Introduction


The Annual Report is prepared as required by the Office’s Terms of Reference and acts as a measure of accountability. It is intended to inform the University community about the day-to-day business of the office through sharing data about the number of visitors and types of concerns brought to the Office. It also identifies systemic issues and makes recommendations that if implemented, will improve and promote fairness at the University. This Annual Report will also provide an update on the progress made towards the recommendations from the 2017 SFU Office of the Ombudsperson Annual Report.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to the students who visit the Office and share their concerns, trusting in the impartiality, confidentiality, and independence of the Office of the Ombudsperson. Similarly, thank you to the SFU faculty and staff who cooperate and collaborate to resolve concerns and improve systems. The combined efforts make the University a fairer, healthier community for all.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Reid
Ombudsperson
Office of the Ombudsperson Essentials

FOUNDATION

The 3 key principles that underpin the operations of the Office of the Ombudsperson are:

• Confidentiality – Visitors to the office can expect that all information shared with the Ombudsperson will be kept in strict confidence. Only with express permission from the student will the Ombudsperson, if appropriate, share identifying information about the student or the concern.

• Impartiality – The Ombudsperson considers the perspective of all involved parties from an objective standpoint and advocates for fair treatment, fair process and fair decisions.

• Independence – The Office of the Ombudsperson is supported with funding from Simon Fraser University, the Graduate Student Society, and through the provision of office space by the Simon Fraser Student Society. The Ombudsperson does not take direction from these bodies. Fairness is the only interest and the driver of any actions.
WHAT DO WE DO?

INDIVIDUAL CASE WORK

The Office of the Ombudsperson is primarily contacted by students with fairness concerns, but is also available to consult with staff or faculty on student-related fairness questions.

Individual case work involves:

- connecting with students in person or over the phone to discuss their concerns and clarify the issue/s
- identifying options available, applicable policies or procedures, relevant resources and assisting the student to assess possible courses of action
- coaching students regarding communication and interaction with relevant people and offices to seek resolution
- if resolution is not achieved and if confusion exists amongst the involved parties, conducting research and contacting relevant people or offices for clarification
- (with permission of student) engaging in shuttle diplomacy or mediation to pursue a fair outcome
- communicating with University administrators about unresolved issues, considering whether a system-wide obstacle is preventing resolution, and issuing recommendations for changes

PREVENTATIVE WORK

The Office of the Ombudsperson is also involved in proactive educational work. Preventative work involves:

- developing and participating in outreach activities to increase and promote fairness

In 2018, I was thrilled to participate in several student orientation sessions, speak at the invitation of several committees and student groups, and facilitate several workshops. I am looking forward to hiring a student to assist in the development of online resources and tools to further promote fairness at SFU and increase accessibility to information.

The SFU Office of the Ombudsperson follows the Standards of Practice of the Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons and is a full voting-member of the organization.
From January 3, 2018 to December 24, 2018, a total of 461 students have sought the services of the Ombudsperson. This represents a decrease of 1 student when compared to the previous year.

*Please note that data does not exist for 2016

### TYPES OF CONCERNS - UNDERGRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with Academic Advising</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint about Instructor or TA</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint about Program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint about Staff</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Issues (availability, scheduling, etc.)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP Withdrawal Appeal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence and Housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Credit Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Refund Appeal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal (WE)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Integrity 3
Complaint about Instructor or Program 8
Complaint about Staff 1
Fees 2
Funding 1
Grading 2
Residence and Housing 1
Supervisory Concerns 30
TA/TM Issue 1
Unsatisfactory Progress Report 5
Withdrawal (WE) 1
Other 5
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CASELOAD PER YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ENROLLMENT STATUS**

- **Undergraduate Domestic** 42%
- **Graduate Domestic** 7%
- **Undergraduate International** 20%
- **Graduate International** 5%
- **Did not Disclose** 26%

**NUMBER OF CONSULTATIONS PER STUDENT**

- **1 to 2** 90%
- **3 to 6** 9%
- **7 or more** 1%
Method of Initial Contact

Email: 78%
Phone: 13%
Drop-in: 8%
Workshop: 1%

How Did Students Hear About the Office?

