

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number **P0078**

Main Contact Information

Institution The University of Winnipeg			
Contact Family Name Besner		Contact Given Name Neil	
Contact Position Vice-President, Research and International		Contact Department Office of the Vice-President, Research and International	
Contact Telephone number Area Code 204	Number 988-7104	Extension	Contact E-Mail address at institution n.besner@uwinnipeg.ca

Financial Contact Information

Financial Contact Family Name Emslie		Financial Contact Given Name Michael	
Financial Contact Position Controller and Executive Director		Financial Contact Department Financial Services	
Financial Contact Telephone number Area Code 204	Number 258-2943	Extension	Financial Contact E-Mail address at institution m.emslie@uwinnipeg.ca

Statement of Account

Total Indirect Costs Funds available in 2011-2012	A	\$869,007
--	----------	------------------

Expenditures incurred in 2011-2012

Facilities	\$173,800
Resources	\$233,088
Management and Administration	\$233,088
Regulatory Requirements and Accreditation	\$178,986
Intellectual Property	\$50,045
Total Indirect Costs expenditures incurred in 2011-2012	B \$869,007

Outstanding Commitments (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.)

\$0

Health Research Affiliates

For organizations with health research affiliates only: for each area of priority, indicate the actual amount of your 2011-2012 grant that was spent by your health research affiliates.

Facilities	
Resources	
Management and Administration	
Regulatory Requirements and Accreditation	
Intellectual Property	

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0078

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 2011-2012 grant invested?
1. Renovation and maintenance of research facilities (excluding expenditures incurred to meet regulatory requirements - see Section IV)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Upgrade, operations and maintenance of equipment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Operating costs (custodial, security, maintenance, utilities, leasing, capital planning, insurance on research space)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 P0078

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?

A portion of the ICP grant was allocated to the Physical Plant office for research laboratory and facility maintenance. Personnel were dedicated specifically to maintain the research facilities housed in the Richardson College for the Environment and Science Building, which officially opened in June, 2011.

Overall, the funds were used partially for maintenance such as painting, plumbing and electrical, and renovations. These were completed as required. In addition, a portion of the funds was used to offset the operating costs of research facilities throughout the university. Expenses such as utilities, custodial costs, and insurance were covered by the grant.

Our Health and Safety Specialist and Lab Safety Officer looked after the necessary requirements for facilities in order for our investigators to conduct research in a healthy and safe environment. This has been extremely beneficial in maintaining state-of-the-art facilities, enabling researchers to conduct the most efficient, safe, and compliant research.

The University of Winnipeg Technology Solutions Centre (TSC) has a position dedicated to the maintenance of research scientific equipment supported by the ICP. TSC is responsible for information technology-related matters. This technical support has been very beneficial in keeping the research infrastructure operating efficiently. TSC is traditionally a very busy office on campus, and this research-specific position enables a fast response from in-house service to get research which might be delayed from technical difficulties back up and running. We continued to use IC funds to work with TSC on an improved grant-tracking and reporting system, which will be implemented in 2012-13. The resulting efficiency and reliability of this system will allow the University to direct more of its resources towards expanding our research program.

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0078

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 2011-2012 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Library operating costs and administration (custodial, security, maintenance, utilities, leasing, capital planning, staff salaries)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Insurance on research equipment and vehicles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0078

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?

The Library used funds for a number of expenses, such as the database licences, which are vital for the research community. Databases give University researchers access to journals and publications necessary for their research, and continuous additions to the Library's resources are proportionately a major indirect cost of research. Having these databases and resources readily available for researchers has enabled them to acquire relevant and up-to-date information in an easily accessible format, efficiently moving their research forward. This measure continues to be a significant contributing factor in the retention of faculty. The Indirect Costs funding has also enabled us to increase subscriptions accordingly.

The Library Acquisitions staff spend a portion of their time dedicated to acquiring material related to research endeavours, and, therefore, a portion of their salary as well as the operating costs are covered by the ICP grant.

Necessary insurance was taken out on research equipment such as vehicles (trucks, boats) and specialized research equipment. The storage of this seasonal equipment was also an expense covered by the grant.

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0078

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 2011-2012 grant invested?
1. Institutional support for the completion of grant applications / research proposals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Acquisition, maintenance and/or upgrade of information systems to track grant applications, certifications, and awards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Eligible training of faculty and research personnel (excluding training to meet regulatory requirements - see Section IV)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Human resources and payroll	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Financial and audit costs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Research planning and promotion, public relations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number

P0078

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?

