

A Guide to Intellectual Property:

**For members of the Institute of Quality Undergraduate Education (IQUE)
and employees and collaborators of the Maple League of Universities Consortium (ML)**

Citation: from *A Guide to Intellectual Property for Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Student*. CAGS (Canadian Association of Graduate Studies) Scholars©

http://www.cags.ca/documents/publications/working/Guide_Intellectual_Property.pdf

Purpose: This document helps to inform members of the Institute of Quality Undergraduate Education (IQUE) and the Maple League of Universities Consortium (ML) in diverse roles, which include:

- undergraduate research fellows,
- student leadership fellows,
- post-graduate fellows,
- faculty excellence leads,
- project managers,
- project directors,
- community-based research and/or thought partners
- faculty, staff, and student colleagues within the home institution (Bishop's),
- faculty, staff, and student colleagues the Maple League of Universities (Acadia, St. FX, and Mount Allison)
- and faculty and staff within higher education in Canada and internationally.

Intellectual property is determined and negotiated on four levels:

- with the university or organization within which the knowledge is gathered, analysed, and shared
- with the supervisor/Primary Investigator
- with the funding source
 - (e.g. Tri-council grants, Jarislowsky funding, Maple League funding, external funding – e.g. BHER, CEWIL)
- with the form and platform for knowledge dissemination (peer-reviewed publication, regular reports (monthly, quarterly, annually), specially commissioned reports, annotated bibliography, knowledge mobilization platforms, white paper, policy papers, social media, digital media production)

All of these can play a role in determining the extent of intellectual property rights. It is important to be clear at the outset about how the varied working arrangements out of which research arises will affect the status of that research as intellectual property.

What is intellectual property? (cf. CAGS, page 3 – 4)

“Intellectual property (or “IP”) simply defined is any form of knowledge or expression created partly or wholly with one's intellect and which can be legally protected. It is the product of the act of creation, such as an invention, a piece of writing, a painting, a design, a piece of music, etc. An invention is any product of the human intellect that is unique, novel, and unobvious to a person skilled in the field of invention. Individuals and/or institutions can own the products of their creativity and innovation in the same way they can own physical property. An owner of IP can control and receive payment for its use, so IP has value in the marketplace. There are four main types of statutory IP protection:

1. patents for inventions – new and improved products and processes that are capable of industrial application;
2. trademarks for brand identity – of goods and services, allowing distinctions to be made between different traders;
3. designs for product appearance – of the whole or a part of a product resulting from the features of, in particular, the lines, contours, colours, shape, texture, or materials of the product itself or its ornamentation; and,
4. copyright for material – literary and artistic material, music, films, sound recordings, and broadcasts, including software and multimedia. In addition, moral rights are the author's right to integrity of the creation in its original form, to attribution, and to prevention of unfavorable associations with the author's creation.”

Who owns intellectual property? (CF. CAGS page 4 – 5)

“In addition, all parties involved in research are governed by specific university policies. Unless they have signed an agreement stating otherwise, they have the right to own the copyright for their own written or artistic work or computer software, and to own the patent rights to any invention they might create, including computer software in some countries. Depending on the circumstances, these rights are often shared with others – their supervisor, their fellow students, and research staff. This will be determined by the requirements of the Law, by university policies, and by conventions of the discipline. Policies can vary from institution to institution. ... In addition to the laws related to intellectual property and university policies, conventions or local customs should be acknowledged and may apply. For example, customs may be followed regarding the recognition of individuals as co-authors in an article or paper presented at a conference [which might differ from reports and other documents and artefacts that represent an organization].”

Disciplinary conventions & differences (cf. CAGS page 6)

“The conventions of a particular discipline can influence intellectual property rights to the extent that they may determine the degree of acknowledgment you are accorded for participation in a project or published article. Conventions about what criteria define a joint author vary among

disciplines. The narrowest definition comes from copyright law and applies to collaborations in literary and artistic works in some of the humanities. There, a "joint author" is technically someone who has collaborated on a work in which the contributions of the various authors are not distinct from one another. In this model, only contributors to the form or expression of the work qualify; those supplying ideas normally do not. If each person's contribution is distinct (e.g., contributors of entries to an encyclopedia), the work is a "collective work."

"In the physical and life sciences, collaboration and teamwork are common. Indeed, a student's research may be guided by a team or committee. Contributors to the original ideas in a project are typically given the right to joint authorship of publications that report on the results of the research. As a guideline, co-authorship should be recognized only where the individuals have participated in a significant way in the following aspects of the research:

- conception of idea and design of experiment/methodology/initiative,
- actual execution of experiment with data collection and curation,
- analysis and interpretation of data for the purposed of research and/or
- actual writing of the manuscript.

