1. Approval of the Agenda

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of January 6, 2020

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

4. Report of the Chair

5. Question Period *

6. Reports of Committees

   A) Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP)
      i) External Review of the Department of Archaeology S.20-17
      ii) External Review Mid-Cycle Report for the Department of Chemistry S.20-18 (For Information)

   B) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUS)
      i) Program Changes (For Information) S.20-19
      ii) New Course Proposals (For Information) S.20-20
      iii) Course Changes (For Information) S.20-21

   C) Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)
      i) Program Changes (For Information) S.20-22
      ii) New Course Proposals (For Information) S.20-23
      iii) Course Changes (For Information) S.20-24
      iv) Annual Report 2019 (For Information) S.20-25

   D) Senate Nominating Committee (SNC)
      i) Senate Committee Elections (For Information) S.20-26

7. Other Business
   i) Proposed Board Policy on University Policies (For Information) S.20-27

8. Information
   i) Date of the next regular meeting – Monday, March 2, 2020
Agenda items and papers for the March meeting will be required by the Secretary at noon on Thursday, February 13, 2020. Submissions may be emailed to senate@sfu.ca, but must be followed up by a signed paper submission. These items will be considered by the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules on Tuesday, February 18, 2020 with Senate distribution on Friday, February 21, 2020.

The Senate agenda and papers for this meeting are available on the Senate website at http://www.sfu.ca/senate/agenda.html.

Detailed curriculum papers can be found on Docushare at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682

Kris Nordgren
Assistant Registrar, Senate & Academic Services
Secretary of Senate pro tem

*Questions should be submitted in writing to Kris Nordgren (email kdn1@sfu.ca) with “Senate Question” in the subject line by Wednesday, January 29th at 9:00 am.
MEMORANDUM

```
ATTENTION: Senate

FROM: Jon Driver, Vice-President, Academic and Provost *pro tem*, and Chair, SCUP

RE: External Review of the Department of Archaeology (SCUP 20-01)

DATE: January 10, 2020

At its January 8, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed and approved the Action Plan for the Department of Archaeology that resulted from its External Review.

The Educational Goals Assessment Plan was reviewed and is attached for the information of Senate.

Motion:

That Senate approve the Action Plan for the Department of Archaeology that resulted from its External Review.

C:
G. Nicholas
N. Krogman
```
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Jon Driver, Chair, SCUP
FROM: Wade Parkhouse, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic
RE: Faculty of Environment: External Review of the Department of Archaeology

DATE: December 11, 2019
PAGES: 1/1

Attached are the External Review Report and the Action Plan for the Department of Archaeology. The Educational Goals Assessment Plan is included, for information only, with the Action Plan.

Excerpt from the External Review Report:
"...we found the Department to have a highly collegial work place and positive student interactions... we can affirm that the Department has outstanding research programs conducted by internationally recognized faculty members with tremendous grant funding acumen and publication results... the Department has led the way nationally and internationally in community engagement, particularly with indigenous communities, and in areas such as its Heritage Resource Management M.A. program.”

Following the site visit, the Report of the External Review Committee* for the Department of Archaeology was submitted in April 2019. The Reviewers made a number of recommendations based on the Terms of Reference that were provided to them. Subsequently, a meeting was held with the Dean of the Faculty of Environment, the Chair of the Department of Archaeology and the Director of Academic Planning and Quality Assurance (VPA) to consider the recommendations. An Action Plan was prepared taking into consideration the discussion at the meeting and the External Review Report. The Action Plan has been endorsed by the Department and the Dean.

Motion:

That SCUP approve and recommend to Senate the Action Plan for the Department of Archaeology that resulted from its external review.

*External Review Team:
John W. Ivcs, University of Alberta (Chair of External Review Committee)
M. Anne Katzenberg, University of Calgary
David Killick, University of Arizona
John Craig (internal), Simon Fraser University

Attachments:
2. Department of Archaeology Action Plan
3. Department of Archaeology Educational Goals Assessment Plan

cc Naomi Krogman, Dean, Faculty of Environment
George Nicholas, Chair, Department of Archaeology
External Review, Department of Archaeology, Simon Fraser University

Conducted March 13-14, 2019, Simon Fraser University

John W. Ives (Chair, External Review Committee)
Executive Director, Institute of Prairie Archaeology
Professor, Department of Anthropology
University of Alberta

M. Anne Katzenberg
Professor, Department of Anthropology and Archaeology
University of Calgary

David Killick
Professor, School of Anthropology
University of Arizona

Submitted April 30, 2019 to the
Office of the Vice-President, Academic
Simon Fraser University
3100 Strand Hall
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6
Executive Summary

At the request of Dr. Glynn Nicholls, Director, Academic Planning and Quality Assurance, Simon Fraser University, and ably assisted by Dr. John Craig, Department of History, Simon Fraser University, the External Review Committee conducted March 13 and 14 interviews with the Chair and faculty members (including Canada Research Chairs), administrative, Museum and laboratory staff members, undergraduate and graduate student representatives and senior administration officials including the Dean, Faculty of Environment, the Associate VP Research, and the Dean, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. We toured laboratory and Museum facilities, and enjoyed student research demonstrations in some of the labs. Both the undergraduate and graduate student presentations we received were made in a highly professional manner. The Committee was provided beforehand with a carefully prepared self-study document, with great attention to detail, for which we thank the Department members.

Seven years after the last external review, we found the Department to have a highly collegial workplace and positive student interactions. As reflected accurately in the most recent QS rankings of archaeology programs, in which Simon Fraser's Department of Archaeology rose to 27th in the world, we can affirm that the Department has outstanding research programs conducted by internationally recognized faculty members with tremendous grant funding acumen and publication results. Consistent with Simon Fraser University's credo, the Department has led the way nationally and internationally in community engagement, particularly with indigenous communities, and in areas such as its Heritage Resource Management M.A. program.

Perhaps borne of the exigencies of a field discipline (and in many ways to its great credit), the ethos of the Department has been to avoid complaining about challenges, and to proceed independently in effecting solutions. This sometimes works to the detriment of the Department in that there may be hesitation in asking for assistance in meeting reasonable needs. The External Review Committee agrees that the two issues of specific interest identified in the Terms of Reference—adequacy of Museum, technical and administrative staff in meeting current and projected needs as well as faculty renewal planning relative to the Department's demographic profile—are the prime challenges to its continued success.

The Department has administrative, laboratory and Museum shortfalls that should be the subject of specific, reasonable and prioritized staffing and modest funding requests to alleviate stresses created by burgeoning workloads and multiple roles with which individual staff members contend. It is important that the Department develop succession planning now for the several Faculty members likely to retire in the next three to five years. Undergraduate and graduate students had understandable course and teaching experience concerns, some of which can be addressed by the staffing measures given above, and others of which can be resolved through dialogue and procedural changes. Implementing those measures will provide a continuing, bright future for the Department of Archaeology.
1.0 Quality of Department of Archaeology Programs

1.1 Undergraduate

The undergraduates with which we met made an excellent presentation and were conversant with issues affecting the program. There is the adage that in volunteer settings, it is really only ten percent of those volunteering who participate in highly active ways; it was clear that the group of students with which we spoke were among those significantly engaged in departmental activities, and there was a high degree of satisfaction with the Department.

Two specific issues were clear, and they are related to administrative staffing level shortfalls. There does not seem to be a reliable 24 month schedule by which students can determine which courses will be on offer—some of them a degree requirement. Both undergraduates and lecturers were aware of first through fourth year student number requirements for courses, but had uncertainty about who exactly determines when a course will not be offered because of low enrollment. Greater clarity around course cancellation would be helpful, especially with regard to required degree courses. The Department should develop a means to forecast course offerings over a rolling two year period for undergraduate students. The Department is aware of solutions to these challenges, as given at p. 428, appendix PP. The less than halftime position devoted to an undergraduate adviser is insufficient; the undergraduates we spoke with indicated that it was at times difficult to schedule advising sessions. Staffing to a full position level would allow direct attention to these specific matters.

With respect to mandatory enrollment levels for first through fourth year courses, undergraduates are aware of the trade-off that exists between sufficient enrollment versus the experiential learning that takes place in smaller course enrollments, and concerned about what can seem arbitrary decisions about whether a course would be offered not. Undergraduates were receptive to more active use of tutorials (rather than exclusively lecture presentations), as discussed below with regard to graduate students views on acquiring teaching experience.

Undergraduate enrollments generally in North America are declining in a number of programs because of underlying factors that are not unique to any institution. There are two factors that are more directly related to the Department of Archaeology. The Faculty of Arts is larger, and therefore created a greater pool of potential majors from which to draw in years past. This is one consequence of the shift to the Faculty of Environment, and can in part be construed as a growing pain. Undergraduates felt that the Faculty of Environment office staff were not as knowledgeable about archaeology program requirements, which may be detrimental when students from other faculties enquire. The second factor that arose in discussions with undergraduates, lecturers and faculty members was that of direct admission. At the high school level, archaeology is not necessarily perceived as a viable career choice. Both secondary students and their parents may hold this view, without any exposure to coursework, or sufficient knowledge of actual employment prospects. This limitation is not readily counteracted, the best option seeming to be a tactical approach to outreach activities armed with indications of student satisfaction and empirical information on employment successes. Dean Ingrid Stefanovic indicated that a new hire would be working on outreach recruitment activities; it would be helpful if the Department of Archaeology could be a key player in that initiative. The visibility measures outlined at p. 427 in Appendix PP are well worth exploring, with Faculty of Environment assistance. Student (and staff) engagement with the Palaeo-Olympics certainly is a good recruitment tool.
Undergraduates themselves did not raise the subject of whether a B.Sc. or B.A. option would be useful, and the faculty comment on that topic seemed neutral: it is true that CRM employers are more directly concerned about another order of skill sets (word processing, database management and similar needs).

1.2 Graduate

Like the undergraduates, the Graduate Caucus members made a concise and highly professional presentation to the external review committee, affirming a positive view of the Department's graduate program. Students are pleased with supervisors and value the interaction they have with their peers. They did voice specific concerns in the three areas also outlined in the self-study report, concerning teaching experience, professional development and funding transparency. They are naturally concerned about a lack of employment opportunities, and indicated that the Department had not produced a tenure track appointment in North America for its Ph.D. graduates since 2009. This is no doubt a reflection of a relatively tight academic job market, but also must be squared with the reality that more than 80% of those with archaeological degrees find employment in private or public sector settings outside of academia.

The specific concerns surrounding teaching were that teaching assistant positions were essentially about marking, rather than hands-on teaching assignments. Students were supportive of a conceptual shift in which some class time would be given over to teaching assistant led tutorials where face-to-face time with undergraduates would accomplish two things: it would provide active teaching experience, and, as the discussion progressed, was thought to promote the kind of engagement that leads to a greater degree of undergraduate recruitment. This approach was endorsed in our meeting with lecturers, assistant and associate professors.

There does seem to be uncertainty regarding the role of lecturers, governed by union agreements, and graduate student teaching opportunities. While lecturers do have specified rights surrounding course offerings, both the graduate students and the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral studies indicated that departments have discretionary power to set aside a proportion of sessional teaching assignments for graduate students. The external committee is certainly aware of the sensitive dynamic that exists for who makes course offerings, how graduate students can acquire teaching experience, and recruitment success based on the quality of overall course experiences. A shift to more teaching assistant engagement in tutorial settings and a re-examination of the extent to which graduate students could teach some sessional courses, within defined labour relations parameters, could go some distance in meeting graduate students concerns in this regard.

The concerns about teaching experience were related to more general discussions of professional development. The graduate students felt that Faculty of Environment driven workshops were too general in character, and would welcome departmental faculty members offering more workshops in grant writing, SSHRC applications, and conference presentations. Students were appreciative of the conference travel and support that is provided. Like the undergraduates, the Museum emerged as a greatly appreciated skill-generator with direct career employment prospects. A greater degree of research assistantship funding in this connection, for the Museum, would certainly be welcomed by graduate students, and would aid the Museum situation.
Students explicitly requested a greater degree of transparency for offer letters at the time of acceptance to the graduate program. They found current letters to be too general in character, and wanted clear funding details, timelines and indications of other grants and opportunities that might be available. The committee does of course have access to offer letters, but it would seem normal for students to know the exact level of financial support and its timelines from an offer letter, along with some stipulations of subsequent scholarship or bursary opportunities for which they would either be eligible or (as at some institutions) required to apply for in the course of their graduate tenure. They acknowledge that shortfalls in administrative staffing levels have an impact on communication and there was strong student willingness to engage in dialogue in determining who should be responsible for pursuing these opportunities.

The students with which we spoke were not aware of degree completion scholarships. In terms of times to completion for degrees, graduate degrees in archaeology and anthropology frequently take longer to complete because of the time consuming nature of the research; this is especially true in the many areas where it is important to build a relationship of trust with First Nations communities. The somewhat longer timelines for both graduate degrees are not at all unusual in a North American context.

In sum, graduate students enjoy the Department's collegial atmosphere, access to internationally prominent researchers, and advanced laboratory settings. There has been some interruption of continuity regarding the graduate chair role, but students are optimistic about working with Dr. Driver and Dr. Lepofsky over the next three years. The specific issues they raise are approachable, and there is a genuine willingness to engage in dialogue about them.

1.3 Heritage Resource Management (HRM) M.A. Program

Simon Fraser's development of this program showed great foresight, for which the Department is very much to be commended. It provides broader contextual training in heritage management in an accessible way for those already engaged in an archaeological resource management career, and it addresses a practical matter arising from unevenness in provincial and territorial archaeological heritage legislation across Canada. Different legislative provisions, ranging from the effect of the Natural Resources Transfer Act for the prairie provinces to heritage legislation developed in different time frames by other provinces, have meant that there are varying educational thresholds for those who can hold an archaeological permit. Alberta, for example, required a thesis M.A. with prescribed amounts of field experience, a model that Saskatchewan and then Newfoundland emulated. British Columbia, with its earlier generation of legislation, required only a Bachelor's degree. The SFU HRM model, providing both context and the requirement of a thesis M.A., has the notable advantage of allowing British Columbia-based consulting archaeologists to acquire an M.A. and to become permit holders in jurisdictions where that is a requirement. This is a factor for British Columbia and Alberta, for instance, in regions such as northeastern B.C. and northwestern Alberta, where natural gas developments frequently span the provincial border. Archaeologists with the capacity to hold permits are pivotal in the business of archaeological resource management. The SFU HRM program therefore met key graduate training needs and resolved a critical business factor (one that had arisen in interprovincial discussions in the past).

While private sector positions in archaeological heritage management in fact dominate part- or full-time employment prospects, there are likely a finite number of practising consultants (and supportive
employers) who would take the step of entering the existing SFU program. There is the distinct possibility that declining HRM enrollment numbers might reflect a certain degree of "market saturation," with 22 students from the first two cohorts in process. The self-study report indicated that as of January 2019, there were seven additional applicants, after the cancellation of the 2018/19 HRM offering, with some optimism that a 2019/2020 cohort could go forward. It could be that British Columbia is reaching a point where the pool of potential applicants is becoming circumscribed, for which there is no simple remedy.

Like other leading edge programs, this is also not a straightforward area in which to be working. Unlike other professional disciplines in Canada, there is little tangible agenda for career upgrading or advancement connected with being a professional archaeologist. There have at times been discussions with organizations (such as the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists in Alberta) for various forms of accreditation and ongoing education beyond the initial archaeological degree, but nothing has ever come to fruition. It will be difficult for one or a few institutions, professional organizations, or regulatory agencies to turn the tide in a constructive direction, particularly with what might be regarded as an "anti-regulatory" tendency dominating provincial politics across the nation at this particular moment.

Simon Fraser would nevertheless be well-positioned to be a leader in promoting a change in perspective, although to be truthful, dividends in enrollment from a broader spectrum of applicants might not be forthcoming in the short to moderate term. One thing the Department might consider would be to request attendance for a presentation at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association of Provincial and Territorial Archaeologists (held immediately prior to the Canadian Archaeological Association meetings, and slated for Edmonton next year), both to raise visibility of the program and its goals with regulators, and to shift the landscape with regard to professional upgrading in this country. Most provincial jurisdictions have associations of consulting archaeologists, from which member applicants would come. In-person contact with those organizations might be productive at the national level (or at least for western Canada). There also can be regular meetings between consulting archaeologists and provincial regulatory offices, at which a direct presentation might be effective. Annual meetings of state archaeologists preceding the Society for American Archaeology conference could provide a similar forum in the U.S.; there is also the Registry of Professional Archaeologists in that country, creating a somewhat different climate for the HRM initiative SFU has. In terms of broader North American reach, it might be worthwhile to request an opportunity to address such a meeting (the next one to be held in Austin, Texas).

Because so much of British Columbia has not been subject to treaties, or has been the subject of modern day treaties that explicitly address heritage matters from an indigenous perspective, the province is in a unique position with respect to post-Truth and Reconciliation activities. A genuinely important avenue that might be pursued for the SFU HRM program would be to work with First Nations communities or groups of First Nations communities to foster both undergraduate (HRM certificate) and HRM M.A. enrollment that would produce well qualified students who could then return to their communities to work in archaeological resource management capacities. There is no doubt that this would also be a long term initiative affecting enrollment, but it is one that should be considered in evaluating the sustainability of the HRM graduate degree program. We were not able to speak with Drs. Yellowhorn or Reimer during the review process, and it would interesting to know their views on the likelihood of successfully pursuing such a strategy.
Despite the challenges, we would encourage the Department and the Faculty of Environment to take a longer view of its importance and sustainability.