Website: 46%
Referral from Staff or Faculty: 41%
Word of Mouth: 13%
2018 Recommendations

This year, I decided to focus the Annual Report on a single issue. Intellectual property policies, procedures and practices at SFU are currently the source of confusion and at times strife, particularly impacting graduate students at SFU. The cases are complex and resolutions elusive. Systemic change is needed urgently.

*Please note that I occasionally provide examples to illustrate an issue. The Office of the Ombudsperson is confidential and identifying details have been altered or omitted to protect the privacy of individuals. As a result, the references to cases are necessarily generic in nature but broadly reflect the types of concerns brought to the Office of the Ombudsperson.
The Impact of Unresolved Intellectual Property Issues on the Graduate Student – Graduate Supervisor Relationship

Of the 60 graduate students who approached the Office of the Ombudsperson in 2018, 30 had issues broadly categorized as “Supervisory Concerns”. The concerns of 16 of these students involved intellectual property (IP) issues. IP issues can seriously impact the student-supervisor relationship, and in at least 6 cases familiar to me, the failure to successfully resolve IP concerns resulted in ruptures so severe that the supervisory relationships ended. Students terminate their studies prior to earning a degree for a wide variety of reasons, but when their departure is the outcome of a student-supervisor conflict, SFU should be interested in finding out what went wrong and what measures might prevent similar outcomes in the future. In IP-related cases, I believe there is much that SFU can do to reduce tensions.

The need for change is urgent. Real damage occurs when student-supervisory relationships are not successful, and the power imbalances are such that the negative impacts are generally borne by the students. Even one case in which IP issues have not been handled responsibly is detrimental to the University’s reputation, and the accumulation of such cases emphasizes the need for immediate action. SFU has several policies that speak to IP, including the Intellectual Property policies (R. 30 series), the Research Personnel policies (R. 50 series), and the Integrity in Research and Misconduct in Research Policy (R. 60.01). While these policies provide some guidance, the rules and regulations that surround IP often depend on the specifics of the individual’s circumstances and factors such as the conventions of the field of study, the way the research is being funded, and the practice of the supervisor. Further, as noted on the SFU Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Research website, “The question which is most likely to cause difficulty is the calculation of the degrees of “ownership” held by the student and by the supervisor(s) who are involved in the research. There are no University regulations governing this area and research contracts normally do not differentiate among the University researchers as to which of them retain the rights not claimed by the sponsoring agency.” In short, early, frequent, and clear communication are essential to maintaining productive relationships where IP is involved.
The ambiguity and lack of specificity inherent in IP policies and practices can lead to confusion, and when clarity is not available, can undermine trust. While the details of the concerns of the students who came to the Office of the Ombudsperson in 2018 differed, the students all expressed frustration with the difficulty in finding information about their rights and accepted practice regarding intellectual property, and in the limited options available to them should they wish to explore their concerns further.

Typical examples of the types of situations that students have experienced include:

- A student is asked to sign an IP agreement by their supervisor and some of the terms of the agreement are confusing to the student. The student asks for clarification and is told the supervisor’s lawyer drafted the agreement. The student feels pressured to sign the agreement without further review or discussion.

- A student has an idea and shares it with their supervisor. The supervisor publishes an article based on this idea and assigns another graduate student to do further work on the idea. The student is upset that they have not been involved in the work or credited in any way. The student attempts to discuss the subject with their supervisor, and later the Graduate Chair. The supervisor refuses to continue working with the student saying that their questioning has damaged the relationship beyond repair.

- A supervisor tells a student that their name will be included on a patent arising from a joint project. The student later learns that the patent does not include the student’s name. The student asks the supervisor, who says that they received advice not to include the student. The supervisor indicates that they are not willing to discuss the matter further. The student consults with other members of their supervisory committee, who indicate that they do not believe the supervisor’s actions are appropriate but encourage the student to focus on completing their degree.
I am in no position to judge the merit of the students’ claims, nor is it my role to develop University policy (although I provide feedback when consulted). I am concerned about an institutional culture in which there is scarce information about IP available and seemingly limited institutional interest in discussing the issue. I consider the lack of information and open discussion around IP a fairness issue. In order to meaningfully participate in the academic community students must be able to access information and resources that assist them in understanding their rights and responsibilities.