"It is important that the research fellow and the supervisor/PI/researcher establish at the outset what the conventions of authorship are that will be applied in the working relationship. It is preferable to determine this before you enter into a working or research relationship with this person so that there are no surprises or disputes when it comes time to publish your research."

University Policies around Intellectual Property in Canada (cf. CAGS page 7)

"Traditionally, universities in North America have allowed their *faculty members* to retain the copyright in literary, artistic and musical works. However, the regulations governing the university's involvement with and entitlement to other research can be specific to the institution."

Who owns Intellectual property in ML and IQUE policy, conventions, or customs?

1. Access to Data (cf. CAGS page 7)

"In many universities, data collected under research projects funded by the federal or provincial governments is considered to belong to the university. Students [or employees] cannot automatically expect exclusive ownership of data gathered for research projects performed under the auspices of a given institution."

- i. For IQUE projects, all data (methodology, surveys and data collection design, data – qualitative and quantitative, reports, etc.) are owned by the PI for the IQUE. The funding

- is through the Jarislowsky Chair of Undergraduate Teaching Excellence, which is housed at Bishop's University (through Microsoft Office platforms, which include Team channels, One drive, Outlook, Sharepoint, One note, etc.). There needs to be an explicit and written agreement with the supervisor for permission on data former fellows, researchers, or employees can take with them or access once they leave the university. Otherwise the data will no longer be accessible to someone who has left the IQUE.
- ii. For Maple League projects, all data (methodology, surveys and data collection design, data – qualitative and quantitative, reports, etc) are owned by the Executive Director (ED) of the ML. The funding is through the Maple League – both operational and external funding, which is housed on a secure platform by the Maple League via Bishop's University (through Microsoft Office platforms, which include Team channels, One drive, Outlook, Sharepoint, One note, etc.). There needs to be an explicit and written agreement with the supervisor for permission on data that former fellows, researchers, or employees can take with them or access once they their contract with the IQUE lab and/university has ended. Without prior and written agreement, the data will no longer be accessible to former fellows, undergraduate/graduate/post-graduate researchers, or employees of the IQUE.

2. Courseware & Content Creation (cf. CAGS page 8)

“Be aware of university policy relative to courseware. As graduate students, you may have occasion to develop courseware (Powerpoint slides, overheads, handouts, and other instructional materials) for a professor in either a paid or an unpaid capacity. The university and/or the professor may claim the rights to these materials: you may not be able to use them for you own purposes later in your career. In addition to the university's intellectual property policy, the professorial union may have policies regarding this issue as well. ... When leaving your alma mater, make sure that all intellectual property that you developed while associated with it has been disclosed in order to avoid any issues of legitimacy at a later stage if such intellectual property is indeed commercially developed”

- iii. For IQUE curricular, non-curricular, and certificate programs/projects, all course materials (modules, training, instructional materials, micro-lectures, digital resources, assignments and assessment, asynchronous content, and all artefacts on the LMS) are owned by the PI of the IQUE. Content creators must be valued and compensated for their work – funded through the Jarislowsky Chair of Undergraduate Teaching Excellence – and the assumption will be that ownership is shared between the PI and the content creator. In this case explicit and written agreement with the supervisor will be negotiated so that former fellows, researchers, or employees can take course-ware content (as outlined above) that they were directly responsible for creating with them and/or have access to after their contract with the IQUE lab and/university has ended. Without prior and written agreement, the course-ware content will no longer be accessible to former fellows, undergraduate/graduate/post-graduate researchers, or employees of the IQUE.

- iv. For Maple League projects, curricular, non-curricular, and certificate programs/projects, all course materials (modules, training, instructional materials, micro-lectures, digital resources, assignments and assessment, asynchronous content, and all artefacts on the LMS) are owned by the ED of the ML. The work must be valued and compensated – funded through the Maple League operating budget or external funding – but convention will be that ownership will be shared with the content creator if there is explicit and written agreement with the PI. In this case explicit and written agreement with the supervisor will be negotiated so that former fellows, researchers, or employees can take course-ware content (as outlined above) with them or access when their contract with the ML has ended. Without prior and written agreement, the course-ware content will no longer be accessible to former fellows, undergraduate/graduate/post-graduate researchers, or employees of the ML.