2.0 Quality of Faculty Research

The quality of faculty research in the Department of Archaeology is outstanding. Throughout the ranks, faculty members are fully engaged in research activities including success in attracting external funding, publishing in high quality journals and training graduate students. The Department has two tier 1 CRC's, both of whom are highly regarded internationally. Dr. Collard (Tier 1 CRC since 2017 following two terms as a Tier 2 CRC) is an honorary research fellow at two prominent U.S. universities and maintains an affiliation with UBC. He is highly regarded for his research into human evolution and cognition. He maintains international collaborations including a large research grant from Australia. He has also made tremendous contributions to graduate training and knowledge translation through numerous media interviews.

Dr. Richards has a truly remarkable research record. He has collaborated and published with a who's who of archaeology and anthropology, pioneering a number of isotopic systems for better understanding paleoecology and paleodiet. He has trained numerous graduate students and post-doctoral fellows who have gone on to prominent positions. He has set up a state-of-the-art isotope facility within the Department. This is unusual because most isotope facilities are centralized on campuses and serve multiple units. Not surprisingly, he has a stellar record of external funding including NSERC, SSHRC, CFI, various European grants and private foundation grants. Dr. Richards is also generous with his time in terms of service to his institution and to his discipline, including numerous media interviews.

Others at the rank of professor are fully engaged as active researchers. Dr. Burley has a long record of successful funding from SSHRC and other external agencies such as the National Geographic Society. He has maintained an active research record with regular publications in high quality journals through his long career, which includes several terms as Head of Department.

Dr. D’Andrea has a very respectable research record with continuous funding from SSHRC, including both Insight Grants and a Partnership Development Grant. Other external awards include the Wenner Gren Foundation and the National Geographic Society. She has served as Department Head and many other service contributions within the institution. She has trained numerous graduate students and provided media interviews to translate her research to the public.

Dr. Driver has maintained an active research record as well as graduate training even while serving as Dean of Graduate Studies for eight years, followed by eight years as Provost. He has an excellent record of service to the institution, First Nations people, and the discipline in addition to his continuous record of funding, both external SSHRC and others, and internal smaller grants.

Dr. Galdikas has an international reputation for her work with orangutans. She continues her affiliations with other institutions but has been less active in scholarly work (grants, graduate training and publications over the last 8 years).

Dr. Lepofsky is a very active and highly innovative scholar with an excellent record of external funding with SSHRC, PDG, NGS, WG, others and outstanding contributions to community outreach and engagement.

Dr. Nicholas has just completed a complex SSHRC partnership grant building upon his extensive work on heritage, cultural resources, indigenous archaeology, DNA and indigenous rights. Successfully
coordinating such major projects is a significant accomplishment and follows a long record of successful funding from SSHRC and other agencies. He has been a very good citizen of his institution and discipline.

Dr. Welch—Professor and Director of the Program in Heritage Resource management is affiliated with White Mt Apache, involved in heritage issues and affiliated with Arizona State Museum. He has attracted funding from numerous sources including the Tri-councils and has held various contracts with companies and nations as well as participating in George Nicholas’ Partnership grant. He was a Tier 2 CRC for two terms (10 years) and has a very impressive record of research.

Dr. Yang also has a remarkable record of research, funding, publications and training. He has many collaborations, has been involved in two partnership grants and has maintained ties with China, benefiting students from Canada and China.

The Department of Archaeology also has an impressive group of early to mid-career scholars who are building their careers, obtaining funding and training graduate students. Dr. Cardoso was recently elected to the College of New Scholars in the Royal Society of Canada. The level of engagement in research is impressive in all ranks with all instructors also publishing regularly and participating in funded research.

Given this level of engagement it is not surprising that the Department compares favorably in terms of external funding within the institution. Table 5.5 of the self-study document indicates comparative data for average research income per faculty member compared to other SFU departments in Social Sciences and Earth Sciences. Archaeology leads all other departments until 2016, when Dr. Nicholson’s SSHRC partnership grant ended; however, Archaeology remains near the top of the list in the last two years.

In comparison with other archaeology units in Canada, SFU is outstanding in terms of research impact. (Figure 5.1 of self-study illustrates the impact as highest among Canadian institutions. It is also noteworthy that (table 5.3) the impact remains very high among the current faculty, indicating that the Department is not riding on previous accomplishments but continuing to make strong contributions in research impact.

The very strong faculty research record is an attraction for graduate students as faculty are receiving funding to help support graduate and post-doctoral research opportunities. All of this feeds back on undergraduate training. The number of awards received by members of faculty is also very impressive. The Department has one member of the Royal Society of Canada (Richards) and one member of the RSC College of New Scholars (Cardoso). Richards and Collard are Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries (London). Equally impressive are the awards from professional organizations and communities (Lepofsky and Driver) and teaching (Nicholas). The level of community-engaged research is a model for others to follow.

SFU can be very proud of the faculty research accomplishments of this Department. It is critical to have strong support personnel to maintain this level of research activity. Both highly trained laboratory technical staff and office staff facilitate faculty research activities and free up time for innovation and graduate training.

3.0 Administration of the Unit
3.1 Administrative and Technical Staff Complements

3.1.1 Administrative Staff

The administrative staff complement consists of 3.4 positions, comprised of a Manager, Chair's Assistant/Graduate Program Assistant, Undergraduate Assistant and Budget Clerk, and Undergraduate Advisor (the 0.4 position). These are hard-working, dedicated staff members, important contributors to the Department's collegial atmosphere and hence its success. Although no one complained to us, it was apparent in interviews and the self-study passages that heavy work volume and multiple roles were seriously taxing administrative services, raising the significant possibility of burnout for key personnel. The unit Manager in particular has roughly a dozen important roles, including the vital matter of office cohesion. The rapid turnover of staff in recent years is a particular matter of concern, as the Manager must train new staff. We were told that the high cost of housing in the area is a major reason why it is difficult to retain staff, and that this is a university-wide problem.

3.1.2 Technical Support Staff

The support staff consists of 2.25 positions—the Laboratory Manager, a full-time technologist, and a quarter-time laboratory technician funded out of Dr. Richard's CRC Chair. This tiny crew has a staggering range of responsibilities. The Manager is responsible for laboratory safety and security in both the Institute for Forensic Research and in all of the archaeology laboratories. She and the two other support staff are responsible for checkout/checkin and maintenance of the Department's vehicles, boats and a wider range of field equipment, including such high-tech items as GPS, surveying equipment and ground-penetrating radar. They are responsible for training students in the use of such equipment, but report that they don't have the time even to learn how to use these technologies. We were very surprised to hear that they are also responsible for all Departmental computers, whether in faculty offices, the administrative offices, and the laboratories. This includes installation and updating of antivirus software and even trouble-shooting and replacement of network hardware (routers, etc.). In our own universities, IT support is centralized at the level of a Faculty (e.g., Faculty of Social Sciences) and at the University of Arizona antivirus software updates are installed remotely. We were told that the Faculty of the Environment has one IT support staffer, but that it can take up to a week for a visit to resolve a reported problem. It was also alarming to hear that the support staff are given no regular training in IT management, and that even if such training was available, they would have no time to attend. Frankly, this sounds like a disaster waiting to happen—the university IT environment is only as strong as its weakest link. Given the kinds of information the Department may hold in connection with forensic cases, Museum collections, and student records, dedicated expertise in this area, whether through additional staffing or a viable centralized service would address a workload issue and hopefully, forestall hacking that would be difficult to explain in the aftermath.

Speaking for both the Administrative and the Technical Staff, there are work volume issues across the board, some of them related to staff turnover and the need for re-training. This is not necessarily a classification problem; rather, we understood that in an earlier era there was a higher ratio of staff to faculty. The staff that talked to us are clearly loyal and dedicated, but we got the definite impression, even if they didn't say so directly that they are worn out by the workload. Rather than allowing for additional fraying of staff morale, this external review committee feels that addressing this deficit is
probably the most urgent priority. The loss of either of the Managers would be a severe blow for the Department—they are each carrying too large a load.

3.2 Facilities

3.2.1 Institute for Forensic Research

The review team viewed the laboratory complex of the Institute for Forensic Research. This is a high quality facility for conducting autopsies on partially decomposed or skeletal remains from forensic contexts and requires a high level of security as well as a careful protocol for containment of biological materials (i.e., cleanliness and sterile procedures). The review team understands that following the retirement of Dr. Skinner, the Centre for Forensic Research was less active and the full time technician retired and was not replaced. With the hiring of Dr. Cardoso, now a director of the Institute, the facility has become more active and provides an opportunity for graduate training (depending on specific cases and need for confidentiality). We understand that although this is a shared facility with Criminology and reporting to the VP, Research, the current technical support comes only from existing laboratory staff in the Department of Archaeology.

Dr. Cardoso has reinvigorated the Institute and he carries a heavy teaching, research and administrative load. Recently inducted into the RSC College of New Scholars, he shows great promise. The current case load is an average of four cases per year. The reference document for the Institute indicates that the university will cover initial costs with an expectation that the Institute will bring in external funding to maintain activities and purchase equipment as it becomes better established. Given the relatively recent turnover in the Institute and the retirement of the full-time technician, the review committee recommends half-time technical support for the Institute for Forensic Research. In addition to supporting the Institute, additional technical support will relieve the Archaeology technical staff, who have taken on this added load following the retirement of the previous full-time technician.

3.2.2 Archaeological Laboratories

One of the most conspicuous changes in the discipline of archaeology since 2000 has been massive growth in the application of scientific techniques to the investigation of archaeological questions. Many Departments of Anthropology in North America have been caught flat-footed by the speed of this incursion, and are either in denial or are scrambling to catch up. The SFU Department of Archaeology, building on the legacy of Erle Nelson (FRSC), has adapted swiftly to this change. Recent hires include two faculty members (Michael Richards and Francesco Berna) with specializations in archaeological science — Dr. Richards in light stable isotopes, and Dr. Berna in studying earliest human control of fire. They have each been provided with first-rate laboratory facilities. The equipment in both laboratories is state-of-the-art, and staffing and space appears adequate.

The Department also has excellent laboratories for more traditional types of archaeological science. There is a well-secured repository for human remains, an area of particular sensitivity at present; these remains are being actively prepared for return to First Nations. The zooarchaeology laboratory has a large comparative collection that is much used by both SFU faculty and students, and by archaeologists working outside the university. This needs more working space, but the faculty and staff using it report no other immediate needs. We did not see the botanical laboratories or the x-ray fluorescence laboratory
of Dr. Reimer. Faculty seem well satisfied with the amount and quality of space available for routine archaeological analysis.

In summary, we are very much impressed by the laboratory facilities in the Department of Archaeology. These do not of course cover the same range of techniques available at larger North American universities that focus on archaeological science, like the University of Arizona or the University of Pennsylvania, but clearly SFU has made smart choices about which areas to invest in. We noted above that the job market in academic archaeology is very tight, but it should also be noted that more than half of advertised tenure-track positions in archaeology for North America over the last three years have indicated a preference for candidates with expertise in some area of archaeological science.

3.2.3 Museum

The Department of Archaeology wholly owns and operates a museum, which performs several functions. It houses archaeological and ethnographic collections that derive from the research of Department of Archaeology faculty, staff and students; it also provides a temporary home for collections of First Nations that lack facilities to house them. There are about 20,000 historic and recent ethnographic artifacts, mostly donated, and a photographic collection of about 135,000 images and movies that document departmental research, but also include donated images of cultures worldwide.

The second function of the Museum is to display some of its collection, both in the single large hall on the lower floor of the Education building, and through the Museum's web site. The third function is to contribute to the Department of Archaeology's teaching mission. The Museum Curator, Dr. Barbara Winter, teaches courses in Archaeological Conservation (ARCH 348-5) and Management of Archaeological Collections (ARCH 349-5). She also provides practical training through unpaid internships—eight at present, and 30 over the last 5 years. The graduate student representatives told us that this training has enabled a number of graduates to find employment in museums throughout Canada, and that they greatly value it.

The student perception of the role of the Museum is evidently at odds with that of the University. The last external review (2012) recommended increased staffing and funding for the Museum, but nothing came of it. A handout provided to us by Dr. Winter states that this same recommendation has been made by each of the last three external review committees, to no effect.

In our opinion the Museum is woefully under-resourced. The display area is not fit for the purpose. The humidity varies wildly, and the fire suppression system looks dodgy, so the cream of the collection—objects in wood and other perishable materials—languishes in the storage rooms where the humidity, at least, is controlled. With an annual budget of only $10,000 (excluding Dr. Winter's salary) the Museum cannot in any case develop new exhibits. The computers run Windows 7, which is no longer supported by Microsoft—and thus is acutely vulnerable to hacking—and the Museum cannot afford the annual license fee for any acceptable inventory management software system or secure backup. Nor is there any space or equipment for the conservation treatments on the collections.

Dr. Winter relies entirely upon volunteered labor in managing the Museum. She reports that she currently has 15 volunteers, each working 3-10 hours a week. She also tells us that she will retire in two years, so there is not much time to find a solution to the problems outlined here. The University should not imagine that it can simply advertise for a replacement—we cannot foresee any competent museum professional being willing to take the position at the current level of support. The Museum should be
given a significant increase in operating funds (with respect to collection safety, paid research assistantships, and sorely needed database accession software) and at least a second staff position. Successful though the Museum has been within the constraints noted above, the University is foregoing many other positive opportunities in not attending to the risks connected with the current situation.

4.0 Work Place Environment and Objectives

Throughout our visit and in this report, the collegial nature of relationships within the Department have been at the forefront. That collegiality is an intangible but genuine element in the Department's success, and is most desirable to sustain. While administrative and technical staff are very much dedicated to their roles, the external review committee was certainly aware of the strain that they are feeling in complex roles that have become reactive more so than proactive. There are the self-study remarks quoted at pages 21 and 22 indicating that administrative staff are overworked, underfunded and at times feel taken for granted. If allowed to continue, this could certainly fray a collegial atmosphere. As discussed below, with respect to issues of specific interest and our concluding recommendations, this is a priority area to address.

As can be readily understood, while excited about and definitely valuing the move into the Faculty of Environment, the Department of Archaeology was the last unit to arrive, and growing pains are to be expected—several of which our recommendations are intended to address. Suffice it to say the Departmental staff members are sensitive to their new position at the institution, and at times will value reassurance as they integrate themselves.

The Department of Archaeology at Simon Fraser has been at the forefront not just of research involving First Nations, but in research in the service of First Nations community interests. The work with Tla'amin First Nation is an excellent example, and the halftime status of Dr. Lepofsky, who was directly involved in that example, will diminish First Nations outreach capacity overall. Relationships with indigenous communities should be considered a priority in faculty succession planning for the future.

Anecdotally, M.A. and Ph.D. graduate students from many years prior to the alumni census information in Appendix HH remain proud of their earlier association with the Department, and in a number of cases are conversant with its work today.

5.0 Future Plans

5.1 Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Quantitative Methods

Our evaluations and recommendations elsewhere in the report do deal with future planning, that we will not repeat here. As yet unmentioned, one theme that emerged in faculty discussions and self-study passages (including Appendix GG, student comments on training priorities), affecting both graduate and undergraduate students, was the desire for more GIS and quantitative methods courses. GIS has emerged as an essential skill for all archaeologists, whether in academic, public archaeology or private sector consulting roles. This is especially true with respect to HRM certificate and M.A. program needs. While GIS training can be sought in other programs, such as Geography, there is nothing quite like both in-house disciplinary expertise and Department-accessible GIS work stations. Given the shortfall in Information Technology (IT) capacity the Department currently has, this should be considered as a priority area for the future. In a Department with a strong science orientation regarding
archaeology, and in this case building on the legacy of the late Jack Nance, it would be equally valuable to cultivate expertise in quantitative methods more generally once again.

6.0 Issues of Specific Interest

6.1 Appropriate Levels of Museum, Technical, and Administrative Staff

Without belaboring points made in other sections of the report and our recommendations below, we conclude that current staffing levels for Museum, technical and administrative staff are not adequate, diminish staff morale, and create challenges for both students and faculty members. That this topic is identified as an issue of specific interest in the terms of reference suggests to us that the current Dean and senior administration are aware of these challenges and receptive to proposals. In some instances, there are potential procedural solutions to difficulties, but in most cases, some additional staffing will be required. Key Museum needs have been identified over multiple cycles of external reviews, and really should be addressed in this cycle. They expose Simon Fraser to two particularly important forms of risk: 1) The current Museum Director might retire within the foreseeable future; without succession planning, this could result in a damaging loss of knowledge, especially given that accessioned collections are necessarily being managed by an ad hoc series of databases, rather than a single, coherent one; 2) The collections are at unwarranted risk to fire or other forms of calamity. Both kinds of risk can and should be ameliorated: the hiring of a full time curatorial assistant would be highly appropriate, and could open new opportunities for the Faculty of Environment and the entire University.

Technical and administrative staffing challenges have been evaluated in earlier sections of the report, but there are important shortfalls there. Rounding out the Undergraduate Advisor position to a full time appointment would be appropriate, as would providing half-time assistance in connection with the forensic lab. In the view of our committee, many of the relatively few, but key challenges the Department faces could be addressed by injecting 1.5 to 2.0 full time positions into the Museum technical and administrative areas described here, coupled with judicial reassignment of more manageable roles.

6.2 Faculty Renewal Plan

The Department’s most recent renewal plan, as described in the self-study (a year old at the time of this writing), assumed a status quo for existing faculty members. It identified as priority hires: 1) A CRM specialist who could aid of the HRM program, potentially serving as half-time director of the Professional MA in HRM program, and 2) Another bioarchaeologist to ensure that the Department can fulfill its teaching obligations for teaching and with respect to the Bioarchaeology Certificate. The needs around the HRM program are critically heightened at this time, we feel, elevating it to the foremost priority. These are both suitable goals. The renewal plan did not address the question of whether the Department should “replace” retirees or seek new directions.

