

Appendix 10: emails between Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council administrators regarding the atypical treatment of the conference, June 14, 2009

Moreno,Jose

From: Trautmansdorff,Christine
Sent: June 14, 2009 5:43 PM
To: Yasmeen,Gisèle; Charette,Carmen
Cc: McNaughton,J. Craig; Gobel,Ursula; Crete-Robidoux,Carole; Taylor,Marilyn
Subject: RE: Draft letter to Ryder

Looking good.

Two notes of caution to consider regarding the sentence below:

It is important that the Council be able to respond to concerns communicated to SSHRC regarding your conference, and we rely on yourself as the grantee to permit an informed response.

I think we should avoid implicating Council in this situation or suggesting that they will respond publicly. They don't have a formal role in the process, nor have we asked them to insert themselves in this case. If they adopt a resolution of some kind, it would be entirely outside normal procedures and would have no binding effect vis à vis the institution... it would simply be an expression of support for Chad's decision or course of action.

Second, I am a little worried that the sentence suggests that SSHRC and Council have a pre-determined role or responsibility vis à vis responding to concerns raised about grants. In the normal course of things, questions or concerns about projects we fund are directed to the grant holder and the institution and that's the end of it. This case is outside the norm.

I think the sentence could be left out without changing the letter.

From: Yasmeen,Gisèle
Sent: June 14, 2009 5:26 PM
To: Charette,Carmen
Cc: McNaughton,J. Craig; Trautmansdorff,Christine; Gobel,Ursula; Crete-Robidoux,Carole; Taylor,Marilyn
Subject: Draft letter to Ryder
Importance: High

Salut Carmen and hello everyone on the cc list...

Herewith, draft response to Ryder that Craig and I will be putting forward tomorrow a.m.

Please note the following:

This letter should be a simple acknowledgement to the request we made on the application... hence, not the place to deal with other possible issues that have not as yet been firmed up (possible E and I stuff, broader PR issues). Those other issues should be dealt with separately and not in correspondence from the program director on the administration of the actual application file in my opinion.

Wording points to the responsibility of co-management of our process with the Institution etc which was taken out by Christine in the shortened version... that definitely needs to be there.

Reference in the letter to the final activity report is open and subject to interpretation. Christine, Craig has pulled out the chapter and verse on final activity reports for conferences (and hopefully for final reports more generally). To my knowledge, we cannot go as far as you mention in your e-mail if we are to respect our current policy but I'll leave it to Craig to flesh out details and respond.

20/07/2009

(ATI 2009-2010 10) - Page: 476

I'm copying Marilyn as I'm concerned about possible implications of all this for her areas. We might also have to request help from some of her offices (particularly Sebastien) as Craig is getting super stretched on this stuff and has competitions next week (conferences, no less).

Christine, I'll try to take a look at your notes for E, G and N before going to bed this evening but am hoping Craig can comment first.

Cheerio and look forward to seeing folks at 8:30 tomorrow a.m.

GY