issued during this time. The goal is to reduce the carry forward by giving out student travel awards. The NSERC grant is for 5 years and the board members will submit a new proposal in due time.

b) update on member invoice payments

Garth reports that \$25.5k have been invoiced, of which \$9.5k were received already. May budget projections are still appropriate.

c) update on 2022-23 audit

Audit has been going well. All documents for 2022/2023 have been submitted to auditor. Auditor expected to review documents in July. Outgoing board has signed required forms. Greg has filed report with Industry Canada but signatures are missing. Greg will take care of this after he returns from vacation. CRA inquired regarding CINP's GST exempt status. Greg had a phone call with CRA on this matter. NSERC account had a large surplus in it. Greg convinced CRA that we do not provide goods or services to NSERC → as of June 26, the issue has been resolved. Everything is progressing as projected.

6. Executive Director Report (Garth)

a) Conference support applications

- *LEGEND Collaboration meeting (Andreoiu)*

Gwen has a conflict on this topic and excuses herself from the discussion.

Garth states that CINP never has supported collaboration meetings in the past. The working group advised against funding the meeting. Ritu elaborates that we need to focus our resources. If we open ourselves up to supporting collaboration meetings, we will dilute our funding available for support of conferences. Garth reports that Corina reached out beforehand, and Garth told her that CINP generally does not support collaboration meetings and that she had to make a case why the meeting should be supported. Garth feels that she failed to explain why CINP should support this collaboration meeting.

Liliana asks what the rules are for support. Liliana supports having a workshop on Onbb and bringing students in. Garth and Thomas reiterates that this is a closed event that this is open to LEGEND members only and therefore should not be supported from CINP.

Thomas motions to decline the request for support of the LEGEND collaboration meeting. Russ seconds. No absentions.

b) CUPC Student Travel Awards

CUPC will be held at the University of Waterloo, Oct 26-29. Apparently the abstract submission deadline is July 14 already, which is really early. The 2023-24 budget approved on January 31, 2023 listed 4x\$750 awards (the agenda stated 7 awards but this was a typo that Garth corrected in his email from July 6, 2023). **Thomas motions to support this with 4 x \$750 student travel awards. Ritu seconds. Russ volunteers to be on the selection committee. Garth will look for another committee member.**

c) Membership

- New Member Applications

 - 233 - Ryan Curry (Guelph, Associate)

- Membership Termination

 - 071 - Reiner Kruecken

 - 130 - Dennis Muecher

Ritu motions to add Ryan Curry and drop Reiner Kruecken and Dennis Muecher, Gwen seconds.

d) More clarity for URS eligibility/selection criteria

Garth reports on raising the question on eligibility criteria for URS awards at the Individual Members AGM at UNB. The consensus during the AGM was that we state that preference will be given to students not already holding major awards for the summer, but there are often mitigating circumstances and we should retain some flexibility. There was no clear consensus on giving preference according to research experience or graduation date, although a statement that preference should be given to students one year from graduation was made by one person.

Following Garth's report from the AGM, discussion emerged among board members. Ritu mentions that the most bright and promising students should receive awards. If the student already has a fellowship, Ritu does not see why the student should not also get a CINP fellowship. She feels that the URS fellowship should be considered independent of any other fellowships the student holds.

Garth reports that the last selection committee decided not to give URS awards to students that already held USRA awards. Gwen: There were a lot of excellent candidates, so the selection committee decided to prioritize. In the response to applicants, wording was chosen stating that financial needs were considered, meaning that students already holding a USRA were excluded from the URS competition. Garth: We would like to maintain flexibility. The current statement on the application form is that a USRA is not required but must be disclosed.

Liliana mentions that we need to be clear with our goals and how we do the selection. There are students with excellent skills but not the best grades who may not get a USRA.

Ritu: We should be mindful to international students who do not have access to USRA awards. Maybe this could be treated in a different way? Garth: we have only one pool of applicants and do not ask students about their immigration status, but we could ask. Gwen: we already ask if students have other financial support. She thinks that their immigration status is less relevant but excellence and financial needs are relevant. Gwen suggests that we could add a statement that *financial need may be a selection*

criteria. Depending on the application pool there is flexibility for the committee to consider financial needs of the student (i.e., if they have other fellowships/awards).