We recommend that succession planning be of equal if not greater importance in the next redrafting of the renewal plan. There is a significant demographic gap between senior faculty members, who have had highly successful research careers (along with active administrative roles) and the most recent hires. While the youngest faculty members most definitely promise a bright future for the Department, they do need the opportunity to establish career paths without being burdened too quickly with administrative responsibilities that could come with roles such as the Chair or Graduate Coordinator.
There was great student and faculty optimism that Dr. Driver had committed to a three year span as the Graduate Program Chair. Nevertheless, there is a strong likelihood that a significant number of retirements could take place within the next three to five years. It is vital therefore, that the Department set a direction for that eventuality, or even for unforeseen developments. That should include agreed upon direction for a replacement strategy, and consideration of external appointments at the Associate rank to bridge that demographic gap.

The tenor of the general discussion amongst faculty members during our first day of deliberations seemed to be toward a “like-replacing-like” strategy. The Department has had an effective Pacific and western North American focus in much of its work. It is always a consideration that an institution heavily funded by a tax-paying public be seen to undertake work with high relevance in its own jurisdiction. A “like-replacing-like” approach (if that is the determination of faculty members) to skill sets and topical areas would serve the Department well, maintaining a mix of international and more specifically western North American interests, commensurate with the Department’s highly ranked disciplinary status.

On the other hand, we were told (by the representatives of the graduate students) that the Department last placed a graduate in a tenure-track academic position in 2009. While 80% of archaeology PhD’s in North America do not obtain tenure-track positions, it is still the case that the reputation of an academic Department rests in part upon the success of its graduates in the academy. The current faculty might want to give some serious consideration to hiring new faculty who could train students in the areas that are in highest demand in the academic job market. The two areas that crop up most frequently in recent advertisements for tenure-track jobs in archaeology are in Collaborative Heritage Management—meaning collaboration with First Nations/Native Americans—and in archaeological science. Both of these areas are likely to remain priority areas for hiring in North America, and SFU has made hires in both of these areas within the last decade. The faculty might want to consider reinforcing these areas rather than replacing on a like-for-like basis.

7.0 Recommendations

Just prior to the visit of the external review committee, QS released its annual review of universities. Four years ago, QS began ranking archaeology programs; all of the factors QS takes into account in such rankings are not immediately apparent, and it would appear that QS evaluates both anthropological and classical archaeological programs at an institution. In the case of the Simon Fraser archaeology program, QS results would be almost wholly attributable to the Department of Archaeology. The Department of Archaeology rose 17 places in the most current QS ranking of archaeology programs, to a position of number 27 in the world, tying the University of Arizona.

While one should be measured in assessing such ranking results, the Department of Archaeology’s global ranking (along with specific metrics such as citations per paper and H-Index citations) is a clear and accurate reflection of the high quality of Simon Fraser’s archaeology program, of which the Department and institution can be justifiably proud—it is, as the current Dean described it, a gem among faculty programs. The key recommendations of the external review committee are therefore geared to sustaining the high quality of the program, with a view to ensuring its long term stability. In that connection, the two issues of specific interest identified for the external review committee,
appropriate levels of museum, technical, and administrative staffing and the faculty renewal plan, are insightful and at the head of our list of recommended strategies.

The Department of Archaeology has staffing needs that should be the subject of specific, prioritized requests to the Faculty of Environment in order to alleviate stresses in office administration, lab and technical support, and faculty areas. We recommend that:

1. The Department address its administrative office staffing shortfall by creating a full time (rather than 0.40) position for an undergraduate advisor for academic counselling, 24-month scheduling of course offerings for undergraduates (including graduate requirement review), targeted recruitment and retention activities, and work volume issues.
2. The Department address its shortfall in lab and technical support by:
   a. Developing a more equitable support strategy with Criminology for shared forensic and autopsy facilities, involving half-time technical support for the Institute for Forensic Research, thereby diminishing the workload for Department of Archaeology staff members;
   b. Developing an Information Technology strategy, whether through Departmental staffing or reliable and timely centralized Faculty or University service, alleviating workload in that area in connection with security, maintenance, and other services.
3. The next draft of the Faculty Renewal Plan place equal priority on succession planning for anticipated senior faculty retirements over the next several years:
   a. Because of the Department's demographic profile, consideration should be given to "infilling" appointments at the Associate Professor level, in concert with an agreed upon strategy, such as "like-for-like" topical and regional subject matters, or, hires in the now prominent areas of collaborative heritage management with an indigenous focus or archaeological science.
   b. There is a need for immediate action with respect to the HRM M.A. program. Continue with plans for an additional HRM specialist and bioarchaeologist, both of which might be hired at an Assistant level, but that might also be considered at the Associate level, as per 3 a.

The Museum is highly valued by students for its capacity to provide volunteer activities and training with real world career prospects, and it has long been identified as an area in need of significant staff and resource support. We recommend that:

4. The Department consider strategies to broaden the Museum’s mandate, and garner a greater degree of institutional support for its role.
   a. If the Department, Faculty of Environment, and University are amenable to a change of perspective, consider funding a strategy study by locally available museum specialists to chart an expanded course for the Museum’s future.
5. The University address immediate and pressing needs the Museum has by:
   a. Providing a much needed curatorial position to the single existing staff member, the Director, with consideration of knowledge transfer and succession planning.
   b. Ensuring acquisition of a comprehensive database management system for existing, accessioned materials.
   c. Installing protective measures, such as sprinkler systems, to prevent catastrophic loss of collections.
d. Creating more funded research assistantships for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Three specific measures would increase graduate student satisfaction with an already successful program. We recommend that:

6. That the Department review its letters of offer for graduate students with a view to providing clarity on the level of and timelines for financial assistance and other opportunities for which students may be eligible.

7. That the Department develop a strategy for making fuller use of discretionary teaching assignments for graduate students.

8. That the Department develop additional in-house workshop settings specific to archaeological career needs.

Finally, the two day format for interviews works reasonably well, and it is true that there are likely few times of a year that will not be busy. Nevertheless, in this case, the post-interview period was rather full with conferences, thesis and dissertation defences, candidacy exams and end-of-term and other commitments for this particular group. Our final recommendation would be to set aside one-half of a third and final day for collective committee outlining and initial drafting of the review document, while the review process is still fresh in participants’ minds.
Appendix 1: Itinerary and Schedule of Meetings, March 13-14
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Dr. Jack Ives, University of Alberta (Chair of External Review Committee)  
Dr. Anne Katzenberg, University of Calgary  
Dr. David Killick, University of Arizona  
Dr. John Craig, Simon Fraser University

---

**Wednesday, March 13, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>Car service from hotel to SFU Burnaby Campus – Drop off at Strand Hall Parking Lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Opening meeting with Senior Administrators: Wade Parkhouse, Associate VP Academic (Chair) Glynn Nicholls, Director, Academic Planning Dugan O’Neil, Associate VP Research Jeff Derksen, Dean, GPS (or designate) Ingrid Stefanovic, Dean, Faculty of Environment</td>
<td>Strand Hall, PCR Room 3187 Continental breakfast served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Walking to Department – George Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>George Nicholas, Chair, Archaeology</td>
<td>EDB 9638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>EDB 9638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Tour: Archaeology Department/Labs, Forensic Centre</td>
<td>Shannon/Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Meet with Lab Manager and Staff</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Meet with Office Manager and Staff</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch with Former Chairs</td>
<td>DAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Meet with Professors</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Meet with CRC Chairs</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Meet with Lecturers, Assistant and Associate Professors</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>EDB 9638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>External Review Committee – Discussion Time</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Ingrid Stefanovic, Dean, Faculty of Environment</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Return to hotel by Car Service – Pick up Strand Hall Parking Lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>Car service from hotel to SFU Burnaby Campus – Drop off Strand Hall Parking Lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Dugan O'Neil, Associate, VP Research</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Jeff Derksen, Dean, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>EDB 9638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Meet with Barb Winter, Museum</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>Meet with Undergraduates (4 representatives)</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>Meet with Graduate Students (2 PhD, 2 MA)</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch Reception</td>
<td>Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>Meet with Graduate Executive Committee Chair and HRM Program Chair</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Undergrad Committee Chair</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>EDB 9638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45</td>
<td>Closing Meeting with George Nicholas</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>External Review Committee – Discussion Time</td>
<td>EDB 9643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Closing meeting with Senior Administrators:</td>
<td>Strand Hall, PCR Room 3187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wade Parkhouse, Associate VP Academic (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Keller, VP Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glynn Nicholls, Director, Academic Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dugan O'Neil, Associate VP Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Derksen, Dean, GPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingrid Stefanovic, Dean, Faculty of Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pat Reid, Coordinator, UGC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Return to hotel/airport by car service – pick up at Strand Hall Parking Lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 1 – To be completed by the Responsible Unit Person e.g. Chair or Director

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit under review</th>
<th>Date of Review Site visit</th>
<th>Responsible Unit person</th>
<th>Faculty Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>March 13-14, 2019</td>
<td>George Nicholas</td>
<td>Naomi Krogman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. *It is not* expected that every recommendation made by the External Review Committee be covered by this Action Plan. The major thrusts of the Report should be identified and some consolidation of the recommendations may be possible while other recommendations of lesser importance may be excluded.

2. Attach the required plan to assess the success of the Educational Goals as a separate document (Senate 2013).

### 1. PROGRAMMING

1.1 Action/s (description what is going to be done):

1.1.1 Undergraduate Program:

a) Revise undergraduate curriculum emphasizing the following areas of specialization— biological anthropology, archaeological science, CRM/Heritage, and environmental archaeology, and create explicit pathways/roadmaps for each area.

b) Develop a 24-month list of courses to be offered.

c) Ensure that our core courses (ARCH 372, 376Q, 471W) are offered on schedule, even with low enrollments, to avoid cancellations that disrupt student’s completion plans.

d) Develop and implement a recruitment strategy—in consultation with Faculty of Environment staff—to increase awareness about and visibility of our program, and to identify potential career prospects.

e) Investigate the potential usefulness and demand for a BSc degree program in the Department of Archaeology.

f) Hire a research assistant to aid in the development of an assessment component for our Educational Goals document.

g) Make better use of the university’s Work Study program to give undergraduates experience in museum collections management.

1.1.2 Graduate Program:

a) Include a statement of guaranteed minimum levels of funding for each incoming student in their offer of admission.

b) (I) the department will reserve a minimum of one sessional instructor position for PhD students each year provided this is consistent with the Collective Agreement.

(II) In courses where TA duties are currently focused on marking exams and assignments, the department will investigate ways to provide teaching assistants with opportunities for greater interaction with undergraduate students.
c) The graduate program chair will collaborate with the graduate student caucus to provide a minimum of four professional development workshops annually.

1.2 Resource implications (if any):

a) Undergraduate Program adjustments are directly related to staffing. Some of the initiatives discussed above will require assistance and resources from the Faculty of Environment around communications and recruitment.

1.3 Expected completion date/s:

1.3.1 Undergraduate Program

a) Curriculum revision completed by Fall 2019 for implementation in Fall 2020.
b) 2-year course schedule completed by Fall 2019.
c) NA
d) New recruitment plan developed by Fall 2019.
e) BSc program development in Environmental Science for an Archaeological Science concentration is underway. Expected implementation is Fall 2020.
f) Hire an RA to assist with Educational Goals Assessment by Spring 2020.
g) Contingent on museum director/faculty members time/willingness to supervise work study students.

1.3.2 Graduate Program

a) New template in place for offers of admission for Fall 2020 cohort.
b) Graduate teaching opportunities in place for Summer 2020.
c) A new pro-seminar program will be implemented in Fall 2019.
## 2. RESEARCH

### 3.1 Action/s:
No actions are required here.

### 3.2 Resource Implications (if any):
None

### 3.3 Expected completion date/s:
NA

## 3. ADMINISTRATION

### 3.1 Action/s:

#### 3.1.1 Administrative Staffing

a) Increase the .40 Advisor position to full-time, to alleviate pressure on other staff. The full-time position will be more equipped to advise students on a more regular basis, as well as assist with recruiting, communications, curriculum evaluation and revision and course planning/scheduling.

b) Increase the current half-time Graduate Program Assistant to a full-time Graduate Coordinator position, which will alleviate burden on the Department Manager regarding graduate program budgeting and awards, scheduling, communication, and address advising issues that graduate students are concerned with. This will also assist with recruiting for and expansion of the professional HRM program for which we currently have no staffing capacity for.

#### 3.1.2 Laboratories Staffing

a) Increase the technician position to full-time, alleviating stress and burn-out by Lab Manager and staff. The full-time position will expand the position’s ability to assist with overall laboratory and department safety responsibilities, maintaining and operating specialized equipment and better supporting research laboratories by providing training in equipment operations and research protocols.
b) Collections Curation Assistant and IT Support Position (two half-time or one full-time technical position) to address the hardware, software and network IT issues emphasized in the report and/or to assist in alleviating the pressing need for better care of Department teaching and research collections. Would be willing to share the IT position/portion with other FEnv departments.
c) Engage with the Institute for Forensics Research (IFR) as to funding a half-time Lab Technician to support all labs in the Centre, with costs split by Archaeology and Criminology (FASS).

3.1.3 Museum Staffing
a) Hire a full-time Curator.

3.2 Resource implications (if any):
Departments are not able to create staff positions; we can submit position requests to the Dean. It is challenging to provide any additional staffing resources in the areas of advising or administration, given our financial situation. Given that the museum provides a wide array of services to the university and beyond, there may be options for funding from outside FEnv.

3.3 Expected completion date/s:
Unknown; all contingent on funding.

4. Working Environment

4.1 Action/s:
a) Increase communications and develop fuller relationships between the Department and the Faculty of Environment to assist students, faculty, and staff with some persistent integration issues.

4.2 Resource implications (if any):

4.3 Expected completion date/s:
a) Ongoing, contingent upon time available to Department Manager and other staff.
5. MUSEUM RESOURCES / FACULTY RENEWAL

5.1 Action/s:

5.1.1. Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology
   a) Obtain a proper museum collections management system.
   b) Develop a Research Associate program to give graduate students experience in the tangible implementation of the principles of the Truth and Reconciliation recommendation through direct work in museum collections management and repatriation.

5.1.2. Faculty Renewal
   a) Identify hiring needs relative to the 3-4 retirements expected in the next 2-4 years.

5.2 Resource implications (if any):
   a) Collections Management systems require new funding
   b) Faculty replacements require authorization from administration.

5.3 Expected completion date/s:
   a) Contingent on funding.
   b) Contingent on funding.
   c) Discussions on faculty renewal will be scheduled for the Fall 2019 semester; a plan will be devised by the end of the Spring 2020 semester.

The above action plan has been considered by the Unit under review and has been discussed and agreed to by the Dean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Leader (signed)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>June 11, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2 - Dean's comments and endorsement of the Action Plan:

Let me begin by congratulating the Department of Archaeology for its stellar review. The exemplary quality of research, high reputation in delivering innovative and significant teaching programs and the positive student feedback all confirm, as noted by the external reviewers, that this department is a gem in the Faculty of Environment and a model of academic excellence for SFU.

That said, there is always room for improvement. The Department Chair has already provided an extensive action plan, which I fully support. In addition, I note the following:

1. Review of staff needs: Some suggestions have been made to increase staffing, thereby addressing needs ranging from advising to IT Services. In close collaboration with the Department, we confirm that the Director of Administration in the Dean's Office will undertake a formal review of current staff responsibilities to determine: (a) whether some reorganization of activities might alleviate the burden and (b) address shortfalls and potential staff burnout. The Dean's Office will endeavour to find a way to resource additional staff, particularly if it is deemed essential to the functioning of the department.

2. Museum Curatorial assistance: I agree that the director of the museum requires curatorial assistance. The Faculty of Environment continues to operate with tight financial constraints, so we are challenged to provide the assistance that we know is well deserved here. Given that the museum fulfills SFU's broad SSHRC and BC government requirements, while functioning as a repository of both FENV as well as university-owned collections, we will explore with the Provost, the VP Advancement and the VPR whether some shared funding opportunities can be identified, perhaps through ARC funds or elsewhere. A new museum planning committee has been struck in Archaeology, and we recommend that this committee renews the vision of what this museum could be, its role in the University, and develops a business plan for the museum. This remains a priority for the Dean's office and should be a priority for the university as a whole.

3. Museum physical infrastructure: The need for museum upgrades - i.e. installing protective measures, such as adequate environmental control systems - is acknowledged by the Dean's office. We recommend that the Department of Archaeology prepares and submits a renovation proposal to the Capital Planning Steering Committee.

4. Graduate Instructors: The Dean's Office agrees that opportunities should be provided to graduate students to instruct courses. We encourage the department to identify ways in which students can obtain this important level of experience while completing their doctoral work.
5. Recruitment and retention: We acknowledge the Department's recent document "Addressing Enrollment Concerns: Issues and Opportunities (3.0)". FENV has recently hired a Director of Enrollment and a half time HS recruiter. We will work with Archaeology to develop and implement a recruitment strategy. We would add that retention is also a priority for the Faculty. Our new full-time and additional half-time staff hires within the Dean's office, dedicated to recruitment and retention, will provide additional support to increase enrolments in Archaeology.

Overall, we believe that by addressing the above challenges, we will ensure that the Department of Archaeology is further strengthened and supported by the Dean's Office in the way that is deserving of a unit that receives international accolades and a stellar reputation worldwide.

Faculty Dean

[Signature]

Date

Dec 11, 2019
Archaeology Department Response to External Review Report:
Comments and Corrections

by
George Nicholas, Chair
June 2019

The External Review Report confirms that the Department of Archaeology is performing well, resulting in a strong national and international reputation. However, the Report highlights two critical, longstanding needs — additional administrative and laboratory staff, and additional resources for our Museum. This response provides some additional information on these two recommendations, as well as a number of factual corrections.