3. Copyright and Creative versus non-creative artefacts (cf. CAGS page 9)

“Copyright protects original literary, musical, dramatic, or artistic works in a variety of forms, including written materials and computer software. Copyright does not protect ideas, but rather the *expression* of such ideas. It prevents anyone from copying, publishing, translating, or broadcasting a work without the copyright owner’s permission. Copyright exists as soon as an artistic, literary, scientific or musical work or software is created.”

- v. Copyright of creative works is not applicable to the work of the IQUE or ML; however, while non-creative artefacts (reports, publications, presentations, policy papers, logos, branding, social media strategies, etc.), are not subject to copyright, they are the intellectual property under the organization that funds and produces this work.

Funding & IP (CAGS page 13 – 14)

“The relationship between funding and intellectual property rights depends on (a) who the funding body is, and (b) what the terms and conditions of funding are. Not all funding bodies are the same. Organizations, such as some charitable associations or foundations or provincial Centres of Excellence (e.g., the Heart and Stroke Foundation or Materials and Manufacturing Ontario) may claim either licensing rights or a share of royalties. Still other organizations, notably companies, do attach intellectual property claims to their support of university research or of fellowships or scholarships for students. ... To ascertain which of these conditions apply, you should be aware of which organization is funding the research you do and what ownership and license rights the organization has to the results of your work. If the research support is in the form of a contract, you may be asked to sign an agreement which indicates that you are aware of the intellectual property terms and conditions of the funding and that you agree to abide by them. If the research support is in the form of a grant, this is [negotiated between the researcher/fellow/employee and the supervisor/PI] about terms and conditions.”

Employee status (cf. CAGS page 14)

“Under the applicable legislation, intellectual property created by an employee in the course of his or her employment is deemed to belong to the employer unless there is an agreement providing otherwise. University policies modify the application of this general principle, however, the degree to which they do and how can vary depending upon the institution ... For instance, the intellectual property policies at certain universities dictate that intellectual property created by university employees in the course of their employment is the university’s property only *if the work or the invention was created at the direction of the employee’s supervisor.*”

- vi. For IQUE, the university (Bishop’s University) and lead researcher who has secured the funding (Jarislowsky Chair of Undergraduate Teaching Excellence) owns licensing rates, royalties (if applicable), and primary ownership of intellectual property. If an employee, fellow, researcher is asked to produce a report, policy document, presentation, or any other artefact as part of their job roles – and is paid and compensated for this work through the IQUE, the IP is owned by the IQUE and lead researcher.
- vii. For the ML the organization owns licensing rates, royalties (if applicable), and primary ownership of intellectual property. In each consulting contract for Maple League work, there is a section explicitly states that the organization owns sole rights to intellectual property produced by its employees. If an employee, fellow, researcher is asked to produce a report, policy document, presentation, or any other artefact as part of their job roles, the IP is owned by the organization

Authorship (cf. CAGS page 15)

“The role of a supervisor varies in different fields of study. This may have an impact on the ownership of intellectual property. Co-authorship: Attribution of authorship is the most common problem area for graduate student intellectual property issues.”

- “In some fields, such as the humanities and social sciences, it is normally expected that students will receive guidance from their supervisors, but generate their own ideas, do their own research, and *seek out their own financial support*. The supervisor acts as a mentor, "resource person", and/or consultant, but less often as a full collaborator. Under these circumstances, the student will have the primary right to the intellectual property produced by his or her research.”
- “In other fields, such as the physical and life sciences, the normal practice is that the student joins an established research group and works collaboratively with the supervisor, other students, postdoctoral fellows, technicians, and/or other employees. In this model, the supervisor has provided the general ideas that guide the research of the group, as well as the resources required to support or conduct the research activities. In the case of such a collaborative research setup, the supervisor would normally make the decision on who shares co-authorship.”

- viii. In the case of IQUE, fellows, researchers, and employees join one or more established research groups and are funded through the research lab secured by the PI (in this case, the Jarislowsky Chair of Undergraduate Teaching Excellence). In a collaborative research set-up, the lead or primary author would be the PI with secondary authorship offered when applicable; co-authorship will be offered when the individuals have participated in a significant way (outlined above, page 3) and will be offered to colleagues and co-inquirers established in advance. Research Assistants (RAs), which may include research fellows (undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate) who support the research (through annotated bibliographies, literature reviews, copy-editing, and preparing manuscripts for publication), will not be eligible for secondary or co-authorship for peer-reviewed publications, reports, conference presentations – but will be thanked in the acknowledgments section if applicable.