While IP questions have come from students studying in all faculties, I note that the complexity of the issues are often increased when the student is studying or working in an environment where commercial interests (either the possibility of commercializing the research or the involvement of external funders) are also involved. The highest volume of IP issues brought to the Office of the Ombudsperson originate in the Faculty of Applied Science, followed by the Faculty of Science.

The Office of the Ombudsperson can assist students with exploring their options and can coach students about how to have difficult conversations, but often the students are seeking specific information: What are my rights, how does IP work, and what is acceptable practice? They need to confer with an informed expert on these questions.

The current practice at the University encourages students with IP concerns to discuss them first with their supervisors, and then with the Graduate Chair if the issues remain unresolved. At any stage a student may also consult with the Associate Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. Section 1 of the Procedures portion of R.60.01 encourages informal consultations as a first step for anyone concerned about instances of alleged misconduct and states that “departments are encouraged to establish mechanisms for such informal resolution. It is acknowledged that there may be a power imbalance in the relationship between parties that might prevent this”. I am not aware of any department that has established specific mechanisms around student IP or research misconduct concerns.

Students tell me that they believe that at the Departmental level they are often met with a reluctance to explore the actual content of their concerns, and instead are cautioned about the potential for damage to the student-supervisor relationship if they pursue the matter. At the Faculty level, generally students are informed about the option of submitting a formal allegation via R. 60.01, but again are not always able to engage in a discussion about the actual substance and merit of their concerns. If a student submits a formal allegation under R. 60.01, their supervisory relationship and their progress in their degree is likely to be negatively impacted.
While the Vice-President Research Office may seem an obvious potential resource for students seeking IP information, they do not offer student-facing services. They have also expressed a reluctance to engage with student concerns outside of the formal allegation process as they investigate and rule on the formal allegations and are wary of potential conflicts of interest. On four occasions, SFU faculty or staff have contacted the Office of the Ombudsperson with substantive questions about IP, indicating that they too are unsure where or who to consult on this issue.

Due to the vacuum of information, concerns that might be addressed through education and clarification may instead escalate. As such, my recommendations are geared towards proactively ensuring that both students and faculty at the University have access to information about IP and that the University culture shifts to one of transparency and openness to having a dialogue on IP issues.

I recommend the following changes for consideration by the Vice-President Academic and Provost, and Vice-President Research and International:
RECOMMENDATION 1.A

Create an IP guide for students and staff that discusses at minimum, what is IP, SFU IP policies, Canadian IP laws, how IP rights are determined generally, how IP rights are determined when a student is also an employee, how IP rights are determined when a student is supported by external funding, how IP rights are determined when work is created with a supervisor as part of a joint research group, and how joint authorship or joint inventorship is determined. Make this information widely available and consider offering multiple opportunities annually for workshops/consultations on these issues. In addition, develop discipline-specific resources that identify the general standards and practices of particular fields.

RECOMMENDATION 1.B

Develop a training program for faculty, especially those holding Chair positions, about how to respond to inquiries about IP issues and dispute resolution skills. Support Departments to establish mechanisms for informal resolution of IP and research misconduct concerns by developing a model step-by-step process that applies university-wide, which departments can supplement. Develop intermediary options (such as mediation) between the informal consultation/resolution and formal allegation stages.

RECOMMENDATION 1.C

Provide standardized templates and guidelines for IP agreements and strengthen protocols around these agreements (i.e. give students time to review and consult before signing agreements, maintain records, ensure students receive copies of agreements).

RECOMMENDATION 1.D

Ensure students and faculty have access to an advisor with expertise on IP issues to provide guidance when questions arise. The advisor role should be structured to position the advisor as an independent and impartial source of information.

RECOMMENDATION 1.E

Establish a working group to review these recommendations and propose other improvements to IP policies, procedures and practices at SFU. Establish a timeline and report back to the University community at three-month intervals.
I note that the University Library’s Copyright Office and the Vice-President Research Office contain a wealth of expertise that will enable them to contribute advice, existing resources and training, and create new materials and tools to address these recommendations.