I. COMMENTS ON STAFFING AND THE MUSEUM

Staffing Needs
Staff and management positions are becoming more complex. With a new emphasis on marketing, communications, recruitment, health and safety, and accountability, increased staffing levels are pivotal to maintaining high-quality teaching and research. The need for additional support for staffing has been emphasized in the past external reviews.

With the expansion of our research and teaching laboratories, our laboratory staff are also increasingly challenged with: maintaining multiple and technologically different labs; renovating or reorganizing old laboratory spaces to suit current needs; keeping up to date with new laboratory protocols and technology; and ensuring the health and safety of all laboratory and field workers. This has left little or no time to provide support for laboratory and field courses, care for and expand research and teaching collections, or to train and mentor work study students or volunteers in a variety of laboratory and field methods. We also note that recommendation 2a in the Report to develop an IT strategy will result in additional work and training for laboratory staff, as would continuing support of the Institute for Forensics Research.

To summarize, we cannot adequately support our graduate and undergraduate teaching programs, nor our outstanding research programs, without additional laboratory staff.

We strongly concur with the recommendations to increase the Advisor from .40 to a full-time position, which could then assist in areas such as recruitment, communications, curriculum revision and review, student success, and course scheduling.

There is also a need for an additional staff person in the Museum (see discussion below).

Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology
The need for additional support for the museum has been emphasized in the last four external reviews, but has never been acted upon.

The Museum is a vital component of the Archaeology Department. It is first and foremost a teaching museum. It is also a critical point of articulation with First Nations engagement and
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reconciliation, including repatriation (see below), and it provides public outreach through site visits and online resources to BC schools.

The Museum also has an important role supporting research by our faculty in terms of ensuring curation or storage needs that meet professional standards. Research conducted on the collections utilizing the Department’s scientific facilities (e.g., XRF, mass spectrometry, ancient DNA, imaging) increases knowledge of First Nations history (and is often requested by First Nations). However, the collections must be organized so that specimens can be found before research begins. Also, more graduate research is being done on museum collections. Support for a comprehensive collections management system and a curator to manage it is thus essential to the Department’s teaching and research programs.

Museum and laboratory staff have also taken on responsibility for major projects of repatriation of artifacts and human remains. Repatriation of museum collections to First Nations is an important component of the university’s commitment to the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. To cite one example, SFU developed a relationship with the Treaty 8 Tribal Association through the repatriation from the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology of a large artifact collection in 2015, which in turn facilitates current SSHRC-funded research and community engagement by faculty and graduate students. The museum holds objects and archives from many First Nations. SFU could advance the goals of Truth & Reconciliation by working with other nations in the same way.

The Archaeology Department and Archaeology LaboratoryStaff work with First Nations to return ancestral human remains, and the remains of hundreds of individuals have already been returned to their descendant communities. One example of this was the return of over 200 ancestors to the Tsawout First Nation managed by George Nicholas and the Laboratory Manager and Staff-- a process that took over 18 months.

Currently the Museum has a single staff member, responsible for collections management, physical facilities, repatriation, displays, education and outreach, liaison with researchers, liaison with instructors, donor relations, and undergraduate work experience. A second staff person is clearly needed.

Finally, it is important to emphasize the role of the Museum as a university resource in that it functions to curate and display university-owned collections; provides university outreach to both local schools and the broader school system through class visits and on-line resources; and, as noted above, is an articulation points for university engagement with First Nations communities. Beyond those services, the Museum fulfills SSHRC and BC Government requirements as a repository for collections derived from archaeological research. Our request for additional resources should thus be considered relative to services provided to the university.
II. CORRECTIONS

Information Technology
The external review report states (in section 3.1.2, Technical Support Staff) that “We were told that the Faculty of the Environment has one IT support staffer, but that it can take up to a week for a visit to resolve a reported problem.”

This is incorrect as there is no such support staffer. This was likely the result of a misunderstanding or miscommunication during their visit.

Also, “Technical Support Staff” should be “Archaeology Laboratory Staff.”

Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology
1. The external review report states (in section 1.2) that “the Museum emerged as a greatly appreciated skill-generator with direct career employment prospects. A greater degree of research assistantship funding in this connection, for the Museum, would certainly be welcomed by graduate students, and would aid the Museum situation.”

While research assistantship funding would help graduate student RAs, compensating them for work on short-term projects, the Museum desperately needs an additional dedicated long-term staff person who can undertake the larger collections management projects such as the development of a comprehensive collections management system.

2) Two statements in section 3.2.3 Museum require correction:
   a) “There are about 20,000 historic and recent ethnographic artifacts, mostly donated, and a photographic collection of about 135,000 images and movies that document departmental research, but also include donated images of cultures worldwide.”

   Not stated was that there are over 60,000 artifacts for which we are responsible, many of which are of interest to First Nations.

   b) “In our opinion the Museum is woefully under-resourced. The display area is not fit for the purpose. The humidity varies wildly, and the fire suppression system looks dodgy, so the cream of the collection—objects in wood and other perishable materials—linguishes in the storage rooms where the humidity, at least, is controlled.”

   Portions of this statement are inaccurate. The fire suppression system was installed recently, and it is the lack of humidity control that is most concerning, because an audit would likely result in the loss of category A designation from the federal government. Therefore, recommendation 5c should be changed from “c. Installing protective measures, such as sprinkler systems, to prevent catastrophic loss of collections” to “c. Installing protective measures, such as adequate environmental control systems, to prevent catastrophic loss of collections”
As a requirement of the Archaeology Department’s response to our recent External Review, this document presents our Assessment Plan for Educational Goals. It was prepared in consultation with Elizabeth Elle (Associate VP-Learning & Teaching) and Teaching and Learning Centre (TLC) staff.

This document sets out our Department-level, Program-level, and Course-level Educational Goals and Learning Outcomes, developed earlier and still in the process of being developed and refined in consultation with TLC staff. An important component we have yet to develop, and one that is becoming required by the university in some capacity, are methods or mechanisms for assessing the efficacy of programs at satisfying Learning Outcomes.

Currently the Teaching and Learning Centre at SFU is in the process of developing a framework and support to aid individual departments in the development of assessment components for their Learning Outcomes. This is expected to be in place within a year or so. Thus, while we are continuing to develop our Learning Outcomes and assessments, there is some expectation that, until a formal process is developed (and some understanding of any potential formal requirements), investing significantly in any specific mechanism(s) may be premature. Thus, we are moving forward somewhat tentatively.

Assessing Course-level Learning Outcomes
Success in achieving our individual course-level goals can be assessed through students’ ability to achieve reasonable grades on exams and assignments and through the nature of the feedback instructors and the department get from the course and instructor evaluations filled out by students. With the implementation of online course and instructor evaluations (planned for Fall 2020), there will be some improvement in this data as the department and individual instructors will now have some input in the questions that students are asked to respond to. However, an important aspect of individual courses, especially for lower and mid-level courses, is to prepare students for subsequent courses as they progress through their program. This leads us from course-level to Learning Outcomes at the Program-level, which is perhaps the most important level and the one that we will be focusing the most effort on in our development of assessment mechanisms.

Developing an assessment component for Program-level Learning Outcomes
This is to ask: how effective are our lower-level courses at preparing students for success in upper-level courses and how effective is our undergraduate program as a whole in providing
students with the knowledge and skills we have identified as our primary Learning Outcomes and, furthermore, how well do these Learning Outcomes goals, assuming they are satisfactorily achieved, prepare our alumni for success in their subsequent career paths?

These can be assessed in two ways.

1) In-Progress Assessment

One way of getting a sense of the efficacy of our program in meeting its Learning Outcome goals is simply tracking average final grades in mid- and upper-level courses. However, while this is something we will do, these are probably not especially informative data and on their own will not provide the sort of measure we require to be able to effectively assess program efficacy and address any potential shortcomings.

Some departments include Capstone courses in the programs that are typically designed to polish off and test students’ discipline-specific knowledge and skills. As we lack a capstone course component, we require some other method for tracking how effectively we introduce, reinforce, and establish ‘expertise’ in each of our Program Outcomes such as, Critical Thinking Skills or Technical Skills. A common approach used by other departments (and likely the most effective one for us as well) is to identify individual courses that were designed to impart one or more specific Learning Outcomes - for example, specific lab courses that develop Technical Skills or writing intensive courses that develop Communication Skills - and use existing assignments in those courses (or design additional assignments) that provide direct measures of students’ success in developing those skills. To be effective, this will require formal curriculum mapping of our specific Learning Outcomes: mapping out in which specific (typically lower-level) courses a Learning Outcome is introduced, in which courses that Learning Outcome is reinforced, and in which courses expertise is developed for that Learning Outcome. Just doing this mapping (something currently underway) will potentially highlight any gaps in the process of presenting and reinforcing individual Learning Outcomes over the course of the undergraduate program and will also indicate those courses best situated for assessing the efficacy of this structure in helping students’ develop these Learning Outcomes.

2) Post-Graduation Assessment

Obviously, this can only be measured by following, to some degree, the relative success of our graduates in their subsequent careers, whether this involves continuing in academia or employment with government institutions or in the private sector. Assessing our degree of success in this respect can be achieved by surveying our alumni’s subsequent graduate advisors and employers and by surveying our alumni directly. Ultimately, this can allow us to more fully and accurately assess both our program-level success and our success in meeting our department’s over-arching philosophy and mission statement. Towards this end, we have already begun collecting data on our alumni as much as accessible in the public domain (and with the recognition that some sensitivity to personal information is warranted). We plan to hire a research assistant devoted to collecting relevant data on our alumni.
Program Assessment Schedule

We will also implement a schedule for when aspects of Program-level assessments are carried out. While data on all students' progress in their Learning Outcomes development can be collected every semester, it may be more reasonable to analyse these data at longer intervals, perhaps yearly or even every other year. After these data are analysed and the results disseminated to all faculty members, they will be discussed in a faculty meeting or retreat and appropriate responses decided on and implemented.
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate

FROM: Jon Driver, Vice-President, Academic and Provost pro tem, and Chair, SCUP

RE: External Review Mid-Cycle Report for the Department of Chemistry (SCUP 20-02)

DATE: January 10, 2020

TIME

At its January 8, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed the Mid-Cycle Report for the Department of Chemistry which resulted from its 2016 external review. The report is attached for the information of Senate.
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Jon Driver, Chair, SCUP

FROM: Wade Parkhouse, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic

RE: External Review Mid-Cycle Report for the Department of Chemistry

DATE December 16, 2019

The External Review of the Department of Chemistry was undertaken in March/April 2016. As per the Senate guidelines, the Unit is required to submit a mid-cycle report describing its progress in implementing the External Review Action Plan. The mid-cycle report and the Unit’s assessment of its Educational Goals are attached for the information of SCUP.

c: Vance Williams, Chair, Department of Chemistry
    Paul Kench, Dean, Faculty of Science
ATTENTION: Glynn Nicholls, Director, Academic Planning and Quality Assurance

FROM: Vance Williams, the Chair of Chemistry

RE: CHEM Mid-Cycle Report and Learning Outcomes

DATE: December 11, 2019

Dear Glynn,

Attached please find the Mid-Cycle Report for the Department of Chemistry which details our progress with the Action Plan stemming from the 2016 External Review.

The assessment of our Educational Goals is also attached.

Sincerely,

Vance Williams
Associate Professor and Chair

Encl. Chemistry Mid-Cycle Report
    Assessment of Educational Goals
## External Review Update for the Department of Chemistry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Progress Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Programming</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.1 Undergraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Department fully recognizes the urgent need to replace the equipment in the undergraduate physical/analytical laboratories - a situation that was identified in 2008 (the year of our last external review). During the last 6 years, $450K has been invested to address the laboratory deficiencies identified at that time, but this is a fraction of the cost required to replace equipment and supplies, which is now estimated at $2.8M.</td>
<td>(see comments below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In the absence of sufficient funding, and with the view to developing innovative programs, the Department spearheaded a proposal to establish the Centre for Self-Directed Studies that would partner the Department with a multi-national firm to equip, supply, and help maintain the Analytical and Physical Chemistry Laboratory, but more importantly, transform the way that our undergraduate students are taught in this core subject in an innovative way. This partnership requires both a 5 year+ University commitment to support the on-going needs of this undergraduate laboratory and internal contributions to match the industrial cash and in-kind contributions. Key components of this opportunity include the utilization of existing space, engaging students with industry-inspired and modern laboratory exercises, developing critical thinking skills and inspiring creativity, maintaining analytical integrity, training students to work as individuals as well as in teams, equipping students with their own supplies, encouraging an honest self-evaluation of skills</td>
<td>In 2017, the Department received $1.3 M for the “Renewal of the Analytical and Physical Chemistry Undergraduate Laboratories at Simon Fraser University”; this project was funded jointly by the VP Academic, VP Research, and Dean of Science. These funds were used to introduce new equipment (e.g., GC-FID/MS, HPLC, plate readers, FAAS, TGA, DSC, UV-Vis-NIR, and sample preparation equipment) into this laboratory and to renovate the space. A member of our Department has spearheaded the initiative to purchase this equipment and to implement changes to the curricula of the analytical and physical chemistry laboratories (CHEM 215, 266, 316, 317, and 366). The Department continues to pursue funding opportunities to modernize our undergraduate teaching in order to better enhance the student experience, both through internal and external sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and providing timely assistance to students to refine and improve their skills, training of essential skills to prepare samples for analytical processes, and replacing antiquated equipment with more robust, modern and industrially relevant equipment. Working closely on technological and industrial-relevant challenges, using pre-commercial instrumentation will better prepare the student for the workforce and foster future innovation and entrepreneurship.

The proposed Centre requires funding of $8M over a period of 5 years to enable our Department to adequately teach essential skills required of analytical scientists (e.g., sample and data integrity, on-going personal skill refinement, and critical thinking in the laboratory) while also engaging more students (e.g., from other Departmental courses, as well as courses from departments beyond our own) than previously possible. This will be enabled through the installation of better equipment, improved maintenance of the equipment, access to sample preparation tools, implementation of an informatics system for process development, data handling and report management, and development of 90 new industry-inspired (real life) laboratory exercises. To this end, the Department has engaged a multinational partner that would provide $4M in cash and in-kind contributions towards the Centre, but which is contingent on the University raising an additional $4M (over 5 years).

The Department has formed a committee to oversee the plans to upgrade the equipment in both the Physical and Analytical Chemistry Laboratories and to implement the Centre for Self-Directed Studies with renewed vigor with the Dean of Science and the Vice Presidents. A detailed
A budget has been created for establishing this Centre; vision and mission statements have been prepared and shared within SFU; and promotional materials have been created. A commitment from the University is required to create the Centre; without this commitment the $4M cash and in-kind contributions from potential partners cannot not be leveraged, and will not be realized.

The Department continues to foster the relationships with these partners to maintain their interest, and will continue to work with members of the University to bring forward a plan for implementation by May 2017. It is proposed that the first phase of this initiative is to immediately secure funds ($2.8 M) from the university to replace outdated equipment and supplies. Phase 2 is to raise an additional $1.2M over the next 5 years, bringing the total to $4M, to secure and leverage the $4M in cash and in-kind contributions from the multinational partner, required to form the Centre for Self-Directed Studies.

- The Departmental Information Technology (IT) committee has met to evaluate both the use of LON-CAPA and the role of the Director of LON-CAPA to ensure that the needs of the Department continue to be met. As a result, the Department is seeking approval from the Dean for a limited term Teaching Support Technologies position (projected to start August 2016) to maintain and further develop the LON-CAPA services used in the Department.  

  This position was not approved.

- The Department will review the number of first-year courses and the frequency of offering, and implement appropriate changes by September 2017.

  A review of course offerings was undertaken. No significant modification in number of courses nor their frequency of offering was deemed warranted. These offerings are evaluated on an ongoing basis.

- The Department is developing a 1-unit course on scientific communications as a pilot project, projected for the Fall 2017 semester.

  Due to logistical and scheduling challenges, this course has not been offered. We are examining ways in which communication skills can be incorporated into existing core courses.
• The Department recognizes the importance of communication skills and will work to ensure that students have improved opportunities in this regard. The Department is reviewing the implementation of its current W-designated courses to ensure that students receive appropriate instruction and timely feedback on written assignments. The Department is developing a complementary 1-unit course on scientific communication that focuses on developing oral presentation skills.

The Department strives to maintain consistency and standards in our course offerings.

1.1.2 Graduate

• The Department is in the process of introducing modular courses at the graduate level. As a pilot project, a special topics course in Chemical Biology (CHEM 759) will be offered in modular form in the Fall of 2016. This will be followed by a staged introduction of further modular courses. The goal is to offer at least one modular course in each of the core scientific disciplines, with certain modules covering the core competencies of the field (preparing students for CHEM 802 and CHEM 808), and other modules serving to diversify the range of topics taught. The Department Graduate Studies Committee will work closely with faculty members to identify potential topics for inclusion in modular courses.

The Department explored two models for modular courses: (a) a series of independent 1-unit courses within a discipline and (b) 3-unit courses consisting of 2-4 modules, each of which is taught by a different faculty member. Because of the logistical challenges associated with scheduling and administering 1-unit courses at different times throughout a semester, model (a) has been adopted as the more practical approach. One such course, focusing on materials chemistry (CHEM 449/849) has now been offered twice, and the Department plans to offer variants in other subdisciplines.

