# SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY <br> Senate Committee on University Priorities Memorandum 

TO: Senate<br>RE: School of Criminology External Review

FROM:

DATE:


August 8, 2003

The Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP) has reviewed the External Review Report on the School of Criminology together with the response from the School and comments from the Dean of Arts.

Motion:
That Senate concurs with the recommendations from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the School of Criminology on priority items resulting from the external review as outlined in s.03-78

The report of the External Review Committee for the School of Criminology was submitted on November 15, 2002 following the review site visit October 2-4, 2002. The response of the School was received on March 10, 2003 followed by that of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts on March 19, 2003.

SCUP recommends to Senate that the School of Criminology and the Dean of Arts be advised to pursue the following as priority items:

## Undergraduate Studies

SCUP has been advised that the School has already taken a number of steps to improve course accessibility while maintaining undergraduate enrollments including:

- Increasing the number of tutorials
- Increasing the TA budget;
- Offering additional distance education sections of popular undergraduate courses;
- Using funding provided by the Dean to recruit a lecturer which will enable faculty to devote more time to the graduate program.

As a result of the above measures, the School has already seen a decrease in the course full turnaway rates. In future, the School is encouraged to continue to monitor the course full turnaway rates and to explore practical solutions to address them.

With respect to the proposal to develop a Legal Studies minor/diploma option, SCUP has been advised that there will be no significant resources required and that alternative methods of delivery for this program will be explored. SCUP requests that an academic plan (including resource implications) be developed and presented to the Dean but otherwise supports the School's intention to offer a Legal Studies option.

## Graduate Program

SCUP was advised that this year's graduate student intake was very strong and that additional graduate course offerings are now available in the Spring and Fall semesters. The School is urged to work closely with the Dean of Graduate Studies around the issues of the expansion of the PhD program and the development of coursework and executive MA programs. In addition, it is the School's responsibility to ensure that appropriate physical, fiscal and human resources are available to support these initiatives.

## Research

The use of the Criminology Research Centre as a coordinating mechanism for the management of the numerous and complex research activities of the School is already underway. The Office of Research Services and the School should maintain their dialogue and their experimentation in the area of contract overhead percentages in order to continue to improve communication and understanding between the two areas.

SCUP notes the success of Criminology faculty in obtaining external grants and their good record of publication of monographs and book chapters. However, in view of the comments by the external reviewers, the faculty of the School are encouraged to consider the balance of publication outlets and to submit more of their work to peer reviewed journals.

## Staffing

The School Director and the Dean's Office should meet in order to identify and address the concerns around staffing identified by the review team.

## Relations with Senior University Administrators

SCUP is of the opinion that the earlier issues around grant overheads and ethics that may have contributed to this recommendation have since been resolved. In view of the vagueness of the external reviewers' recommendation, the Director of the School is advised to consult with faculty members to see if any particular issues need to be addressed and to deal with them accordingly.
encl.
c: R. Gordon, Director, School of Criminology
J. Pierce, Dean of Arts

# SIMONFRASERUNIVERSITY <br> SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY <br> MEMORANDUM 

TO: All members of SCUP
FROM: Dr. Robert Gordon, Director, School of Criminology
RE: External Review Response
DATE: June 24, 2003

Please find attached a breakdown of the output of the School's faculty since 1996. I have provided separate sheets covering the areas of research funding, publication of books, publication of book chapters, and publication of peer reviewed journal articles.

Please note that the research funding does not include contracted research activity that is not administered by the University. Several faculty undertake extensive research under these kinds of arrangements. The breakdown also does not include funding to Centres and Institutes (e.g. the Centre for Restorative Justice) which conduct research as part of their mandate.

The peer reviewed journals do not include the two journals mentioned by the reviewers, but do include other national and international journals which are considered to be of importance for those working in particular fields (e.g. the International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, the British Journal of Criminology, and the Canadian Journal of Aging).

Other publications ((e.g. reports) are not listed.
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# SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY Office of the Dean, Faculty of Arts MEMORANDUM 

To: John Waterhouse VP Academic

From:
John T. Pierce foademic
Dean of Arts
Date: March 18, 2003

## Introduction

In general, this is a very positive review which speaks favourably of Criminology's leadership, the quality of its faculty and students, research productivity and capacity to manage change. An overarching concern was expressed about "the difficulties the School is currently facing in sorting out priorities about its resources and programs." A number of recommendations and suggestions are made to improve the situation. I wish to comment upon these within the structure of the external review report and the context of the School's response to the report.