Funds from the ICP facilitated the purchase of software licencing and supplementary in-house development of the WebGrants grant-tracking and ethics application software. Considerable human resources involving TSC, faculty, research office staff and senior administrative personnel have been devoted to the successful implementation of this software. This enhancement of our grant and ethics application business processes results in more efficient service to our researchers, improved tracking and budgeting capability both for researchers and support personnel, and a significant move toward more sustainable operation of the research enterprise.

Four full-time employees were devoted to the management and administration of research activities at The University of Winnipeg.

The ICP covered a portion of the day-to-day operations of the Research Office. Funds supported various workshops and seminars to faculty, students, and staff in areas such as funding opportunities, grantsmanship, ethics, showcasing researchers, and lectures. The funds are also directly supporting the costs of a part-time University Veterinarian and contracted support of a Commercialization and Intellectual Property expert.

There were a number of support bodies that the ICP Grant funds went towards, particularly through memberships to ProQuest, the Canadian Association of University Research Administrators (CAURA), The Canadian Federation for the Humanities, and WestLink Innovation. These organizations helped the Research Office disseminate important external funding information and opportunities and provided employees with valuable administrative information. Ongoing memberships have also enabled the Research Office to stay abreast of policy updates and developments in local, national, and international research.

ICP funding supported the costs associated with highlighting the research community at The University of Winnipeg.

The Senior Grants Accountant's salary is derived from a portion of the Financial Services share of ICP funds, along with salaries of staff in Accounts Payable and Purchasing. The Human Resource function includes payroll, salary, and benefits administration. These administrative positions contributed a portion of their time to research support and are funded in part by the Indirect Cost Program grant. Audit and Health and Safety Office salaries are also accounted for in the portion dedicated to the administration of research-related functions. The ICP grant also covered external audit fees when they related to research. All of these positions provide vital administrative and advisory support to our researchers.

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0078

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 2011-2012 grant invested?
1. Creation and support of regulatory bodies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 P0078

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?

Animal user training is needed for any individual dealing with animals used in research, such as faculty, animal care technicians, and physical plant employees. Such training is mandatory, as set forth by the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC), and consists of, for example, animal use certification programs, wet lab programs, and fish use programs. The Indirect Costs Program enabled the Research Office to cover this valuable and necessary training including, in particular, our two animal care technicians' ongoing membership in the Canadian Association for Laboratory Animal Science, as was recommended by the CCAC.

This support for maintaining the competency of our animal users removed the expense from departments and individual researchers, and allowed the redirection of funds to other needs. This measure contributed to a more collegial atmosphere in the University regarding the need for training and resulted in a higher level of cooperation from researchers and animal users. As we prepared to move our animal care program into the vivarium of our new Science Complex in 2012, animal users have needed updates to their training, new Standard Operating Procedures continued to be developed, and specific training was required for our animal care technicians using new equipment.

We continued to revise and create Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for animal care, and to revise and update our animal care Policies and Terms of Reference. Our Animal Use application forms were reformatted and revised to reflect the conditions required by CCAC and to make them more accessible to our researchers. In addition, the forms have been adapted for eventual use with the WebGrants ethics application software (to be implemented in September, 2012).

The University continued to review and revise its governance and compliance structure for its animal care program, in preparation for the CCAC site visit scheduled for 2013. Health and Safety training was covered for the handling of radiation, biohazards and waste disposal biohazards.

The ICP grant covered the salaries and benefits of two animal care technicians who are now staffing the vivarium of the Richardson College for the Environment and Science Building. The University employs an experienced University Veterinarian part-time to provide care, oversight and compliance to CCAC regulations to the animals on a regular, as well as on an as-needed, basis.

With its ICP allocated funding, the Research Office supported costs related to the Veterinarian's travel to and from the facilities, to other centres for specialized training, and the costs incurred in order to allow one of the research office staff to attend the CAURA-West TCPS-2 ethics workshop.

A portion of the ICP funds were used to provide stipends for the Community Representatives who are members of our two ethics committees. The role of Community Representative is vital to the function of both animal and human ethics review boards and is mandated by both the Tri-Council and the CCAC.