• The Department wishes to be competitive and fair in regards to graduate student stipends. However, it should be recognized that the Department has no control over TA and graduate fellowship stipends, which supervisors must supplement from research grants. The Department Graduate Studies Committee has conducted a survey of stipends for chemistry students at universities across Canada. In terms of their net income (after subtraction of tuition fees), SFU Chemistry students are increasingly falling behind peers at comparable chemistry

Graduate student stipends were adjusted according to the following schedule:

PhD Students:
rate to the end of summer 2017: $23,500/year
Fall 2017 onwards: Increase of $250/yr for the next 3 yrs.
Fall 2017 = 23,750
Fall 2018 = 24,000
Fall 2019 = 24,250

MSc student:
to end summer 2017: $20,000/year
fall 2017 onwards: Increase of 3%/yr for next 3 years
departments. Over the last 5 years, the spending power of SFU's chemistry graduate students has decreased by 10 to 15%. Following this assessment, the DGSC will make a recommendation for increases in the stipend levels for M.Sc. and Ph.D. students that will be voted on at a Department meeting. It is planned to complete this process before the end of the Fall 2016 term.

| Fall 2017 | 20,600 |
| Fall 2018 | 21,218 |
| Fall 2019 | 21,854.54 ($21,855) |

2. Research

- The Department fully endorses this request as the current NSERC funding and allocation model disadvantages those researchers applying for small pieces of equipment. There is a constant and consistent need to upgrade small pieces of equipment for our undergraduate laboratories and for research purposes.

- Securing funding for small equipment purchases, repairs and renewal remains a challenge. The Dean of Science has formalized a competitive process for funding both research and teaching initiatives, which has been very beneficial.

3. Administration

- The Department recognizes the necessity of equity and diversity in the Department, Faculty, and University, and fully embraces this recommendation. A new Mentorship and Professional Development Committee has been approved by the Department (as of June) and will work with the proposed Equity and Diversity Committee at the Faculty level. The membership of this committee will be formalized by Sept 2016.

- A Mentorship, Professional Development and EDI Committee was formed in 2016.

- The Department recognizes the issues faced by junior faculty and agrees with the suggestions that commitments should be firmed up, clarified, and documented as much as possible. The Mentorship and Professional Development Committee described above will serve to address the needs of new and junior faculty. A manual will be compiled to document frequently used procedures and policies in our Department, and kept up-to-date by

(see above)
This committee. This manual, along with information about professional development offered through the university, will be provided to new hires upon their arrival. The Mentorship and Professional Development Committee will also meet with the new faculty member to arrange for mentorship and to discuss other training opportunities in the University. Commitments made to a candidate prior to their arrival will be appropriately documented. The Department will recommend that new faculty begin their appointments on July 1st, if appropriate.

- The Department will develop and consider the integration of adjuncts on a case-by-case basis, as opportunity arises.

| The Department continues to seek ways in which adjunct faculty contribute to the teaching and research within the department. Most notably, adjuncts commonly participate as guest lectures in courses. We have not yet had the opportunity to include adjuncts in departmental administration, but hope to do so on search committees, as appropriate. |

- While the Review Committee did not make any outright recommendations on this matter, the need to increase the Financial Assistant position to >0.6 FTE remains a high priority from the viewpoint of the Department. We continually fail to meet Departmental expectations in matters of finance in a timely manner. To state that this is a stressful situation for the group is an understatement. The Department has recently re-addressed and reconfirmed the need to increase the Financial Assistant position. The Department continues to address this issue.

| The Department now has a full time Financial Assistant, which has proven critical to our operations. |

4. Working Environment

- For the past two years the Department has, on its hiring plan, recommended the hiring of a female faculty member using a targeted search. The Department will continue to pursue opportunities to hire female faculty members using any relevant provisions of the collective agreement. Each new hiring committee in the department will work with appropriate experts to minimize unconscious biases.

| Two female faculty have been hired in Chemistry recently: one at the Assistant Professor, level, start date 2018, and a Lecturer, to start 2021. One female faculty retired in 2019. We recognize that there remains a considerable gender imbalance in our Department; redressing this remains a Departmental priority. |
The Department fully endorses the need to strive for, achieve, and maintain gender equity. The recommendation of placing more female faculty on onerous committees such as the TPC must be balanced against over-subscribing female faculty members on committees to the detriment of their research programs and teaching duties. The Department will explore the idea of creating internal department guidelines for the tenure and promotion committee that increase the number of female committee members on the TPC. However, it is recognized that there are ongoing negotiations between SFUFA and SFU's upper administration concerning the composition of TPCs. The Department is awaiting clarity on this issue.

The disproportionate administrative burden placed on female faculty in Chemistry remains a concern. Whenever possible and appropriate, we have reached out to colleagues from other departments to serve on committees.

SFU Human Resources has initiated a Performance Development Program which includes an ongoing evaluation system for staff. The Department will be commencing its involvement in the program over the next year.

The Department has not formally implemented this process, but the Department managers regularly meet with their staff to discuss goals, assess progress, provide mentorship and give feedback on performance, as per the guidelines of the Performance Development Program.

This situation has become more acute with the announcement that the Faculty glass blower is retiring at the end of July. The Department will review and update the glassblower job description to best fulfill the needs of the Department and Faculty of Science. A committee of faculty members and the Manager, Laboratory Operations will conduct a search for a suitable candidate, and an advertisement for the position will be posted in July. A tentative agreement has been made with our previous glassblowing technician to orient and train the new technician. The Dean has agreed to provide support for this training.

The Faculty hired a new glass blower in 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A new committee was approved by the Department at its June meeting. The committee will assess the allocation of space, with a view to providing recommendations that meet the Department's current and future needs. A comprehensive report will be provided to the Chair by May 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with the Action Plan, the Space Committee provided a report on the space status to the Chair and the Department at the Departmental Meeting in July 17, 2017. A more comprehensive and up-to-date report is provided here. Since its establishment, the Committee has conducted a comprehensive assessment of the space allocation, and made the following recommendations to the Chair:

1. Movement of the Sun lab to the North side of C7076: The move required renovation to provide more lab benches and more power and space for the existing fridges at the centre of the lab.
2. Movement of the Warren chemistry (wet) lab from C7076 into C8064, and relocation of the Warren group students to the office space (C8040) next to their chemistry lab.
3. Movement of the Kaake lab from C8085 and C8045 to C7076. This move required the installation of two fume hoods in C7076 with funding from the Dean of Science.
4. Movement of the Agnes lab items from C7076 to C8045 to facilitate the action of Item 3 above.
5. Downsizing of the Wilson lab along with the actions of Items 3 & 4 above to accommodate the new Ramogida lab.

These recommendations have been implemented throughout the 2017, 2018 and 2019 Academic Years. It is fair to say that, as a result of these actions, the present space allocation better meets the Department's current and future needs although our need for more space remains a challenging issue.
1.1 Undergraduate Educational Goals

In the course of the Chemistry Department’s 2016 External Review, the Department formulated a set of nine educational goals, which are listed in Table 2 (EG1-9). We have carried out a preliminary inventory of how these goals are implemented in courses within our core curriculum. We have limited this inventory to core courses, i.e. those that students must take to complete a major (B.Sc.) in chemistry. The results of this inventory are summarized in Table 1, where “Y” (green shading) indicates that the course significantly contributes to and engages with the learning outcome, “P” (yellow shading) indicates that the course partially contributes, and “N” (unshaded) denotes that the course does not significantly contribute to this goal. In most cases, the Educational Goals are incorporated across a large number of our courses.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EG 1</th>
<th>EG 2</th>
<th>EG 3</th>
<th>EG 4</th>
<th>EG 5</th>
<th>EG 6</th>
<th>EG 7</th>
<th>EG 8</th>
<th>EG 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236W</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = no, does not meaningfully contribute to this learning outcome
Y = yes, significantly contributes to this learning outcome
P = partially contributes to this learning outcome
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG 1</td>
<td>Have a solid foundation in the fundamentals of current chemical theories and their application to the physical world.</td>
<td>Our curriculum focuses on foundational knowledge and skills. As such, this EG is central to most courses, although a small number of exclusively lab classes put less emphasis on theoretical considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 2</td>
<td>Be skilled at analytical reasoning, problem solving, and critical thinking.</td>
<td>This educational goal is central to every chemistry course offered in the core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 3</td>
<td>Be able to design, perform and record chemical experiments and be capable of analyzing the results of these experiments. This includes the ability to critically assess results, identifying and quantifying experimental uncertainties and evaluating methodological limitations.</td>
<td>Many of our lab courses require students to perform and record experiments. In lower division, students are not asked to design experiments. Hence, many of our lab courses are listed as P. In our next iteration, EG 3 will be subdivided to better capture these distinctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 4</td>
<td>Have hands-on experience with a broad range of experimental methods, and be able to use a variety of modern instrumentation and standard techniques.</td>
<td>This EG is addressed predominately in laboratory courses, but is also often fulfilled in lecture courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 5</td>
<td>Be able to communicate the results of his or her work to both chemists and non-chemists, in writing and orally.</td>
<td>Communication skills are central to many of our courses, usually in the form of communicating to other chemists; for this reason, several entries are listed as P. Future iterations will differentiate between communicating to chemists and non-chemists, and differentiate between courses that emphasize oral and written communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 6</td>
<td>Be able to use modern library search and retrieval methods to access information about specific chemical topics.</td>
<td>Use of the primary chemical literature, (e.g. database searches and accessing peer-review papers) is emphasized increasingly from second year onward. Subsequent inventories will capture the case studies of how this EG is implemented across the offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 7</td>
<td>Be knowledgeable about chemical safety procedures, including proper methods and regulations for the safe handling, use and disposal of chemicals and the safe use and handling of chemical instrumentation.</td>
<td>Safety training is integral to all courses that have laboratory components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 8</td>
<td>Be able to identify and solve chemistry-related problems and to apply this to the exploration of new areas of research.</td>
<td>As seen in Table 1, this Educational Goal does not appear to be widely implemented across our program. This judgement may in part be due to ambiguity in the original wording, which has led to some differing interpretations. Subsequent inventories, which take a finer-grain approach than our Y/P/N ranking (see 1,2, below), will likely reveal places where this goal arises in courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 9</td>
<td>Have the experience and ability to collaborate effectively as part of team to solve problems.</td>
<td>Students routinely engage in group work projects, especially in labs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Next Steps

- We expect some variation in terms of educational goals depending on the instructors. All our core course are offered at least once a year, and many are offered more frequently. As such, almost all are taught by multiple instructors, and no faculty "owns" any of these courses. In order to assess this variation, the Department has struck a four-person Learning Outcomes Committee, chaired by Senior Lecturer John Canal. This committee is tasked with surveying every faculty involved in each core course, and reconciling the responses.

- As noted, there are several instances where the educational goals are either too broad to be properly assessed, or that need refining.

- Our second iteration of this survey will replace the Y/P/N scale with one that quantitatively ranks (on a scale of 1-5) instructors' assessment of the degree to which the goals are satisfied for each course.

- We will extend the survey to non-core courses. In order to establish their likely impact on a typical major's educational experiences at SFU, we will summarize the percentage of chemistry majors that take each course.

- We have begun to critically assess the results of this inventory on our program-level education goals. In particular, EG 6 and EG 8 both appear to be under-served at present. We will consider how these goals can be better reinforced within our program offerings.

- We are working towards establishing metrics by which we measure success. Currently we rely on grades as a measure of success, as the educational goals are closely integrated with the course grading (exams, assignments, etc.). However, we recognize that this captures only short-term effects; we need to establish a process by which to measure these over the entire program and after graduation. Guidance from CEE would be greatly appreciated in this regard.
2.1 Graduate Educational Goals

The following Graduate Educational Goals (G-EG) were identified for M.Sc. and Ph.D. students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G-EG</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-EG 1</td>
<td>Expand general chemistry knowledge. Students will continue to broaden and deepen their understanding of fundamental concepts in chemical theory and experiment as the basis for their sustained success as scientists and educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-EG 2</td>
<td>Develop expertise in specific disciplines. Each student will acquire deep working knowledge in a chosen field of specialization in chemistry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-EG 3</td>
<td>Ability to effectively communicate and disseminate results. Students will learn to develop and articulate logical arguments with clarity. They will become confident and competent in writing for and speaking with expert scientific, general scientific and general public audiences on topics specific to their discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-EG 4</td>
<td>Ability to search, comprehend and dispute the literature. Students will have the ability to search, read and critically assess the primary peer-reviewed literature in order to understand the scientific context and concepts for their research and to synthesize new ideas in their field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-EG 5</td>
<td>Ability to rationalize complex data sets and to conduct meaningful analyses. Students will have the ability to produce, analyze and interpret chemical data and reduce their findings to sound conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-EG 6</td>
<td>Ability for independent and original scientific research. Students will be able to conceive, design and execute projects in theoretical and/or experimental research in a chemical discipline. Students will learn how to solve significant, newly realized and hitherto unresolved problems in their chosen field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-EG 7</td>
<td>Responsible and ethical conduct in research. Students will understand and be committed to maintaining the highest standards of safety, honesty, ethical conduct and integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-EG 8</td>
<td>Teamwork and interdisciplinary collaboration. Graduates will have developed the ability to work effectively as part of a team; they appreciate the value of cross-cutting multidisciplinary research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-EG 9</td>
<td>Teaching and mentoring skills. Students will acquire skills to teach chemistry knowledge to undergraduate students and gain experience mentoring less experienced personnel in a research setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment of these Educational Goals are carried out as part of supervisory committee meetings and qualifying course (CHEM 802 and 808). We are working to make the evaluation of individual Educations Goals an explicit part of these processes. Indeed, students in CHEM 802 and 808 are graded on criteria that are closely aligned with these goals. The Chemistry DGSC is reviewing the adoption of uniform grading criteria that capture these goals. We continue to assess whether these goals need modification or expansion.
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate
FROM: Wade Parkhouse, Chair
Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

RE: Program Changes

DATE: January 10, 2020
PAGES: 1/2

For information:

Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of January 9, 2020 SCUS approved the following curriculum revisions effective Fall 2020.

a. Faculty of Applied Sciences (SCUS 20-03)

1. School of Computing Science
   (i) Changes to the internal transfer requirements for the Software Systems Major

2. School of Mechatronic Systems Engineering
   (i) Changes to the internal transfer requirements for the Mechatronic Systems Engineering Honours

b. Beedie School of Business (SCUS 20-04)

   (i) Description changes to the:
      • Business Technology Management Certificate
      • Business Analytics & Decision Making Certificate
      • Innovation & Entrepreneurship Certificate
   (ii) Lower division requirement changes to the:
      • Business Administration Major and Honours
      • Business and Communication joint Major
      • Business and Geography Joint Major
      • Business and Psychology Joint Major
      • Information Systems in Business Administration and Computing Science Joint Major
      • Business and Economics Joint Honours
      • Business Administration Minor programs
   (iii) Changes to the Major, joint major and minor admission requirements
c. Faculty of Science (SCUS 20-05)

1. Department of Biomedical Physiology and Kinesiology

(i) Upper division requirement changes to the Behavioural Neuroscience Bachelor of Science Major and Honours programs
(ii) Upper division requirement changes to the Kinesiology Bachelor of Science Major and Honours programs
(iii) Upper division requirement changes to the Biomedical Physiology Minor program
(iv) Upper division requirement changes to the Kinesiology Bachelor of Science Major and Honours programs

2. Department of Mathematics

(i) Upper and lower division requirement changes to the Applied Mathematics Major and Honours programs
(ii) Upper division requirement changes to the Mathematics and Computing Science Bachelor of Science Joint Major and Joint Honours programs
(iii) Upper division requirement changes to the Mathematics Bachelor of Science Major program
(iv) Upper and lower division requirement changes to the Mathematics Bachelor of Science Honours program

3. Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry

(i) Upper division requirement changes to the:
   • Molecular Biology and Biochemistry Bachelor of Science Major and Honours programs (Summer 2020)
   • Molecular Biology and Biochemistry and Computing Science Bachelor of Science Joint Major and Joint Honours programs (Summer 2020)
   • (ii) Requirement changes to the Genomics Certificate program (Summer 2020)

4. Department of Physics

(i) Upper and lower division requirement changes to the:
   • Physics Major
     o Applied Physics Bachelor of Science
     o Biological Physics Bachelor of Science
     o Chemical Physics Bachelor of Science
     o Physics Bachelor of Science
   • Physics Honours
     o Applied Physics Bachelor of Science
     o Biological Physics Bachelor of Science
     o Chemical Physics Bachelor of Science
     o Mathematical Physics Bachelor of Science
     o Physics Bachelor of Science
Senators wishing to consult a more detailed report of curriculum revisions may do so on the Senate Docushare repository at [https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682](https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682).
For information:

Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of January 9, 2020, SCUS approved the following curriculum revisions effective Fall 2020.

a. Faculty of Science (SCUS 20-02)

1. Department of Mathematics

   (i) New Course Proposals:
      - MATH 426-3, Probability
      - MATH 450-3, Introduction to topology
      - MATH 475-3, Mathematical Topics in Data Science

Senators wishing to consult a more detailed report of curriculum revisions may do so on the Senate Docushare repository at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682.
For information:

Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of January 9, 2020 SCUS approved the following curriculum revisions effective Fall 2020.

a. Faculty of Applied Sciences

1. School of Computing Science
   (i) Prerequisite change for CMPT 371
   (ii) Prerequisite and description change for CMPT 376W

b. Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

1. Department of Psychology
   (i) Prerequisite change for PSYC 425 and 426 adding an amendment to the Criminal Record Check section (Summer 2020)

c. Beedie School of Business

   (i) Equivalent statement change for BUS 200, 201, and 202
   (ii) Description and prerequisite change for BUS 336

d. Faculty of Science

1. Department of Biomedical Physiology and Kinesiology
   (i) Deletion of BPK 324, 417W,
   (ii) Equivalent statement change for BPK 325, 417
   (iii) Title and prerequisite change for BPK 443
2. Department of Chemistry

(i) Prerequisite change for CHEM 364

3. Department of Earth Sciences

(i) Prerequisite change for EASC 401

4. Department of Mathematics

(i) Course number change for MATH 310
(ii) Prerequisite changes for MATH 314, MACM 416, MATH 418 and 462
(iii) Course number, title, description, prerequisite change and equivalency statement for MATH 461
(iv) Title, description and prerequisite change for MATH 348

5. Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry

(i) Prerequisite change for MBB 326

6. Department of Physics

(i) Prerequisite change for PHYS 211, 255, 384, 385, 395, and 413
(ii) Prerequisite and equivalency statement changes to 321

Senators wishing to consult a more detailed report of curriculum revisions may do so on the Senate Docushare repository at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682.
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate

FROM: Jeff Derksen,
Chair of Senate Graduate Studies
Committee (SGSC)

RE: Program Changes

DATE: January 16, 2020

For information:

Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of January 7, 2020, SGSC approved the following program changes, effective Fall 2020:

**Faculty of Applied Sciences**

**School of Computing Science**

1) Program change (calendar revision): Computing Science MSc
2) Program change (calendar revision): Computing Science PhD

**Beedie School of Business**

3) Program change (calendar revision): Executive MBA

**Faculty of Science**

**Department of Mathematics**

4) Program change (calendar revision): Applied and Computational Mathematics MSc
5) Program change (calendar revision): Applied and Computational Mathematics PhD

Senators wishing to consult a more detailed report of curriculum revisions may do so on the Senate Docushare repository at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION Senate
FROM Jeff Derksen,
Chair of Senate Graduate Studies
Committee (SGSC)
RE: New Course Proposals

DATE January 16, 2020

For information:
Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of January 7, 2020, SGSC approved the following new courses, effective Fall 2020:

Faculty of Applied Sciences
School of Computing Science
1) New course: CMPT 700 Technical Writing and Research Communication

Beedie School of Business
2) New course: BUS 600 Orientation
3) New course: BUS 618 Indigenous Business Management
4) New course: BUS 675 Indigenous Economies

Faculty of Science
Department of Mathematics
5) New course: APMA 940 Mathematics of Data Science

Senators wishing to consult a more detailed report of curriculum revisions may do so on the Senate Docushare repository at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682
MEMORANDUM  

ATTENTION: Senate  
FROM: Jeff Derksen,  
Chair of Senate Graduate Studies  
Committee (SGSC)  
RE: Course Changes  

DATE: January 16, 2020

For information:
Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of January 7, 2020, SGSC approved the following curriculum item, effective Fall 2020:

Beedie School of Business
1) Course change (title, description): BUS 730

Senators wishing to consult a more detailed report of curriculum revisions may do so on the Senate Docushare repository at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682
I am pleased to submit the 2019 Senate Graduate Studies Committee Annual Report.