## Undergraduate Studies

The review team believed that the undergraduate program should be pared back in order to redirect resources to the graduate program. I support the . School's conclusion that this is an ill-advised strategy. This would be a disservice to many qualified students trying to enter Criminology and to the Faculty of Arts which must maintain its share of enrollments. The School has put forward some practical, low-cost solutions to maintaining enrollments, such as hiring a lecturer, expanding the TA budget, revising pedagogy, reviewing enrollment caps, and exploring the use of more distance education courses.

The School also believes it has the capacity to undertake a Legal Studies program. I would not support this unless and until there is a proper business plan that weighs the benefits of this initiative against the cost in time and money to the Graduate Program.

## Graduate Program

The School wishes to expand the size of the PhD program which I would support so long as certain conditions are met relating to resource issues such as space, financial resources and supervisory capabilities. The Dean of Graduate Studies should be consulted on the feasability of such a move.

The review team recommended, and the School concurs, that graduate students should not be involved in admission and funding decisions of their existing and possible future cohorts.

If the graduate program is to expand, more graduate courses must be offered. The School supports the recommendation of the review team in this regard and believes there is existing and latent potential to do so.

At the MA level, there is also support for a coursework MA and an Executive MA. This can only be done after careful and close consultation with the Dean of Graduate Studies. Certainly the prospect of premium fees for the Executive MA could influence the comparative viability of this program.

## Research

Given the number of Research Centres and Institutes functioning within Criminology, the review team wisely suggested a co-ordinating mechanism. This is now being done through the Criminology Research Centre.

The review team observed that notwithstanding the scholarly activity and productivity of members of the School, more effort could be devoted to publishing in "high prestige peer reviewed journals". This concern has been communicated to faculty. Clearly more could be done in this area although I have been assured by the Director that peer reviewed journal articles remain an important part of the publishing record. I might also add that given the success of faculty in SSHRC grant competitions, external referees do not necessarily share this concern.

On the subject of contracts and grants, the review team identified communicative problems between ORS and faculty within Criminology. ORS was seen as a bottleneck with researchers responding by taking their grants and contracts outside the University. The Response to the External Review suggests that actions have been taken to improve the situation over the next two years.

## Staffing

A reference is made to "dramatically increased workloads and staff stress". My office will be working with Criminology to determine the origins and solutions to these problems.

## Governance

I believe the present Director has done a commendable job at building consensus and fostering a co-operative and collegial environment.

## Relations with Senior University Administrators

Given the lack of specifics in this section, I am unable to comment. The Dean's office has had a positive and close working relationship with Criminology. I will leave it to SCUP to determine if any further action needs to be taken with respect to some other senior University administrator(s).


John T. Pierce
JTP/rt
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Cc: T. Perry, Associate Dean, Arts } \\ & \text { R. Gordon, Director, School of Criminology }\end{array}$

# SIMONFRASERUNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY 

XVEXORANDUM

| To: | Dr. John Pierce, Dean of Arts <br> Ms. Laurie Summers, Director, Academic Planning |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Dr. Robert Gordon, Director, School of Criminology |
| Re: | External Review Report |
| Date: | March 7, 2003 |

Please find attached a copy of the School's response to the above captioned report.


## SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY

## RESPONSE TO EXTERNAL REVIEW

Robert M. Gordon, Ph.D., Professor and Director.<br>Paul Brantingham, J.D., Professor and Associate Director (Graduate Programme) Gail Anderson, Ph.D., Associate Professor and Associate Director (Undergraduate Programme).

## INTRODUCTION

The School is pleased to receive what we consider to be an overall positive evaluation by the external review team. Appropriate notice has been taken of the various comments, criticisms and suggestions offered by the reviewers and their sage advice on a number of matters and issues affecting the School.

The School is particularly grateful to the reviewers for their invaluable advice on aspects of the School's programmes, particularly the proposed new programmes in the graduate area.

The external review report has been examined and discussed by the School's three main committees: the Executive Committee; the Undergraduate Programme Committee; and the Graduate Programme Committee. The responses to the reviewers' recommendations that follow are based upon the deliberations and conclusions of those committees.

## RECOMMENDATION 1

It is recommended that the School reduce the number of courses offered at the undergraduate level even at the cost of reducing its overall number of undergraduate students. This also means living with a rate of student(course) turn away that is higher than that of many other disciplines. Reducing the number of courses could be compensated in part by increasing the number of students in the distance education courses, in the ethics courses, and in the field practice.