Following receipt of these recommendations, Dr. Wade Parkhouse, Associate Vice-President, Academic and Dr. Joy Johnson, Vice-President Research and International, provided the following response:
Dear Ms. Reid,

Thank you for sharing the 2018 Office of the Ombudsperson Annual Report. We have reviewed the report and share the concerns and recommendations that you have outlined. We recognize the ambiguity and lack of specific training and support materials for students and faculty related to IP, co-authorship, and supervisory relationships can lead to confusion. We are in the midst of clarifying policies and developing procedures to advance best practices in graduate supervision and the student-supervisory relationship. Led by the Provost’s office, this work includes the following components:

1. A document outlining an understanding of the purpose, duties, and expectations of the supervisory committee including its composition, roles of supervisors and committee members, when it should be formed and how often it should meet, and how progress and decisions should be documented.

2. A document that guides options for students and their supervisory committee to get clear understanding how publications, conference presentations, IP, and related matters are handled, and a process that ensures that students and their supervisor enter into a clearly defined relationship on these matters at the beginning of graduate studies.

3. A document that clearly articulates alternative ways to achieve dispute resolution should disagreements arise between the student and the supervisor/supervisory committee.

4. Training procedures and processes for graduate program chairs, graduate program assistants, supervisor, and students in regard to supervisory matters.

In addition, under the leadership of the VPRI, we are moving forward with a review of SFU’s IP policy and are developing templates and training materials for the SFU research community regarding how to protect and gain value from intellectual property.

In your report you indicate that a significant number of IP issues arise specifically in two faculties. As such, we have initiated two independent sets of consultations within the School of Mechatronic Systems Engineering: one with graduate students and one with faculty. The goal of these consultations is to better understand the different perspectives on these matters to inform the development of the materials and specific training procedures. A timeline for this work has been established, and we plan to pilot test materials with the School of Mechatronic Systems Engineering this fall. Once piloted, programming will roll out across the university.

Sincerely,

Wade Parkhouse, PhD
Associate Vice-President, Academic

Joy Johnson, PhD, FCAHS
Vice-President, Research and International
Progress Made on 2017 Recommendations

The 2017 Office of the Ombudsperson Annual Report focused on three fairness issues at SFU and made recommendations to the responsible offices. Each office named in the recommendations was contacted in July 2019 and asked to provide an update on the implementation of the recommendations.
ISSUE 1
RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS TO APPEALS PROCESSES

I recommend the following changes for consideration by the Registrar and Executive Director Enrollment Management:

RECOMMENDATION 1.A

Review the admissions appeal, tuition and fee refund appeal and professional program waiver and appeal processes to ensure that adequate information is available to students regarding:

1. Who to contact with questions about the appeal process and who will make the decision;
2. The grounds for appeal;
3. What supporting documentation a student must submit with their appeal;
4. The deadlines and timeline for the appeal;
5. The relevant factors the decision maker will consider when deciding the appeal; and
6. Whether a decision is final or may be appealed.

RECOMMENDATION 1.B

Consider establishing a general standard of service for responding to student inquiries and appeals and publish those standards. Pro-actively inform students of issues that arise that cause delay beyond the established guideline for response times, and in doing so provide a revised anticipated response time. I request that the Registrar inform the Office of the Ombudsperson of any actions that are taken or changes that are implemented regarding the appeals processes. This will allow me to better advise students and ensure that I am providing accurate information.

Dear Ms. Reid,

Thank you for reconnecting to follow up on these recommendations. As the Registrar noted in her original response, admissions appeals and tuition and fee refund appeals had been internally identified as requiring a review as well, and your recommendations have played an important role as that work has progressed.

With respect to admissions appeals, Kathryn Verkerk, Associate Registrar for Recruitment & Admissions, reviewed your recommendations upon starting her role and oversaw a revamp of the admission appeals website to ensure the information students require was present and clear. Service and response standards were also reviewed, and the information published online.

For tuition and fee refund appeals, a number of changes have been put in place. We have recently overhauled the website, providing students with more information as per the recommendations. Moreover, service and response time standards were reviewed, committee membership was expanded to include (among others) a student voice, and a centralized contact point created for inquiries.

We believe these steps have been positive in helping provide better service and clarity to students, but recognize that the work is never complete. Over the next year, we will continue to monitor how the changes are working and will be making further changes accordingly. As always, we welcome the Office of Ombudsperson’s continued recommendations on this topic, as well.