The Senate Graduate Studies Committee is charged by Senate with the following terms of reference:

1. To maintain the academic standards established by Senate.
2. To review and make recommendations to Senate concerning new graduate programs.
3. To review and make recommendations to Senate concerning major changes to graduate programs.
4. To review and approve all proposed new graduate courses, course deletions, and minor changes to programs. These changes shall be reported to Senate in summary form.
5. To administer, review and make recommendations to Senate concerning Graduate General Regulations.
6. To consider matters concerning Graduate Studies referred to the Committee, and to make recommendations to the appropriate bodies.
7. To consider and decide on policy recommendations concerning graduate course registration, course and program withdrawal procedures, and on the administration of graduate records.

This report covers the period of January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019, during which SGSC held nine meetings.

The Senate Graduate Studies Committee has two subcommittees: SGSC Appeal subcommittee (Unsatisfactory Progress under GGR 1.8.2), and the SGSC subcommittee Individualized Interdisciplinary Studies Steering Committee (Individualized Interdisciplinary Studies Graduate Program).

Discussions on graduate education
SGSC discussed various issues pertaining to admission to a master’s program, thesis embargo, and credit for research in science thesis. Among other discussion items were grading of capstone courses, strengths and challenges in faculties, and ideas for rethinking graduate studies. SFU Library instruction plan was also reviewed.
SGSC reviewed, recommended, approved and submitted to Senate curriculum changes related to the addition, deletion and modification of programs and courses, as well as revisions to regulations.

Revisions to Policies and Programs

a) Graduate General Regulations:
   - GGR 1.2 Administration of Graduate Studies
   - GGR 1.3 Admissions
   - GGR 1.4 Enrollment
   - GGR 1.5 Graduate Grading Systems and Policies
   - GGR 1.6 Supervision
   - GGR 1.7 Program Requirements
   - GGR 1.8 Progress, Withdrawal and Leave
   - GGR 1.9 Preparation for Examinations
   - GGR 1.10.2 Classification of the Thesis

b) Graduate refunds policy

c) FAS: CMPT MSc, PhD; CMPT DD MSc, PhD; Prof CMPT MSc; ENSC MSc, MEng, PhD; MSc MSc, PhD.

d) FASS: ECON MA, PhD; FREN MA; GSWS MA, PhD; LS MA; PHIL MA, PSYC MA, PhD, MPP.

e) BUS: BUS PhD; MOT MBA.

f) FCAT: CA MA; CMNS DD MA; IAT MA; MFA.

g) FENV: GEOG MA; SD Grad Cert.

h) FHS: MPH.

i) SCI: APMA MSc, PhD; BISC MSc, PhD; BPK MSc, PhD; MATH MSc, PhD.

Notice of Intent approved and recommended

BUS: Masters in Management MiM; Indigenous Business Leadership Executive MBA

FCAT: Contemporary Arts PhD

New programs approved and recommended

FASS: History Grad Cert FPP; TRSS MA FPP

Curriculum Changes Approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Changes</th>
<th>New Courses</th>
<th>Courses Changed</th>
<th>Courses Temporarily Withdrawn</th>
<th>Courses Reinstated</th>
<th>Courses Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate admissions, enrollments and credentials awarded per academic year

In 2018/19, the overall number of applications increased by 14% with a 17% increase in international applicants and a 10% increase in the number of domestic applicants compared with the previous academic year. New enrollment numbers remained relatively the same from 2017/18 to 2018/19. There is a slight increase in numbers for total and degree enrollments and a notable overall increase in credentials awarded of 24%.
Graduate Admissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gradute Admissions</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>6101</td>
<td>6141</td>
<td>7181</td>
<td>8221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>3272</td>
<td>4338</td>
<td>5090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>2899</td>
<td>2869</td>
<td>2843</td>
<td>3131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>2541</td>
<td>2686</td>
<td>2859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted offers</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2148</td>
<td>2282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Enrollments</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>4066</td>
<td>4193</td>
<td>4415</td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree**</td>
<td>3456</td>
<td>3572</td>
<td>3726</td>
<td>3816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total headcount of all graduate students (degree, certificate, diploma, exchange and qualifying)
** Total headcount of master's and doctoral students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credentials Awarded</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters (M)</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral (D)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (including certificates and diplomas)</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SGSC Appeals Subcommittee
No formal appeal hearings were held in 2019.

SGSC Individualized Interdisciplinary Studies Steering Committee
In 2019, ten student were admitted to the Individualized Interdisciplinary Studies program and one student successfully defended. At the end of 2019, 30 students were registered in this program.

SGSC members during 2019 were:
- J. Derksen, Chair, Dean and Associate Provost of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- G. Agnes, Z. Druick, Associate Dean(s), Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- P. Saeedi, Chair FGSC, Applied Sciences
- S. Zwagerman, Chair FGSC, Arts and Social Sciences
- A. Gemino, Chair FGSC, Business
- S. Poyntz, P. Pasquier Chair(s) FGSC, Communication, Art and Technology
- W. Cassidy, L. Le Mare, Associate Dean (s), Graduate Studies in Education
- D. Yang, Chair FGSC, Environment
- T. Beischlag, F. Lee, Director(s) of Graduate Programs, Health Sciences
- M. Silverman, Chair FGSC, Science
- T. Budd, L. Rinke-Hardekopf, GSS Executive Representative(s)
- K. Gerlich-Fitzgerald, Associate Director, Admissions & Records
- N. White, University Librarian designate
- S. Lord Ferguson, S. Ho, H. Eksal, Graduate Students
- D. Babeshko, Coordinator, Graduate Curriculum & Policy (non-voting)
- K. Vieira-Ribeiro, M. Grahame, Recording Secretary (non-voting)
To: Senate
From: Kris Nordgren, Secretary
       Senate Nominating Committee
Date: January 17, 2020
Subject: Senate Committee Elections

This is a summary of the nominations received and outstanding vacancies for Senate committees.

All nominations must be received by the Senate Office from the Nominating Committee in time to be included in the documentation sent out for the next Senate meeting. Senators will be informed that further nominations may be made by individual members of Senate. Any such nominations must reach the Committee Secretary the Friday before the meeting of Senate, and no further nominations will be accepted after this time. The Committee Secretary will provide members of Senate at the Senate meeting with such further nominations as may have been received. Oral nominations during the meeting of Senate will not then be allowed.

If only one nomination is received for a position, the position will be elected by acclamation. If more than one nomination is received for a position, online voting will be held during the week following the Senate meeting on Monday, December 2, 2019. An email will be sent to all Senators with information about the candidates and a link to the online voting system. Voting will be permitted for 48 hours and election results will be released within three days of the end of voting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>TERM (from June 1, 2019)</th>
<th>NOMINATIONS RECEIVED (after January Senate Elections)</th>
<th>CANDIDATES ELECTED (from January Senate meeting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DQAC</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAR</td>
<td>Student Senator (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCEMP</td>
<td>Faculty Senator</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS</td>
<td>Member of the University Community (at-large)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abdul Zahir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIA</td>
<td>Faculty Member (Arts and Social Sciences)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Maite Taboada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Member (Communication, Art and Technology)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Member (Health Sciences)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCODA</td>
<td>Faculty Member (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Ingrid Northwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Member (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Navpreet Kaur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUP</td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Health Sciences)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Student Senator (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student Senator</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student Senator (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUTL</td>
<td>Faculty Member (Arts and Social Sciences)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Member (Business Admin)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGAAC</td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGSC</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC/LPAC Dual Positions</td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Applied Sciences)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Arts and Social Sciences)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNC</td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Communication, Art and Technology)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Health Sciences)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Science)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abhishek Parmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCSAB/SGAAC</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUAAC</td>
<td>Undergraduate student (alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SCIA Faculty members: In the event that the Faculty Member is unable to attend, the Faculty Dean is authorized to appoint an alternate replacement.

CC   Calendar Committee  
DQAC Diverse Qualifications Adjudication Committee  
ESC Electoral Standing Committee  
LPAC Library Penalties Appeal Committee  
REB Research Ethics Board  
SAB Senate Appeals Board  
SCAR Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules  
SCCS Senate Committee on Continuing Studies  
SCEMP Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning  
SCIA Senate Committee on International Activities  
SCODA Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals  
SCUH Senate Committee on University Honours  
SCUP Senate Committee on University Priorities  
SCUS Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies  
SCUTL Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning  
SGAAC Senate Graduate Awards Adjudication Committee  
SGSC Senate Graduate Studies Committee  
SLC Senate Library Committee  
SNC Senate Nominating Committee  
SPCSAB Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards & Bursaries  
SUAAC Senate Undergraduate Awards Adjudication Committee
MEMORANDUM

Attention: Senate  

Date: January 16, 2020

From: Dr. Jonathan Driver, VPA pro temp

Re: Proposed Board policy on University Policies

Page: 1 of 1

Policies play an important role in university governance. To be effective, SFU’s policies and procedures must be current, practical and useful, readily accessible, and comply with applicable law.

A policy management framework is being proposed to provide guidance and support to members of the university community who are developing new university policies or revising existing policies. The proposed framework, as set out in the attached draft Policy and its associated procedures and related documents, provides step-by-step guidance for those involved in policy development, from initiation through to Board of Governors approval.

Our intent in establishing this framework is to bring clarity, transparency and consistency to process for developing and reviewing university policies. The framework ensures that stakeholders are consulted, that university policies are compliant with reporting, legal, and other requirements, and are regularly reviewed.

The framework also requires policy developers and approvers to consider why a new policy or amendment is needed and the benefits, risks, and the other implications associated with it including considerations of equity, diversity, and inclusion. This draft Policy and associated documents have been shared with SFU’s Indigenous leadership for their recommendations on ways for policy developers and approvers to also consider the implications of new/revised policies for members of SFU’s Indigenous communities.

Your feedback is most welcome as we advance toward a consistent policy management framework. The SFU community is asked to review the draft policy and related documents and submit feedback to Kim Hart at krhart@sfu.ca by Thursday February 6, 2020.

c: Kim Hart, Policy Project
Policy on University Policies and Procedures (B 10.00)

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
Policy and Procedures

Date  
TBD

Number  
B 10.00

Date of Last Review/Revision: n/a

Mandated Review:  
2023

Policy Authority: University Secretary

Associated Procedures: B 10.00 Procedures to Develop, Amend, Repeal and Approve University Policies [link]; Appendix A [link]; Summary of Steps in the Process to Develop, Amend, and Repeal University Policies [link]

1.0  PREAMBLE

1.1 University Policies address matters within the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors. University Policies establish the rules by which the University has decided to govern its affairs, assign roles and responsibilities, provide guidance for the actions of members of the University Community, contribute to openness and transparency, facilitate operational continuity and consistency of decision-making, and reduce institutional risk. To be effective, University policies and their related procedures must comply with applicable law, be current, practical and useful, and readily accessible.

2.0  PURPOSE

2.1 The purpose of this policy is to:

2.1.1 Establish a consistent approach to create new and amend existing University Policies and Procedures, and to establish a procedure to develop, review, approve, amend and repeal University Policies in a consistent, collaborative and coordinated manner;

2.1.2 Facilitate the writing of clear, coherent, user-friendly, accessible and effective policies and procedures; and

2.1.3 Assign responsibility for developing and approving University Policies and Procedures.
3.0 SCOPE

3.1 This policy applies to all members of the University Community who play a role in the development, approval, maintenance, review, amendment and repeal of University Policies and Procedures.

4.0 DEFINITIONS

4.1 Board means the Board of Governors of Simon Fraser University.

4.2 Editorial Amendment means a housekeeping or minor amendment to a University Policy; it does not require Board approval and includes formatting changes, language changes to improve clarity without changing the meaning, name changes, updating of defunct policies or organizational structure, programs, or positions.

4.3 Mandated Periodic Review means the date by which a University Policy approved by the Board must undergo substantive review to determine whether any changes are needed. Where this date is not specified within the policy, it is the date established by the University Secretary.

4.4 Policy Authority means the President and Vice Chancellor, a Vice President, the University Secretary or the General Counsel who sponsors a policy that falls under their jurisdiction.

4.5 Policy Gazette means Simon Fraser University's website that serves as the repository for University Policies and Procedures and is maintained by the Office of the University Secretary.

4.6 Responsible Authority means the head of an academic or administrative unit responsible and accountable for the development, implementation, maintenance, and review of a University Policy.

4.7 Substantive Amendment means a significant amendment to a University Policy and includes: any change to the role or responsibilities assigned to an office, a unit, or a position; any change to the actions that are permitted or prohibited; any change to the rights or responsibilities of an individual; and any change to the Policy Authority. This type of amendment requires Board approval.

4.8 University Community means all students and employees of the University and all people who have a status at the University mandated by legislation or other University policies, including: research assistants, post-doctoral fellows, members of Senate and the Board of Governors, volunteers, visiting and emeritus faculty, and visiting researchers.

4.9 University Policy means an official document formally approved by the Board that establishes key requirements and responsibilities and guides or directs the actions of members of the University Community regarding a particular matter.

4.10 University Procedure means an official document approved by the Policy Authority that prescribes the method by which a University Policy will be carried out and given effect.

v. 1.0 December 5, 2019
5.0 POLICY

5.1 General

5.1.1 University Policies will promote good governance, management practices, and behavior consistent with the University’s core principles and advance the University’s mission.

5.1.2 University Policies must be developed, approved, amended, reviewed or repealed pursuant to this Policy.

5.1.3 University Policies must be current, compliant with applicable law, and consistent with other related legal and policy authorities, and with agreements entered into by the Board.

5.1.4 University Policies and Procedures must be presented in a common, standardized format using the approved University Policy or Procedure Template and written with inclusive, plain language. See section 13 Forms and Templates for the SFU Policy Template.

5.1.5 University Policies must be made publicly accessible electronically on the Policy Gazette and will normally be linked electronically to the associated University Procedure.

5.2 New Policies and Substantive Amendments to Existing Policies

5.2.1 New University Policies and substantive amendments to existing University Policies must be formally approved by the Board.

5.2.2 The Policy Authority is responsible for proposing new policies or amendments to existing University Policies in accordance with the processes described in B 10.00 Procedure to Develop, Amend, Repeal and Approve University Policies.

5.3 Editorial Amendments

5.3.1 Editorial amendments to University Policies do not require Board approval.

5.3.2 The Responsible Authority is responsible for proposing and the University Secretary is responsible for approving editorial amendments to University Policies in accordance with the processes described in B 10.00 Procedure to Develop, Amend, Repeal and Approve University Policies.

5.4 Repealing Policies

5.4.1 Repeal of a University Policy must be formally approved by the Board.

5.4.2 The Policy Authority is responsible for initiating the repeal of a University Policy in accordance with the processes described in B 10.00 Procedure to Develop, Amend, Repeal and Approve University Policies.
5.5 Development of Procedures and other documents related to University Policies

5.5.1 University Procedures and any revisions to them must be approved by the Policy Authority.

5.5.2 The Responsible Authority is responsible for developing University Procedures to give effect to the University Policy.

5.5.3 University Procedures should accompany a University Policy at each stage of the policy approval process.

5.6 Effective Date

5.6.1 A University Policy takes effect on the date it is formally approved by the Board or at a later date specified by the Board.