This recommendation suggests that the School should reduce the number of courses offered at the undergraduate level and so reduce the number of students in the programme. The reviewers suggest that the turn-away rate, presently one of the highest in the Faculty of Arts, should be simply accepted. The goal of this recommendation is to divert faculty currently teaching in the undergraduate programme to graduate teaching to enable the School to increase the number of courses offered at the graduate level. This will allow more graduate (particularly Ph.D.) students to be admitted.

While we agree that support does need to be given to the Graduate Programme, we disagree most strongly that this should be done at the expense of the Undergraduate Programme The Undergraduate Programme is very strong, extremely popular and very successful. Its popularity is clearly reflected in the high tum-away rate and reducing this turn-away rate has been, and continues to be, a concern of the School and the Dean of Ars.
There are several reasons why a reduction in the size of the Undergraduate Programme would be inappropriate:

- Reducing undergraduate classes would reduce the pool of students who intend to enter our graduate programme.
- Reducing undergraduate classes would reduce the number of T.A. and T.M. positions available for graduate students, the majority of whom rely upon such positions for financial support while in the programme.
- A reduction in undergraduate classes would fly in the face of larger University policies of increasing access.

The School feels that there are several ways in which the size of the Undergraduate Programme can be maintained, and even increased to reduce the course tum-away rate, while simultaneously providing more teaching resources for the graduate programme.

- The School, like other departments, could hire at least one lecturer to teach between six and eight undergraduate courses each year. This would immediately allow interested faculty to shift from undergraduate to graduate teaching.
- Interested faculty should receive tutorial relief (i.e., three contact hours) if they are willing to teach a three contact hour graduate seminar course in addition to their assigned two courses per semester. This is an effective and relatively low cost way of mounting more graduate courses and is a popular option amongst some faculty members. However, it will require an appropriate increase in the numbers of funded T.A. base units. Significantly, the availability of new base units would ensure that the increased numbers of graduate students entering the programme receive financial support.
- Popular undergraduate courses are being reviewed to determine whether enrolment can be increased. This includes re-assessing seminar classes, presently capped at 25 students, to determine whether they can be converted into lecture/tutorial courses. The ultimate enrolment limits would depend upon increases in the number of T.A. base units but increased numbers of tutorials will mean increased financial support for graduate students.
- Some existing courses are being considered for development as Distance Education courses, as well as for on-campus delivery. This will serve to increase the number of course spaces as well as the number of T.M.
positions available for our graduate students. Faculty are being approached to determine their interest in either writing a Distance Education version of a course themselves, or supervising a graduate student to write the course, based upon the on-campus version.
- The enrolment in Crim. 369 (the ethics course) has been expanded from 36 to 50 students and is currently under development as a Distance Education course.
- During the Spring 2003 registration period we made a concerted effort to address the course full turn-away rate by adding tutorial/lab sections where possible in some courses, and by increasing the maximum enrolment in others. As a result, there was a significant reduction in our turn-away rate. However, in order to continue with this reduction the School will need an increase in the numbers of T.A. base units.


## RECOMMENDATION 2

No new undergraduate programme that would require additional resources should be undertaken.

This is a reference to a proposed major in Legal Studies.
The School agrees that in a time of scarce resources priorities should shift to the areas of greatest need in the School (i.e., the graduate programme). Nevertheless, we believe that a Legal Studies programme at the undergraduate level should be started beginning with a low cost option in the form of a clearly defined minor in Legal Studies coupled with a P.B. Diploma in Legal Studies. The minor and the diploma will cover essentially the same ground and will require no new faculty resources or other resources.
The Legal Studies major programme had been approved, in principle, by School faculty prior to the external review and was to be built, primarily, from existing courses in criminology and other departments for which the new programme would act as an umbrella. Some new courses may be required and some courses may need to be offered more frequently if the idea of a major in Legal Studies is pursued. A minor/diploma could be offered with no new courses and, therefore, no new resources.

The minor/diploma programme would be re-assessed after a period of time to determine its success and, if popularity and resources allowed, the programme could be expanded to include a major/honours programme in Legal Studies.
The targeted commencement date for the minor/diploma in Legal Studies is September 2004.

## RECOMMENDATION 3

The School of Criminology should admit more graduate students, in particular Ph.D. students. Only academic or pedagogical reasons should justify rejecting applicants meeting the University's standards for admission.