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0078

Section IV - Regulatory Requirements and Accreditation (continued)

Impact Statement

With the release of the second edition of the Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (2nd edition) in 2010, careful review and revision of our human ethics guidelines and policies was underway to ensure compliance and best practices in our research involving human participants. Application forms for research involving humans were updated, revised and reformatted for use with the WebGrants ethics application software (to be implemented in September, 2012).

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0078

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 2011-2012 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 type="checkbox"/>
2. Administration of invention patent applications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0078

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?

The University has maintained a contractual relationship with a person dedicated to technology transfer and protecting the University's and faculty intellectual property rights in the negotiation of research contract relationships. We are seeking to expand this function and role. Funds also covered legal, maintenance and renewal fees as well as correspondence with lawyers.

In order to support this contractual relationship, the Research Office used a portion of the ICP funds.

Research office staff continue to revise the policies and procedures governing the negotiation and administration of external research contracts, with valuable input from the intellectual property consultant, the University's Legal Counsel, and the Vice-President, Human Resources.

All of these functions support the research activities of existing faculty and the outcomes will certainly be part of encouraging the recruitment and subsequent retention of new faculty.

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0078

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.

The Indirect Costs Program has been instrumental and absolutely essential in supporting the recruitment, development and retention of researchers. By supporting the research productivity and maximizing the success of existing faculty members, the University has attracted and retained such highly-qualified researchers as Dr. Evelyn Peters (CRC Tier 1). The University was extremely proud to be selected to host a CRC Tier I for Dr. Jeffrey Martin, who is the leader of a joint Canada-Japan effort to make the best measurement of the neutron electric dipole moment ever conducted. In addition, with the renewal of Dr. Dawn Sutherland's Tier II CRC in Science Education in Cultural Contexts, the ICP grant allowed the University to continue to direct funds to support Dr. Sutherland's collaboration with colleagues from around the world to explore the relationship between cultural presentations of science and identity. Exploring these relationships may contribute to more culturally relevant ways of teaching science.

The University is proud to retain such respected researchers as planetary geologist Dr. Ed Cloutis (recipient of major funding from the Canada Space Agency) and wildlife biologist Dr. Craig Willis (awarded nearly \$400,000 from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department). The University named Dr. Willis as its first Chancellor's Research Chair in recognition of his internationally-recognized research in Wildlife Health and Environmental Change. Through the provision of staff and contracted services personnel, we have been successful in marshaling additional supports for such prestigious researchers.

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.

The ICP grant is the catalyst for the development of research grants, some of them "big science", but most of the "small science" variety. The IC grant funds support the Vice-President, Research and International in strategic research planning, particularly related to attracting additional research funding. The funds allow a small university such as ours to provide well-trained administrative personnel to assist faculty with the development and implementation of research grants. In 2011-12, the Province of Manitoba gave the University \$100,000 to fund the analysis and construction of a business case for radioactive isotopes production in Manitoba. The University's success in obtaining this funding was in large part the result of the diligent strategic work of personnel in the Research Office.

Support from the ICP funds benefits our researchers in technology development and intellectual property processes.

The ICP funds support the needs of our researchers and scholars in both the natural and human sciences, by allowing the University to provide the infrastructure required to allow them to focus on and expand their research. New granting initiatives and advances in communication technology infrastructure (the Cisco Telepresence Suite), as well as the profoundly important support garnered for the construction of the new Richardson College for the Environment and Science Building (opened in June 2011) create a productive, inspiring, and rewarding environment for research at The University of Winnipeg. Without support for the numerous expenses eligible under the ICP program, the University would not be able to maintain and build on its current level of funding for research.

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number P0078

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.

With the redirection of a substantial portion of our own operating funds, the University has been able to meet both our teaching and research objectives by upgrading and retrofitting our current campus facilities, expanding our campus, meeting faculty salary requirements, etc. Despite the ever-increasing pressure on our operating funds, we have been able to meet the academic priority of our University, which is to attract and retain highly-sought faculty in order to provide our students with the best instruction and research opportunities.

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.

ICP funds assist in the development and creation of graduate studies programs. Support for research equipment and facilities gives researchers the opportunity to attract and train highly-qualified personnel, thus attracting graduate students to our programs.

The University has been able to provide support for faculty representatives for SSHRC and NSERC, enabling them to devote time to mentoring researchers who seek federal funding.

Indirect Costs Outcomes Report

File Number

P0078

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.uwinnipeg.ca/index/research-index>

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.