5.6.2 University Procedures take effect on the same date as the University Policy with which they are associated. If the University Procedures are subsequently reviewed and revised separately from the University Policy with which they are associated, the revised University Procedures take effect on the date specified in those procedures.

5.6.3 A University Policy approved by the Board prior to the effective date of this policy remains in effect until it is amended or repealed.

5.7 Mandated Periodic Review of University Policies

5.7.1 A University Policy must normally undergo a substantive review at least once every five years to determine whether any changes are needed but may be reviewed at any time.

5.7.2 The University Secretary will establish the Mandated Periodic Review date for any policy approved by the Board that does not specify a date for review.

5.7.3 The Policy Authority must keep University Policies current by requiring the Responsible Authority to review them in accordance with the Mandated Periodic Review date specified within the policy or as established by the University Secretary.

5.7.4 Procedures associated with a University Policy must be reviewed whenever the University Policy is reviewed, but may be reviewed separately at any time.

5.8 Other Policies and Agreements

5.8.1 Faculties, other academic units, and administrative units may establish local policies and procedures for matters within their purview, but these are always subject to and must not contradict University Policies. Where there is a contradiction, the University Policy will prevail.

5.8.2 Where a University Policy directly contradicts a provision in a collective agreement between the University and a union the collective agreement provision will prevail with respect to the members of the bargaining unit covered by that collective agreement.
5.8.3 In the event of a contradiction between two or more University Policies:

a. where each policy has an interpretation section, the matter will be referred to the persons named in the interpretation sections who will jointly make a decision which shall be final;

b. where some but not all of the policies have an interpretation section, the matter will be referred to the persons named in the interpretation sections and the President who will jointly make a decision which shall be final;

c. where none of the policies have an interpretation section, the matter will be referred to the President who will make a decision which shall be final.

6.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

6.1 The Policy Authority is responsible for initiating University Policy development and review, for drafting proposed policies and amendments, and for developing and approving associated procedures. The Policy Authority is also responsible for initiating repeal of University Policies.

6.2 The University Secretary and the Governance and Nominating Committee of the Board are responsible for recommending to the Board the approval of new University Policies, the approval of substantive amendments to existing University Policies, and the repeal of University Policies.

6.3 The Board is responsible for approving new University Policies, substantive amendments to existing University Policies, and the repeal of University Policies.

6.4 The University Secretary is responsible for approving editorial amendments to University Policies and for making those amendments.

6.5 After a University Policy is approved by the Board the Policy Authority is responsible for implementing it through the Responsible Authority and for monitoring compliance.

6.6 The Office of the University Secretary is responsible for publishing University Policies and Procedures in the Policy Gazette, for removing Policies that have been repealed, for keeping the Policy Gazette current, and for maintaining related records.

7.0 RELATED LEGAL, POLICY AUTHORITIES AND AGREEMENTS

7.1 The legal and other University Policy authorities and agreements that may bear on the administration of this policy and may be consulted as needed include but are not limited to:

7.1.1 University Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 468 [link]

7.1.2 GP 30 Interpretation Policy.

8.0 RETENTION AND DISPOSAL OF RECORDS

8.1 Information and records made and received to administer this policy are evidence of the University's actions to manage the development, amendment, approval, and repeal of University
Policies. Information and records must be retained and disposed of in accordance with a records retention schedule approved by the University Archivist.

9.0 POLICY REVIEW

9.1 The University Secretary will review this policy at least once every three years.

10.0 AUTHORITY

10.1 This policy is administered under the authority of the University Secretary.

11.0 INTERPRETATION

11.1 Questions of interpretation or application of this policy or its procedures shall be referred to the President and the Chair of the Board of Governors, who will jointly make a decision which shall be final.

12.0 ASSOCIATED PROCEDURES

12.1 The procedure for this policy are:

12.1.1 Procedures to Develop, Amend, Repeal and Approve University Policies [link];

12.1.2 Appendix A: Instructions to Initiate, Consult, Approve and Announce University Policies [link];

12.1.3 Summary of Steps in the Process to Develop, Amend, and Repeal University Policies [link].

13.0 FORMS AND TEMPLATES

13.1 The forms and templates that must be used for a University Policy and University Procedures are:

13.1.1 SFU Policy Template [link]

13.1.2 SFU Procedure Template [link]
Procedure to Develop, Amend, Repeal and Approve University Policies

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Policies and Procedures

Date

TBD

Number

B 10.00 - Procedures

Date of Last Review/Revision: n/a

Mandated Review: 2023

Policy Authority: University Secretary

Parent Policy: B 10.00 Policy on University Policies and Procedures [link]

1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this procedure is to describe the steps by which University Policies and Procedures are developed, reviewed, amended, repealed and approved. These steps are guided by the University’s governance requirements.

2.0 DEFINITIONS

2.1 Board means the Board of Governors of Simon Fraser University.

2.2 Editorial Amendment means a housekeeping or minor amendment to a policy; it does not require Board approval and includes formatting changes, language changes to improve clarity without changing the meaning, name changes, updating of defunct policies or organizational structure, programs, or positions.

2.3 Mandated Periodic Review means the date by which a University Policy approved by the Board must undergo substantive review to determine whether any changes are needed. Where this date is not specified within the policy, it is the date established by the University Secretary.

2.4 Policy Authority means the President and Vice Chancellor, a Vice President, the University Secretary or the General Counsel who sponsors a policy that falls under their jurisdiction.

2.5 Policy Gazette means Simon Fraser University’s website that serves as the repository for University Policies and Procedures and is maintained by the Office of the University Secretary.
2.6 **Responsible Authority** means the head of an academic or administrative unit responsible and accountable for the development, implementation, maintenance, and review of a University Policy.

2.7 **Substantive Amendment** means a significant amendment to a University Policy and includes: any change to the role or responsibilities assigned to an office, a unit, or a position; any change to the actions that are permitted or prohibited; any change to the rights or responsibilities of an individual; and any change to the Policy Authority. This type of amendment requires Board approval.

2.8 **University Policy** means an official document formally approved by the Board that establishes key requirements and responsibilities and guides or directs the actions of members of the University Community regarding a particular matter.

2.9 **University Procedure** means an official document approved by the Policy Authority that prescribes the method by which a University Policy will be carried out and given effect.

3.0 **PROCEDURE TO PROPOSE NEW UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND TO AMEND UNIVERSITY POLICIES THAT REQUIRE SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS**

3.1 **Identify Need and Initiate Process**

3.1.1 The Responsible Authority identifies the need for a new or amended University Policy.

3.1.2 The Responsible Authority prepares a briefing memo to the Policy Authority, with a copy to the University Secretary and the General Counsel, that identifies, explains or comments on:

   a. why a new policy is needed or why an existing policy requires amendment;
   b. existing University Policies that may apply to, overlap with, or impact upon the policy matter identified;
   c. the legal and regulatory framework that may inform the policy;
   d. the benefits and risks of introducing a new policy or amending an existing one and the implications of not doing so;
   e. any impact on equity, diversity, and inclusiveness;
   f. the measures designed to eliminate or to reduce any identified negative impact on equity, diversity, and inclusiveness;
   g. the probable financial implications;
   h. whether the new or amended policy must go to Senate, or to a Senate Committee, and whether for information or for approval;
   i. key stakeholders;
   j. the consultation plan;
   k. the communications plan; and
   l. the plan for training.

3.1.3 The Policy Authority considers the briefing memo and, after consulting with the University Secretary and the General Counsel, directs the Responsible Authority whether to proceed with the proposed new or amended policy.

3.1.4 If the Policy Authority directs the Responsible Authority to proceed, the Responsible Authority prepares the proposed new or amended draft policy and provides it to the
Policy Authority, the University Secretary, and the General Counsel for review, with the draft procedures.

3.1.5 The Policy Authority tables the briefing memo and the draft policy and procedures for discussion at a meeting of the University Executive.


3.2 Community Consultation

3.2.1 After University Executive approval, the Policy Authority is responsible for consulting with the community about the draft policy and procedures and for determining the scope and timing of the consultation.

3.2.2 In all cases the Policy Authority submits the draft policy and procedures with a consultation message to the Office of the University Secretary to post on the Policy Gazette website for community input.

3.2.3 The Policy Authority decides in the circumstances of each case and informs the University Secretary whether consultation with key stakeholders and the university community will proceed concurrently or in sequential order.

3.2.4 The Policy Authority undertakes the consultation with key stakeholders.

3.2.5 The Office of the University Secretary posts the proposed new or amended policy on the Policy Gazette website under Draft Policies and sends the consultation message to the University community on behalf of the Policy Authority, inviting input.

3.2.6 The Responsible Authority compiles and considers the input received and prepares a post-consultation briefing memo for the Policy Authority summarizing the input received and any recommended changes to the draft policy arising from the input.

3.2.7 The Responsible Authority provides the post-consultation briefing memo to the Policy Authority, the University Secretary and the General Counsel, accompanied by a revised draft of the new or amended policy and a separate copy of that revised draft policy tracking any proposed changes.

3.2.8 See Appendix A [link] for detailed step-by-step instructions and considerations.

3.3 Approval and Dissemination

3.3.1 Following the community consultation and review by General Counsel, the Policy Authority approves the draft policy and tables it for discussion and approval at a meeting of the University Executive.

3.3.2 After University Executive approval, the Policy Authority prepares the Board submission requesting Board approval of the new or amended policy.
3.3.3 The Responsible Authority obtains the necessary approvals and signatures to add the draft policy to the Board agenda, with the exception of the President's signature which will be obtained by the Board Office.

3.3.4 The Board considers the proposed new or amended policy and decides whether to approve it.

3.3.5 After formal approval by the Board, the Board Office notifies the Policy Authority, Responsible Authority, University Secretary, and General Counsel.

3.3.6 The Responsible Authority provides the community announcement to the Office of the University Secretary.

3.3.7 The University Secretary assigns the new or revised policy a Policy or Revision Number. The Office of the University Secretary documents and maintains a tracking record of the policy history, posts the approved new or amended policy on the Policy Gazette website, and sends an announcement to the University community and key stakeholders informing them of the approved new or amended policy.

4.0 PROCEDURE TO MAKE EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING POLICIES

4.1 Identify Need and Initiate Process

4.1.1 The Responsible Authority or the University Secretary identifies the need for editorial amendments to an existing University Policy.

4.1.2 The Responsible Authority submits a request and explanation to the University Secretary about proposed editorial amendments to a University Policy accompanied by a revised version of the University Policy showing tracked changes.

4.2 Approval and Dissemination

4.2.1 The University Secretary, after consulting with the Responsible Authority, approves the editorial amendments to the policy.

4.2.2 The Office of the University Secretary documents and maintains a tracking record of the policy history.

4.2.3 The Office of the University Secretary updates the policy on the Policy Gazette website and sends an announcement to the University community and, when necessary, to key stakeholders, informing them of the editorial amendments.

5.0 PROCEDURE TO REPEAL A UNIVERSITY POLICY

5.1 Identify Need and Initiate Process

5.1.1 The Responsible Authority identifies a University Policy to be repealed.

5.1.2 The Responsible Authority consults with the University Secretary about the proposed repeal.
5.1.3 If the University Secretary agrees with the proposed repeal, the Responsible Authority prepares a briefing memo to the Policy Authority explaining why the policy is superseded or obsolete and should be repealed.

5.1.4 The Policy Authority tables the briefing memo for discussion at a meeting of the University Executive.

5.2 Approval and Dissemination

5.2.1 After University Executive approval, the Policy Authority prepares the Board submission requesting Board approval to repeal the policy. The Board submission must be provided to the Board Office and must include a background memo, Board cover sheet and include a copy of the policy.

5.2.2 The Responsible Authority obtains the necessary approvals and signatures to add the policy to be repealed to the Board agenda, with the exception of the President's signature which will be obtained by the Board Office.

5.2.3 The Board considers the request and decides whether to approve repeal of the policy.

5.2.4 After formal approval by the Board, the Board Office notifies the Policy Authority, Responsible Authority, University Secretary, and General Counsel.

5.2.5 The Office of the University Secretary documents and maintains the tracking record of the policy history, removes the policy from the Policy Gazette website, and sends an announcement to the University community and key stakeholders informing them of the repeal.

6.0 RELATED LEGAL AND POLICY AUTHORITIES

6.1 The legal and other University Policy authorities and agreements that may bear on the administration of this policy and may be consulted as needed include but are not limited to:

a. University Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 468 [link]

b. GP 30 Interpretation Policy [link]

b. B 10.00 Policy on University Policies and Procedures [link]

c. Appendix A: Instructions to Initiate, Consult, Approve and Announce University Policies [link]

d. Summary of Steps in the Process to Develop, Amend, and Repeal University Policies [link]

7.0 FORMS AND TEMPLATES

7.1 The forms and templates that must be used for University Policy and Procedures are:

7.1.1 SFU Policy Template [link]
7.1.2 SFU Procedure Template [link]
Appendix A - Instructions to Initiate, Consult, Approve and Announce University Policies

1.0 PURPOSE

These guidelines are intended to provide detailed step-by-step instructions to assist the Responsible Authority and the Policy Authority to move a proposed new policy, or substantive amendments to an existing University Policy, through each stage of the process.

2.0 PROCEDURE TO PROPOSE NEW UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND TO AMEND POLICIES THAT REQUIRE SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS

2.1 Identify Need and Initiate Process

When the Responsible Authority has identified the need for a new or amended policy, the Responsible Authority will:

2.1.1 Identify which governance bodies (i.e. University Executive, Senate, Board of Governors) need to be involved in the policy development, review, and approval process and at what stage(s). If uncertain, consult with the University Secretary’s Office, the Senate Assistant, and the Board Office.

2.1.2 Review the existing policy and any related University Policies to identify who has a vested interest in the policy and why (for example, AVPA, Deans, Chairs and Directors of academic departments, administrative managers of academic or non-academic departments, Student Services, Facilities Services, IT Services, unions, etc.)

2.1.3 Identify whether this is a multi-campus issue that should involve Executive Directors at SFU Surrey and SFU Vancouver.

2.1.4 Prepare a briefing memo that comments on all of the matters listed in section 3.1.1 of the Procedures. The briefing memo is intended to be comprehensive and thorough, so that all of the relevant considerations have been identified and addressed early in the process. This will create a more efficient and informed process at subsequent stages.
2.1.5 The briefing memo must identify, explain or comment on:

a. why a new policy is needed or why an existing policy requires amendment;
b. existing University Policies that may apply to, overlap with, or impact upon the policy matter identified;
c. the legal and regulatory framework that may inform the policy;
d. the benefits and risks of introducing a new policy or amending an existing one and the implications of not doing so;
e. any impact on equity, diversity, and inclusiveness;
f. the measures designed to eliminate or to reduce any identified negative impact on equity, diversity, and inclusiveness;
g. the probable financial implications;
h. whether the new or amended policy must go to Senate, or to a Senate Committee, and whether for information or for approval;
i. key stakeholders;
j. the consultation plan;
k. the communications plan; and
l. the plan for training.

2.1.6 Provide the briefing memo to the Policy Authority, with a copy to the University Secretary and the General Counsel, for consideration and direction.

2.1.7 If directed by the Policy Authority to proceed, use the policy and procedures template posted on the Policy Gazette website to prepare a draft of the new or revised policy and its separate but associated procedures. Also prepare related documents that are needed to give effect to the policy such as guidelines, standards, forms, and templates. The draft procedures must be approved by the Policy Authority and must accompany the proposed policy at each stage of the process.

2.1.8 Provide the draft policy and associated procedures to the University Secretary and to General Counsel for review and comment. Also provide a copy of the briefing memo, for context.

2.1.9 Provide the draft policy and associated procedures to the Policy Authority for review and approval.

2.1.10 Revise the draft policy and associated procedures and/or the briefing memo as directed by the Policy Authority. The Policy Authority will take the briefing memo and the draft policy with its associated procedures forward for discussion at a meeting of the University Executive.

2.1.11 Consult the Senate Assistant regarding the Senate governance process. If the new policy and its associated procedures should go to Senate or to a Senate Committee for information or decision, submit the draft policy and procedures to the Senate Assistant as directed but not until after they have at least been initially considered and approved by the University Executive.
2.2 Community Consultation

2.2.1 After the draft policy and procedures have been considered and approved by University Executive, the Policy Authority is responsible for consulting with the community including determining the scope and timing of the consultation.

2.2.2 In all cases, the Responsible Authority prepares the following for the Office of the University Secretary:

a) A short consultation message to be sent out by email to the SFU community and published on the Policy Gazette website that invites community input. The consultation message should briefly explain why the proposed new or amended policy is needed, what the anticipated result of the changes will be and how it will affect the community, and include a contact name and email address for submitting input with a deadline for receipt of written input (usually 2-4 weeks after posting);

b) A list of key stakeholders (individuals, unions, organizations or groups) and the email addresses to which the consultation message is to be sent. If the new or revised policy needs student consultation, the Responsible Authority must coordinate with the appropriate contact in Student Services;

c) A copy of each of the new or revised policies in both PDF and Word format with tracked changes or a red line version. If the revisions are extensive, also provide a clean copy of the new or revised policy;

d) A copy of the procedures associated with the policy; and

e) Instructions about the sequence for notifying key stakeholders and the community about the policy consultation.

2.2.3 Allow 2-3 business days from receipt of the above by the Office of the University Secretary and posting on the Policy Gazette website.

2.3 Approval and Dissemination

Following community consultation, the Responsible Authority will:

2.3.1 Redraft the policy as necessary based on community input. If minimal input is received, the Responsible Authority may consider undertaking a second community consultation.