“A requisite of co-authorship is work that involves an original contribution as understood by that discipline. The right to co-authorship may be lost if a co-worker leaves the project or does not contribute substantially to the work. Although acknowledgement may be appropriate in such circumstances, co-authorship rights cannot be assumed. Normally, the supervisor, in consultation with his or her co-authors, will make the decision as to when or whether a co-authored manuscript should be submitted for publication and to what journal. A student considering publication of his or her own paper also has a responsibility to consider the intellectual property and co-authorship rights of others who may have been involved in the research.” (CAGS page 15).

- ix. In the case of the ML, fellows, researchers, and employees join one or more established research groups/projects/communities of practice and are funded through the Maple League secured by the ED (either through operating budget or external funding secured by the ED). In a collaborative research set up, the lead or primary author would be the ED with secondary authorship offered to researchers/fellows/employees when applicable; co-authorship will be recognized when the individuals have participated in a significant way (outlined above, page 3)
- x. For employees, fellows, and researchers who wish to pursue independent research projects, this work is done outside regular work hours and will not be compensated by the research lab or organization. The data gathered under the lab or consortium (compensated through funding and supervised by the PI) will not be available for independent research projects unless expressly requested and approved in writing in advance of publication or dissemination (conferences, presentations, job talks).

Inventorship (cf. CAGS page 16)

The work of both the IQUE and the ML is of research and design (R&D), and much of the work engages in academic entrepreneurialism. This requires some framing for the sub-category under IP called “inventorship.”

“An inventor is a person who has had an original idea or has contributed intellectual input which constitutes an inventive step to one of the claims of the patent. A patent application may be filed naming one or more inventors. A person who works under the direction of another and does not contribute any original thought to the claimed invention or that has not creatively contributed to the proof of principle or concept cannot and must not be named as an inventor. For example, "works as a technician" is not an adequate justification to confirm one's status as an inventor or co-inventor. This type of relationship should be delineated clearly in writing before research or development work is undertaken relative to the project or activity. Professional collaborators may or may not contribute to the inventive concept being claimed and great care should be taken in deciding who should be named as an inventor. It is important to understand that inventorship is a legal matter, not a collegial matter — not all co-authors of a publication are necessarily co-inventors. Collaborators not deemed to be co-inventors can, however, be recognized through some sharing of the net proceeds of the invention.

- xi. In the case of the signature initiatives of the IQUE and the Jarislowsky Chairship inventorship is under the sole ownership of the Jarislowsky Chair. These initiatives include the Online Learning and Technology Consultants (OLTC) program, Hearts and Souls International Conference (formerly QUEUC), ENG225 Shakesperience, Hope University, and innovative teaching projects, which include Prosecuting Satan for Crimes Against Humanity, Putting Shakespeare on Trial for Fraud, Shakespeare's Guide to Wicked Problems (co-owned by Lisa Dickson and Shannon Murray), Shakespeare's Guide to Critical Hope (co-owned by Lisa Dickson and Shannon Murray).
- xii. In the case of the signature initiatives of the Maple League, inventorship is under the sole ownership of the ED. These initiatives include the OLTC program, activities and programming related to the VMLTLC (Better Together, Maple League Hosts, Book Club, and the Micro-certificate in Teaching and Learning. Inventorship is not applicable for “Maple League supported” initiatives (as outlined in the October 21 Monthly report posted on www.mapleleague.ca)

VII. Dispute Resolution (cf. CAGS page 17)

“If a dispute or concern arises with respect to intellectual property and/or co-authorship rights, you and your supervisor should first try to resolve any differences amicably. If discussion with your supervisor does not resolve the problem, you have several avenues of help within your department that can be taken in the following order: your research supervisory committee, the graduate coordinator/director of your department and the chair of the department. You can also seek advice concerning intellectual property management from your university's Technology Transfer office. If the department is unable to find a satisfactory solution, you can seek help from the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and from the office of the Vice-President or Principal of Research.”

- xiii. All disputes or unaligned expectations will be first discussed between the researcher/fellow/employee and the PI/supervisor in a candid and compassionate manner so that both parties can come to an understanding based on the guidelines outlined in this policy document. If there are still unresolved questions, the negotiations will include conflict mediation in governance pathways accordant with the following advisory bodies
- a. In the case of IQUE, the Jarislowsky Chair will bring in the Director of Research at Bishop's University for consultation. In complex cases, the Director of Research might recommend that the query be resolved in consultation with the VP Academic. If that fails to find resolution the Jarislowsky Chair will ask for guidance from the Jarislowsky Advisory Council (comprised of internal and external members).
 - b. In the case of the Maple League, the ED will bring in the Chair of the Maple League Research Committee (MLRC) for consultations. In complex cases, the Chair of the MLRC might recommend that the query be resolved in consultation with the VP Academics.