Best,

Steve Birnie
Associate Registrar, Information, Records & Registration Services
I recommend the following changes for consideration by the Vice-President, Academic and Provost and the Vice-Provost, Students & International:

RECOMMENDATION 2.A

1. Produce general guidelines to inform students how to request extensions and deferrals for an anticipated missed academic deadline/missed exam.
2. Make the guidelines easily accessible to students online by publishing them on the Student Services website where they are easy to find.
3. Advertise the availability of this resource.
4. Direct students to consult relevant sources of information in course outlines.
5. Identify potential relevant deadlines related to a deferral request.

RECOMMENDATION 2.B

Provide guidelines or training to instructors about fairness considerations when exercising discretionary decision-making

I received the following progress report from Rummana Khan Hemani, Vice-Provost, Students & International pro-tem and Registrar.
Dear Ms. Reid,

Student Services recognizes that there is potential for improvement in the consistency of practice and communication regarding extensions and deferrals for illness and other related issues. We share the concerns articulated in the Office of the Ombudsperson Annual Report and we concur that some recommendations may help address this complex, multi-pronged communications, education, and policy problem. While a uniform policy could create consistency in process, we are concerned that the diverse needs of the many departments involved may make such a recommendation an unrealistic goal. We remain committed to working in partnership with our colleagues from across the Vice President, Academic & Provost’s portfolio to address this systemic issue.

Student Services has made efforts to address elements of this issue for which we are responsible. A great deal of work has been done to consider how we might evolve our approach to communicating with students to be more proactive and personalized in nature. The Student Experience Initiative is currently reviewing University policies that are seen to negatively impact the student experience. Since publishing their webpage on sick notes, Health & Counselling Services has seen a steady increase in site visits. Additionally, the Withdrawal under Extenuating Circumstances (WE) website was revamped over the course of this past academic year.

As mentioned, we remain committed to exploring this complicated issue further and will continue to provide updates to the Office of the Ombudsperson as progress is made.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Rummana Khan Hemani
Vice-Provost, Students & International pro-tem and Registrar
ISSUE 3
RECOMMENDED WAYS TO IMPROVE GRADUATE STUDENT/SUPERVISOR RELATIONSHIPS

I recommend the following changes for consideration by the Dean & Associate Provost Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies:

RECOMMENDATION 3.A

Develop more outreach programming (FAQs, workshops, handouts, etc.) to inform students about supervisory relationships, their rights, and relevant policies, processes and practices.

RECOMMENDATION 3.B

Develop oversight and accountability mechanisms to ensure adherence to the Graduate General Regulations.

RECOMMENDATION 3.C

Develop a communications plan to disseminate information about the Graduate General Regulations and supervision best practices to faculty and academic administrators on a regular and continuing basis. I request that the Dean & Associate Provost Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies inform the Office of the Ombudsperson of any actions that are taken or changes that are implemented regarding graduate student supervision. This will allow me to better advise students and ensure that I am providing accurate information.

I received the following progress report from Dr. Jeff Derksen, Dean of Graduate and Post-Doctoral Studies and Associate Provost

Dear Ombudsperson,

Thank you for the recommendations that you have detailed in your annual report. A close and productive working relationship with your office is vital to our work in the Office of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies as it ensures a fair and just mission that is vital to graduate studies and postdoctoral research.