2.3.2 Prepare a post-consultation briefing memo for the Policy Authority describing the stakeholders consulted, a summary of the input received, and what input (if any) was accepted and incorporated in the draft policy.

2.3.3 Provide the final draft of the proposed new or amended policy and associated procedures to the University Secretary and to General Counsel for review and comment. Provide each of them with a copy of the post-consultation briefing memo, for context.

2.3.4 Provide the post-consultation briefing memo to the Policy Authority together with the final draft policy and associated procedures, for review and approval. The Policy
Authority will take the post-consultation briefing memo and the final draft of the proposed new or amended policy and associated procedures forward for discussion and approval at a meeting of the University Executive.

2.3.5 After University Executive approval, and if instructed to do so by the Senate Assistant, the Responsible Authority will, through the Policy Authority, submit the final draft of the proposed new or amended policy and associated procedures to the Senate Assistant for submission to Senate or to a Senate Committee, as required, for information or approval.

2.3.6 Prepare a Board submission requesting Board approval of a new or amended policy. The Board submission must be provided to the Board Assistant in the Board Office and must include a background memo, Board cover sheet and the final draft of the proposed new or amended policy and associated procedures. An amended University Policy must be presented by including both a revised version of the policy and a version of the revised policy showing tracked changes.

Please note:

a. Amendments cannot be made to a University Policy after the Board approves it except for minor editorial and formatting changes.

b. The Board Office will notify the Policy Authority, Responsible Authority, University Secretary, and General Counsel of the Board’s decision.

2.3.7 After formal approval by the Board, provide a brief community announcement to the Office of the University Secretary for distribution on behalf of the Board. The Office of the University Secretary documents and maintains a tracking record of the policy history, posts the approved new or amended policy on the Policy Gazette website, and sends an announcement to the University community and key stakeholders informing them of the approved new or amended policy on behalf of the Board.
SUMMARY OF PROCEDURAL STEPS: B 10.00 Policy on University Policies and Procedures

This document is divided into three sections:

1. steps to propose new University Policies or to amend existing University Policies that require substantive amendment;
2. steps to make editorial changes to University Policies; and
3. steps to repeal University Policies.

This summary of steps is intended to provide a quick overview of the above processes. Please read it in conjunction with SFU’s B 10.00 Policy on University Policies and Procedures [link], B 10.00 Procedure to Develop, Amend, Repeal and Approve University Policies [link], and Appendix A: Instructions to Initiate, Consult, Approve and Announce University Policies [link].

The Responsible Authority should review University Policies and Procedures regularly and at minimum on the Mandated Review Date to ensure they remain relevant and compliant with legal, reporting, or other requirements. The Responsible Authority should also review University Procedures whenever technological, operational, organizational, or other changes occur, to ensure the procedures remain accurate.

SECTION 1

STEPS TO PROPOSE NEW POLICIES AND TO AMEND POLICIES THAT REQUIRE SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify the need for a new policy or for substantive amendments to an existing University Policy.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consult with Senate Assistant to determine whether proposed new policy or amendments to existing policy must go to Senate or to a Senate Committee, and if so, confirm whether the policy will be presented for information only or for decision. Follow instructions from the Senate Assistant about what is required, and when.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prepare briefing memo of reasons for new policy (or policy amendment) and related considerations (see section 3.1.2 of Procedures for a list of items to consider).</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Send briefing memo to Policy Authority, with a copy to the University Secretary and to the General Counsel.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Consider briefing memo and, in consultation with the University Secretary and General Counsel, direct Responsible Authority whether to proceed with proposal.</td>
<td>Policy Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Draft the new policy (or the amendments to the existing University Policy).</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare associated procedures and other related documents such as templates and guidelines.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provide draft policy and procedures to the University Secretary and the General Counsel for comment. Include a copy of the briefing memo, for context.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Provide draft policy and procedures to the Policy Authority for approval.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Revise draft policy, procedures, and/or briefing memo as directed by the Policy Authority.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Table briefing memo and draft policy and procedures at University Executive meeting and obtain Executive approval.</td>
<td>Policy Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>After Executive approval, provide draft policy and procedures and consultation message to University Secretary's Office.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Inform University Secretary whether consultation with key stakeholders and university community will proceed concurrently or sequentially.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Post the draft policy and procedures on SFU Policy Gazette website.</td>
<td>University Secretary's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Send consultation message to university community on behalf of the Policy Authority.</td>
<td>University Secretary's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Compile and consider community input.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Prepare post-consultation briefing memo and make any recommended changes to the draft policy and procedures.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Provide post-consultation briefing memo and revised draft policy and procedures to Policy Authority, University Secretary and General Counsel for comment.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Approve post-consultation revised draft policy and procedures.</td>
<td>Policy Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Table post consultation briefing memo and revised draft policy and procedures at University Executive meeting and obtain Executive approval.</td>
<td>Policy Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>After approval by Executive, prepare Board submission.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Provide Board submission to Board Office.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Consider Board submission and make recommendation to Board.</td>
<td>University Secretary and Board Governance and Nominating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Consider submission and recommendation; decide whether to approve the new policy (or the substantive amendments to an existing policy).</td>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Notify Policy Authority, Responsible Authority, University Secretary, and General Counsel about Board decision.</td>
<td>Board Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Add the approved new policy (or amended existing policy) to SFU Policy Gazette; include link to Procedures.</td>
<td>University Secretary’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Send announcement to university community.</td>
<td>University Secretary’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Update policy history and related tracking records.</td>
<td>University Secretary’s Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2

STEPS TO MAKE AN EDITORIAL AMENDMENT TO AN EXISTING UNIVERSITY POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify the need for editorial amendment of an existing University Policy.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority or University Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prepare a request and explanation of proposed editorial amendments submit it to the University Secretary (or, if editorial amendment is initiated by University Secretary, consult with Responsible Authority).</td>
<td>Responsible Authority or University Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approve editorial amendments to a University Policy.</td>
<td>University Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Update policy on SFU Policy Gazette.</td>
<td>University Secretary's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Send announcement to university community and notify key stakeholders if necessary.</td>
<td>University Secretary's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Update policy history and related tracking records.</td>
<td>University Secretary's Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 3

STEPS TO REPEAL A UNIVERSITY POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify the need to repeal a University Policy and consult with University Secretary.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prepare briefing memo of reasons for repeal and send to Policy Authority.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Table briefing memo at University Executive meeting and obtain Executive approval.</td>
<td>Policy Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>After approval by Executive, prepare Board submission.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide Board submission to Board Office.</td>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Consider Board submission and make recommendation to Board.</td>
<td>University Secretary and Board Governance and Nominating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Consider request and decide whether to repeal the University Policy.</td>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Notify Policy Authority, Responsible Authority, University Secretary, and General Counsel about Board decision.</td>
<td>Board Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Remove repealed University Policy from SFU Policy Gazette.</td>
<td>University Secretary’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Send announcement to university community.</td>
<td>University Secretary’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Update policy history and related tracking records.</td>
<td>University Secretary’s Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Insert Policy Title

**SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Policy and Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Last Review/Revision</th>
<th>Mandated Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Policy Authority:** [Insert here the position title of the Policy Authority]

**Associated Procedure(s):** [Insert here the number and title of the policy’s corresponding procedure]

**A / AD / B / GP / I / R / S / T**

Use the appropriate policy prefix according to which category this policy will likely be classified within the Policy Gazette. This is a required data element. The University Secretariat will assign the appropriate number to the policy.

**Policy Title**

*Is a descriptive title for the policy, which clearly and succinctly communicates the primary subject matter that is dealt with by the policy.*

**Section Numbering**

*Beginning with the first relevant data element and continuing to the last data element, number each section heading and paragraph within that section sequentially using the following format:*

**Level One — Section Heading:**

1.0 PREAMBLE
2.0 PRINCIPLES
3.0 PURPOSE
4.0 Etc.

**Level Two — Paragraph:**

1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, etc.

**Level Three — Sub-Paragraph:**

1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3.1, 1.4.1, etc.

**Level Four — Sub-Sub Paragraph:**

a., b., c., d., etc.

**Level Five — Sub-Sub-Sub Paragraph:**

i., ii., iii., iv., etc.
1.0 PREAMBLE

1.1 Any preliminary contextual statements needed to introduce or establish the circumstances within which the policy is set. This is a discretionary data element.

2.0 PRINCIPLES

2.1 Statements of principle are intended to express fundamental truths or propositions that serve as the foundation for the policy rules. The principles convey the overarching culture and values that frame the policy. A policy has either a preamble or principles but not both. This is a discretionary data element.

3.0 PURPOSE

3.1 Whether narrowly defined (e.g., regulation of university trade-marks) or comprehensive (e.g., sustainability), the purpose statement sets out why the policy exists and what it is intended to achieve. Purpose and Preamble is sometimes the same thing, in which case use “Purpose”. This is a required data element.

4.0 SCOPE and JURISDICTION

4.1 Scope explains the extent to which the Policy applies within the institution to its departments, functions, programs and/or activities. This is a required data element.

5.0 DEFINITIONS

5.1 Define key terms used in the policy, expressing their exact meaning to ensure they are correctly understood within the policy. This is a discretionary data element.

6.0 POLICY

6.1 Policy statements translate the broad purpose into concrete, clearly defined courses of action. They articulate major decisions the institution has made about its mandate/mission and how it will pursue them. Policies should state what the key decisions are regulating an activity, clearly and succinctly, and who is responsible for carrying out those decisions in order for the policy to be implemented effectively. This is a required data element.

7.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

7.1 As each policy in some way governs the institution and its activities, it is necessary also to declare who is expressly responsible for monitoring or otherwise carrying out those activities. The range of responsibilities can vary greatly depending on the kind of policy. Some policies are administered by a single person/role, while others involve committees, and the broadest charge the entire university community with shared responsibility. This is a required data element but, in the alternative, may be included instead under the procedures data element.
8.0 REPORTING

8.1 This section identifies the legislated or policy requirement to produce a report and describes who is responsible to prepare the report, how frequently, what minimum information the report is to contain and to who the report is submitted. This is a required data element if relevant but, in the alternative, may be included instead under the policy and procedures data elements.

9.0 RELATED LEGAL, POLICY AUTHORITIES AND AGREEMENTS

9.1 This section identifies other legal and policy authorities and agreements (e.g., collective agreement) related to administering this policy that should be consulted because they are interconnected. This is a required data element if relevant.

10.0 ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

10.1 This section reminds those individuals invoking the policy that the information and records created under the policy are administered subject to British Columbia's Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and the University's information policies. This is a required data element if relevant (e.g., a policy governing a process that documents confidential or personal information).

11.0 RETENTION AND DISPOSAL OF RECORDS

11.1 This section identifies the authority and procedure for managing the retention and disposal of records created under the policy. This is a required data element if relevant (e.g., a policy governing an investigative or adjudicative process that creates case files).

12.0 POLICY REVIEW

12.1 This section identifies the frequency of undertaking a cyclical review of the policy. This is a required data element.

13.0 AUTHORITY

13.1 This section identifies the university executive officer with line authority for the policy and under whom the policy is administered. This is a required data element.

14.0 INTERPRETATION

14.1 This section identifies the executive officer(s) to whom questions of interpretation or application of the policy and its procedures are directed and whose decision is final. This is a required data element.

15.0 ASSOCIATED PROCEDURES

14.1 This section identifies by title a list of the procedural documents associated with this policy and are each a hyperlink to the related material. This is a required data element when there are associated procedures.
Include by providing hyperlinks to related policy documents:

PROCEDURE (separate linked document)

Procedure and its related data elements (see below) are used for information that is lengthy or liable to change more frequently than the policy itself. This section describes the sequence of actions that implement the policy, with detailed step-by-step instructions. It includes any procedures named in the policy and required to carry out the policy. Procedures should state clearly and succinctly how the persons responsible are to carry out the policy decisions in order for the policy to be implemented effectively. Separate procedures can be written for each role that has distinct responsibilities under a policy. This is a required data element.

Generally speaking, the following types of policy documents are used when policy and procedure are complicated and more detailed instruction is needed to support the effective implementation of the policy.

APPENDIX (A, B, C...AA, BB, CC...)

Information linked to a policy and procedure that includes detailed instructions describing how to apply a specific point of policy that may differ according to the circumstances (e.g., the application of fair dealing in a variety of situations) and the specific assignment of roles and responsibilities established in the policy (e.g., an advisory committee’s terms of reference); typically used for information that is lengthy or liable to change more frequently than the policy itself as a result of experience, legislative change, legal precedent or other circumstance. Standardize the labelling of Appendices using capital letters. This is a discretionary data element.

SCHEDULE (A, B, C...AA, BB, CC...)

Information linked to a policy and procedure that sets out in detail a specific point referred to in the policy (e.g., identifying organizations that do and do not fall within the scope of the policy); typically used to increase certainty and avoid misunderstanding, for information that is lengthy or liable to change more frequently than the policy itself. Standardize the labelling of Schedules using capital letters. This is a discretionary data element.

STANDARD

Information linked to a policy and procedure that provides criteria for use in situations that require the exercise of discretion and judgment (e.g. if x is the case, do y; but is x the case?). Standards supply "rules of thumb", factors to consider, etc. to support sound and consistent decision-making in the context of the policy. This is a discretionary data element.

GUIDELINE

Information linked to a policy and procedure that sets out a policy in a more general narrative discussion, typically aimed at an external audience (e.g., to provide an overview, explain its rationale or impact, indicate options and resources available to users). This is a discretionary data element.
FORMS AND TEMPLATES

Information linked to a policy and procedure. Forms provide a standardized format for collecting the same information during the course of the procedures. Templates provide a standardized format for communicating information during the course of the procedures. Templates function as "boilerplate" texts that can be adapted to particular circumstances as required (e.g., letter, agreement, report). This is a discretionary data element.
[Insert Procedure Title]

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY Date Number
Policy and Procedures

Date of Last Review/Revision: Mandated Review:

Policy Authority: [Insert here the position title of the Policy Authority]

Parent Policy: [Insert here the number and title of the procedure’s parent policy]

A / AD / B / GP / I / R / S / T

Use the appropriate prefix that corresponds to the category of the policy under which this procedure falls within the Policy Gazette. This is a required data element. The University Secretariat will assign the appropriate number to the procedure.

Procedure Title

Is a descriptive title for the policy, which clearly and succinctly communicates the primary subject matter that is dealt with by the policy.

Section Numbering

Beginning with the first relevant data element and continuing to the last data element, number each section heading and paragraph within that section sequentially using the following format:

Level One – Section Heading: 1.0 PREAMBLE 2.0 PRINCIPLES 3.0 PURPOSE 4.0 Etc.
Level Two – Paragraph: 1.1, 1.2., 1.3, 1.4, etc.
Level Three – Sub-Paragraph 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3.1, 1.4.1, etc.
Level Four – Sub-Sub Paragraph: a., b., c., d., etc.
Level Five – Sub-Sub-Sub Paragraph: i., ii., iii., iv., etc.
1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 Whether narrowly defined (e.g., regulation of university trade-marks) or comprehensive (e.g., sustainability), the purpose statement sets out why the procedure exists and what it is intended to achieve. This is a required data element.

2.0 DEFINITIONS

2.1 Define key terms used in the procedure, expressing their exact meaning to ensure they are correctly understood within the procedure. This is a discretionary data element.

3.0 PROCEDURE

3.1 Procedure and its related data elements (see below) are used for information that is lengthy or liable to change more frequently than the policy itself. This section describes the sequence of actions that implement the policy, with detailed step-by-step instructions. It includes any procedures named in the policy and required to carry out the policy. Procedures should state clearly and succinctly how the persons responsible are to carry out the policy decisions in order for the policy to be implemented effectively. Separate procedures can be written for each role that has distinct responsibilities under a policy. This is a required data element.

4.0 RELATED LEGAL, POLICY AUTHORITIES AND AGREEMENTS

4.1 This section identifies other legal and policy authorities related to administering this procedure that should be consulted because they are interconnected. This is a required data element if relevant.

Generally speaking, the following types of policy documents are used when policy and procedure are complicated and more detailed instruction is needed to support the effective implementation of the policy.

APPENDIX (A, B, C...AA, BB, CC...)

Information linked to a policy and procedure that includes detailed instructions describing how to apply a specific point of policy that may differ according to the circumstances (e.g., the application of fair dealing in a variety of situations) and the specific assignment of roles and responsibilities established in the policy (e.g., an advisory committee's terms of reference); typically used for information that is lengthy or liable to change more frequently than the policy itself as a result of experience, legislative change, legal precedent or other circumstance. Standardize the labelling of Appendices using capital letters. This is a discretionary data element.

SCHEDULE (A, B, C...AA, BB, CC...)

Information linked to a policy and procedure that sets out in detail a specific point referred to in the policy or procedure (e.g., identifying organizations that do and do not fall within the scope of the policy); typically used to increase certainty and avoid misunderstanding, for information that is lengthy or liable to change more frequently than the policy itself. Standardize the labelling of Schedules using capital letters. This is a discretionary data element.
STANDARD

Information linked to a policy and procedure that provides criteria for use in situations that require the exercise of discretion and judgment (e.g. if x is the case, do y; but is x the case?). Standards supply "rules of thumb", factors to consider, etc. to support sound and consistent decision-making in the context of the policy. This is a discretionary data element.

GUIDELINE

Information linked to a policy and procedure that sets out a policy in a more general narrative discussion, typically aimed at an external audience (e.g., to provide an overview, explain its rationale or impact, indicate options and resources available to users). This is a discretionary data element.

FORMS AND TEMPLATES

Information linked to a policy and procedure. Forms provide a standardized format for collecting the same information during the course of the procedures. Templates provide a standardized format for communicating information during the course of the procedures. Templates function as "boilerplate" texts that can be adapted to particular circumstances as required (e.g., letter, agreement, report). This is a discretionary data element.