Garth will work on a draft of wording and circulate with the board for comments.

Gwen: with respect to graduation date, there has been positive feedback towards keeping status quo.

e) Various Announcements (SAPES, IPP)

Garth sent 22 candidates to NSERC as suggestions for SAPES based on the various subfields that they are looking for replacements of departing SAPES members. Candidates are 14 female, 8 male. Garth hopes to diversify SAPES this way.

Garth received a comment from a member who raised a concern on members on SAPES who are untenured, and whether this is appropriate. Mike Roney received similar comments within IPP. Mike Roney and Garth sent a letter to Kevin Lapointe at NSERC to bring this concern forward.

Mike Roney is stepping down as IPP director. Carsten Krauss (Alberta) will become the new IPP director. Garth talked with Carsten at CAP. They are planning to continue working together closely between CINP and IPP. They are planning a trip to Ottawa in the fall to raise concerns about TRIUMF's 5-year funding and increasing graduate student stipends. Trip will be likely September or October, depending on when ISED and other senior Ottawa leadership are available.

Ritu feels the need for having dedicated RTI funds. We have been operating with RTI under the envelope of NSERC. There are certain difficulties with CFI: 1) university politics, 2) for large projects CFI IF only happens once every 2.5 years. For some experiments in SAP this can be difficult. If you do not get in, you are delayed to the next round. The current NSERC RTI envelope is insufficient. Ritu suggests that Garth should raise the issue and see if we can get a dedicated RTI envelope. Garth reports that he has raised this in a pre-COVID meeting in Ottawa. There appears to be no institutional memory. Garth raised concerns that mid-career scientists are disadvantaged. CFI needs a program for mid-career scientists. When Garth brought this up in the past, CFI immediately shut this discussion down. Garth also states that in his experience NSERC does not want to compete with CFI. The structure of infrastructure funding is a question for ISED. The Bouchard report suggested a significant increase to the discovery program. Thomas adds to the discussion that this year there were 0% RTIs awarded this round. This is a problem and should be raised with NSERC. Ritu: The current model is that there is one pie (discovery grant, project, and RTI funding), and it depends on how we cut the pie. Other disciplines have a separate RTI program. Ritu suggests that we have the envelope money for SAP but also have an added dedicated fund for RTI. Thomas states that it is an advantage that the SAPES can prioritize research support over RTI support. The main issue is that the envelope is under significant stress, and we require an increase in funds. The discussion evolves on lack of funding. Garth suggests that there should be a dedicated mid-career competition, ideally on an annual basis. Ritu reiterates her concerns about university envelope/politics with CFI. Garth: the Naylor report suggested changes to CFI. CFI is a strange creature with a special standing in the funding landscape. Garth will discuss with Carsten on how to address the concerns that were brought forward.

Russ leaves at 2:06.

Garth and IPP typically define a list of talking points prior to their trip to Ottawa. From this discussion, the points to discuss are:

- 0% RTI success rate
- CFI issues with university politics
- lack of mid-career awards

The plan is to meet with Nipun Vats (ISED ADM-S&T), CFI and NSERC.

The discussion evolves on how we could approach our MPs. Ritu suggests having a letter signed by members of the community and send this to MPs. Garth wrote his MP and invited them to visit the lab, which they did. The discussion continues brainstorming on how we could try to increase profile. Garth encourages everyone to reach out to their MPs.

7. News from TRIUMF

The big thing is TRIUMF science week coming up.

Ritu: For the 5-year planning, the process is different this year. First, there has been peer a review and then in the fall the 5-year plan will be submitted. It is therefore timely for CINP and IPP to go to Ottawa.

8. Other Business

None

9. Next Board Meeting

Garth asks for unavailability in September. Except the first week of September there is no other unavailability mentioned.

10. Adjourn

Ritu motions to adjourn.

July 27 E-vote on amended 2022-23 Financial Statements

I have reviewed the Draft FS document from the auditor as well as the other documents and put a motion forward that we approve the financial statement as presented with the \$4k reclassification and minor \$10 discrepancy.

Motion: Gwen, Seconded: Russ. Voting in favor: Gwen, Russ, Liliana