APPENDIX: Policies for Intellectual Property (IQUE and ML)

- i. For IQUE projects, all data (methodology, surveys and data collection design, data – qualitative and quantitative, reports, etc.) is owned by the PI for the IQUE. The funding is through the Jarislowsky Chair of Undergraduate Teaching Excellence, which is housed at Bishop’s University (data will be housed in secure channels on Microsoft Office platforms, which include Team channels, One drive, Outlook, Sharepoint, One note, etc.). If former fellows, researchers, or employees want access to this data once they leave the university/IQUE, they must secure explicit and written agreement from the supervisor/PI (in this case, the Jarislowsky Chair) for permission. Otherwise the data will no longer be accessible to anyone who has left the IQUE.
- ii. For Maple League projects, all data (methodology, surveys and data collection design, data – qualitative and quantitative, reports, etc) is owned by the Executive Director (ED) of the ML. The funding is through the Maple League – both operational and external funding, which is housed on a secure platform by the Maple League via Bishop’s University (Microsoft Office platforms, which include Team channels, One drive, Outlook, Sharepoint, One note, etc.). If former fellows, researchers, or employees want access to this data once they leave the ML, they must secure explicit and written agreement from the supervisor/PI (in this case, the ED) for permission. Otherwise, data will no longer be accessible to anyone who has left the ML.
- iii. For IQUE curricular, non-curricular, and certificate programs/projects, all course materials (modules, training, instructional materials, micro-lectures, digital resources, assignments and assessment, asynchronous content, and all artefacts on the LMS) are owned by the PI of the IQUE. Content creators must be valued and compensated for their work through funding via the Jarislowsky Chair of Undergraduate Teaching Excellence. The convention will be that ownership is shared between the PI and the content creator but will be determined on a case by case basis. In this case explicit and written agreement with the PI will be negotiated so that former fellows, researchers, or employees can take course-ware content (as outlined above) that they were directly responsible for creating with them and/or have access to it after their contract with the IQUE lab and/university has ended. Without prior and written agreement, the course-ware content will no longer be accessible to former fellows, undergraduate/graduate/post-graduate researchers, or employees of the IQUE.
- iv. For Maple League projects, curricular, non-curricular, and certificate programs/projects, all course materials (modules, training, instructional materials, micro-lectures, digital resources, assignments and assessment, asynchronous content, and all artefacts on the LMS) are owned by the ED of the ML. The work must be valued and compensated – funded through the Maple League operating budget or external funding. Convention will be that ownership will be shared with the content creator if there is explicit and written



agreement with the PI. In this case explicit and written agreement with the supervisor will be negotiated so that former fellows, researchers, or employees can take course-ware content (as outlined above) with them or access when their contract with the ML has ended. Without prior and written agreement, the course-ware content will no longer be accessible to former fellows, undergraduate/graduate/post-graduate researchers, or employees of the ML.

- v. Copyright of creative works is not applicable to the work of the IQUE or ML; however, while non-creative artefacts (reports, publications, presentations, policy papers, logos, branding, social media strategies, etc.), are not subject to copyright, these artefacts are the intellectual property under the organization that funds and produces this work. Single authorship beyond the PI/ED is not permitted when reports and other documents represent the organization rather than individual opinions/perspectives.
- vi. For IQUE, the university (Bishop's University) and lead researcher/PI who has secured the funding (in this case, the Jarislowsky Chair of Undergraduate Teaching Excellence) owns licensing rates, royalties (if applicable), and primary ownership of intellectual property. If an employee, fellow, researcher is asked to produce a report, policy document, presentation, or any other artefact as part of their job roles – and is paid and compensated for this work through the IQUE – the IP is owned by the IQUE and lead researcher.
- vii. For the ML, the organization owns licensing rates, royalties (if applicable), and primary ownership of intellectual property. In each consulting contract for Maple League work, there is a section that explicitly states that the organization owns sole rights to intellectual property produced by its employees. If an employee, fellow, researcher is asked to produce a report, policy document, presentation, or any other artefact as part of their job roles (and are compensated through salary or honorarium), the IP is owned by the organization. Single authorship or co-authorship outside the ED is not the convention for paid work on artefacts shared via internal communications (shared via email, Teams, or shared google documents) or public facing documents (shared on the ML website and/or social media channels).
- viii. In the case of IQUE, fellows, researchers, and employees join one or more established research groups and are funded through the research lab secured by the PI (in this case, the Jarislowsky Chair of Undergraduate Teaching Excellence). In a collaborative research set-up, the lead or primary author is the PI with secondary authorship offered when applicable; co-authorship will be offered when the individuals have participated in a significant way (outlined above, page 3) and will be offered to colleagues and co-inquirers established in advance. Research Assistants (RAs), which may include research fellows (undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate) who support the research (through annotated bibliographies, literature reviews, copy-editing, and preparing manuscripts for