Over the last year we have been redeveloping our approach to graduate supervision and the mechanisms that we use for oversight and training. In this time, we have made strong realignments that have built more complete oversight. This has been achieved through initiating regular consultations with the Graduate Student Society (GSS) Advocate, through the communication of the importance of supervisory relations to Graduate Program Chairs, and by emphasizing the role of supervisory relations to Deans and Associate Deans involved in the graduate enterprise. At another scale, and one that has proven to be effective, we have worked hard to shape a culture of openness and respect that allows graduate students to come to our office if they have concerns or questions. These aspects have led us to work up from students through to the Provost’s office in bringing the supervisory relationship into a clearer focus; this, in turn, has led to greater accountability for supervisory relations within faculties and departments. We do recognize that there needs to be continuous work on this front, however.
Through the Supervision for the 21st Century Committee of the Student Experience Initiative (SEI), we held several meetings of the working group (comprised largely of graduate students from across faculties); these meetings gave us a candid view of what graduate students expect today from their supervisory relationship and what areas they feel are antiquated, irrelevant, or under-developed. The outcome of these meetings, and of the research of Melissa MacGregor (our committee Research Assistant), will be a new handbook and guide for supervision, taking into account the shape of graduate supervision for the conditions of the 21st century. This handbook will be key in informing graduate students of the relevant policies, processes, and practices of supervision and in guiding faculty members toward exemplar supervisory practices themselves. Likewise, through the SEI, we have collaborated with Health and Counselling in Dr. Susan Brook’s “Dissertation and Thesis Support Group”, which provides group counseling and advice for graduate students in the sometimes isolating phase of their thesis production. Our Indigenous Graduate Co-ordinator, Denver Lynxleg, has met with Indigenous Graduate students to hear their experiences in terms of supervision and access to culturally specific resources; this has led to greater options and cultural knowledge in the planning and shape on thesis defences for Indigenous graduate students.

As our policies and procedures are attentive to actually existing practices, we do post policy changes on our website and we plan on mounting a social media process that will highlight specific policies for graduate students. We have also been in consultation with the GSS in developing their rights and services for graduate students handout which will be distributed at graduate orientation this year; this “Know Your Rights” sheet can be expanded into a campaign in concert with our office. Lastly, our office, will inform you via email of any policy changes related to graduate students once they are approved by the Senate Graduate Studies Committee.

Sincerely,

Jeff Derksen
Dean of Graduate and Post-Doctoral Studies
and Associate Provost
Event Participation and Professional Development

- Participated in undergraduate and graduate student orientation events in September 2018
- Attended ACCUO BC Regional meeting in July 2018
- Attended and presented at California Caucus of University and College Ombuds in November 2018
- Delivered various presentations to faculty and administrative offices/service units on the function and role of the Office of the Ombudsperson from January – December 2018
- Facilitated “Managing Up: The Student-Supervisor Relationship” workshop each term as part of Thesis Bootcamp programming
- Completed Justice Institute of British Columbia courses towards the Certificate in Conflict Resolution: Specialization in Mediation/Third-Party Intervention
- Joined the Planning Committee for the California Caucus of University and College Ombuds
- Joined the Executive of the ACCUO as the Western Region Representative
Thank You

The Office of the Ombudsperson is reliant on a University community that is willing to engage in discussions about the principles of fairness and their application at SFU. The following individuals have helped to sustain and support this dialogue:

Ian Forsyth, University Secretary
Dr. Tim Rahilly and Nancy Johnson (acting), Associate Vice-President Students & International
Dr. Jeff Derksen, Dean & Associate Provost Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies
Dr. George Agnes, Associate Dean Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies
Rummana Khan Hemani, Registrar and Executive Director Enrollment Management
Tina Edmundson, Administrative Coordinator Student Services
Marcia Guno, Director, Indigenous Student Centre
Dr. Mitchell Stoddard, Director of the Centre for Accessible Learning
Martin Mroz, Director of Health and Counselling
Heather Roberts, Academic Integrity and Student Conduct Officer
Marie Brunelle, Human Rights Office
Roya Ghorab, Confidential Administrative Professional, Human Rights Office
Erin Biddlecombe, Director of Operations, Planning, Projects for the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students & International
Harjap Grewal, Graduate Student Society Advocate
Concetta di Francesco and Haleh Pashaei, Manager and Acting Manager, Student Academic Appeals
Samer Rihani, Acting President of the Simon Fraser Student Society
Martin Wyant, Chief Executive Officer, Simon Fraser Student Society
Chantal Turpin, Director of University Relations, The Graduate Student Society
Pierre Cenerelli, Executive Director, Graduate Student Society
The members of the Ombuds Advisory Committee

I am also indebted to the support I received from colleagues in the Association of Canadian College and University Ombuds (ACCUO). The vibrancy of our discussions and the integrity with which they operate as Ombuds is truly inspiring. It is a group of gracious, kind, and wise individuals, and I am lucky to be a part of their community.