publication), will not be eligible for secondary or co-authorship for peer-reviewed publications, reports, conference presentations – but will be thanked in the acknowledgments section if applicable.

- ix. In the case of the ML, fellows, researchers, and employees join one or more established research groups/projects/communities of practice and are funded through the Maple League secured by the ED (either through operating budget or external funding secured by the ED). In a collaborative research set up, the lead or primary author would be the ED with secondary authorship offered to researchers/fellows/employees when applicable; co-authorship will be recognized when the individuals have participated in a significant way (outlined above, page 3).
- x. For employees, fellows, and researchers who wish to pursue independent research projects, this work is done outside regular work hours and will not be compensated by the research lab or organization. The data gathered under the lab or consortium (and if this data collection has been funded through and supervised by the PI) will not be available for independent research projects unless expressly requested and approved in writing in advance of publication or dissemination (including but not limited to conferences, presentations, job talks).
- xi. In the case of the signature initiatives of the IQUE and/or the Jarislowsky Chairship, inventorship is under the sole ownership of the Jarislowsky Chair. These signature initiatives include the Online Learning and Technology Consultants (OLTC) program, Hearts and Souls International Conference (formerly QUEUC), ENG225 Shakesperience, Hope University, and innovative teaching projects, which include ENG321 Prosecuting Satan for Crimes Against Humanity, ENG224 Putting Shakespeare on Trial for Fraud, and ENG223 Shakespeare’s Guide to Wicked Problems
 - a. Co-owned initiatives include The Early Modern Guide to Wicked Problems (co-owned by Lisa Dickson and Shannon Murray), Shakespeare’s Guide to Critical Hope (co-owned by Lisa Dickson and Shannon Murray), leadership from the Edges, Marvel and Mentorship (co-owned by Heather Lawford), and guerilla leadership (co-created with Heather Smith, Rachel Forsyth, Paul Taylor, and Claire Hamsire).
- xii. In the case of the signature initiatives of the Maple League, inventorship is under the sole ownership of the ED. These initiatives include the OLTC program, activities and programming related to the VMLTLC (Better Together, Maple League Hosts, Book Club, and the Micro-certificate in Teaching and Learning. Inventorship is not applicable for “Maple League supported” initiatives (as outlined in the October 21 Monthly report posted on www.mapleleague.ca). Consultations on the OLTC will be undertaken with the co-founders, Scott Stoddard and Georges-Philippe Gadoury-Sansfacon. Consultations

about the Microcertificate in Teaching and Learning will be undertaken with the MLTLC committee.

- xiii. All disputes or unaligned expectations will be first discussed between the researcher/fellow/employee and the PI/supervisor in a candid and compassionate manner so that both parties can come to an understanding, informed by the guidelines outlined in this policy document. If there are still unresolved questions, the negotiations will include conflict mediation via governance pathways accordant with the following advisory bodies
- a. In the case of IQUE, the Jarislowsky Chair will bring in the Director of Research at Bishop's University for consultation. In complex cases, the Director of Research might recommend that the query be resolved in consultation with the VP Academic. If that fails to find resolution the Jarislowsky Chair will ask for guidance from the Jarislowsky Advisory Council (comprised of internal and external members).
 - b. In the case of the Maple League, the ED will bring in the Chair of the Maple League Research Committee (MLRC) for consultations. In complex cases, the Chair of the MLRC might recommend that the query be resolved in consultation with the VP Academics.
- xiv. Grant writing is not considered a form of intellectual property. If an employee, fellow, or researcher is involved in grant writing, they do not own the content, nor should they expect to be direct recipients of the grant if the proposal is successful. The PI is responsible for determining how funds, if secured, will be allocated outside IP considerations.
- xv. Award writing is not considered a form of intellectual property. If an employee, fellow, or researcher is involved in award writing, they do not own the content, nor should they expect to be direct recipients of the award unless explicitly named in the application.