The School agrees with this recommendation. The graduate programme will be expanded through the admission of more students, particularly at the Ph.D. level. We will phase in an increase in Ph .D. students over a two to three year period beginning in September 2003. The size of the increase will be dependent upon the addition of new teaching resources for the programme (see Recommendation 1). An incremental expansion that maintains academic admissions standards and teaching quality is clearly keyed to the availability of space and faculty resources.

## RECOMMENDATION 4

Involving (graduate) students in admission and funding decisions which apply to their colleagues is unethical and introduces Malthusian tendencies in the admission process.

The School has considered this issue as part of a broader adoption of a new, comprehensive Policy and Procedure Manual.

The issue of graduate student involvement in admission and funding decisions was put to a faculty vote following a period set aside for discussion. The ballot was retumed on March $6^{\text {th }}$. Faculty voted to exclude graduate students on the Graduate Programme Committee from admission and funding decisions, and from viewing confidential materials relating to such decisions, and this policy is now part of the School's Policy and Procedure Manual.

## RECOMMENDATION 5

The School should increase the number of courses offered at the graduate level. One way to achieve this would be to redesign and renumber some courses presently offered at the undergraduate level and offer them exclusively as graduate courses. This will lead to an increased participation of faculty in the graduate programs and will address a major problem in the graduate program. To realise this change in a coherent manner, the School will have to rethink its graduate programs.

The School agrees that it must increase the number of courses offered at the graduate level. As a first step, teaching resources have been reallocated in order to increase the number of course offerings for 2003-2004 to provide course work in all specialty areas and to provide advanced level (e.g., Crim 811; Crim 831) offerings for Ph.D. students who have taken their MAs in the School of Criminology. In doing so, we have increased
the number of individual faculty members involved in graduate instruction. In addition, we have begun to rotate teaching assignments to utilise more of our faculty in graduate level instruction.

The School does not agree with the External Review Committee that it is never possible to offer advanced topic seminars in dual advanced undergraduate/ graduate seminar formats. The School notes that this is common practice in many major research universities. We plan to experiment with this approach and will offer one advanced forensics course on this basis during 2003-2004.

## RECOMMENDATION 6

The School should go forward with the projected M.A. by coursework and practicum and the Executive M.A. program but those initiatives should be monitored carefully.

The School will develop both an M.A. by coursework and practicum and an Executive M.A. program over the next two academic years. Proposals will be brought forward through normal channels in due course.

Planning for both the M.A. by coursework and practicum and the Executive M.A. has commenced. The M.A. by coursework and practicum is being developed first, with a target commencement date of September 2004.

The Executive M.A. Programme will be a special cohort programme charging premium fees and will require more extensive development. The target commencement date is September 2005.

Discussions are underway to increase the School's graduate secretary position from part time to full time to accommodate the increased workload.

## RECOMMENDATION 7

The School should consider the creation of a federation of its research centres, institutes and laboratories under the umbrella of the Criminology Research Centre in order to consolidate and share administrative and grant-facilitation resources.

This existing federation has been more clearly defined by clarifying the administrative functions of the Criminology Research Centre. Grants and contracts generated by the various centres and institutes are now administered through the Centre which is supported, in part, by monies retumed from contract overhead charges as well as budgeted administration charges in each grant.

Discussions have been held regarding the feasibility of the Faculty of Arts grants facilitator being available to faculty in the School of Criminology on a scheduled, monthly or bi-monthly basis.

## RECOMMENDATION 8

More faculty should publish in peer reviewed journals.
The School's extremely productive faculty already publishes in peer-reviewed journals. Nevertheless, this recommendation has been passed to faculty who are encouraged to publish further in such places.

## RECOMMENDATION 9

The Office of Research Services should take the initiative to conduct a full scale consultation with the faculty in the School to find ways to smooth the process in which grant and contract projects are processed and to remove bottlenecks in acceptance procedures.

The recommended consultation has started. The School and O.R.S. has reached agreement on a sliding scale of contract overhead percentages which is now in place for an experimental two year period. Further meetings will occur to address other problems as and when required.

## RECOMMENDATION 10

The School of Criminology and (a) Senior Administrator of SFU should make every effort to dissipate misunderstandings and improve their relations with one (an)other.

A mutually beneficial and fruitful meeting has occurred between the School's Executive Committee and a Senior Administrator. The School looks forward to continuing good relations with the individual concerned.

# Report of the External Review Committee on the School of Criminology 

Simon Fraser University

Maurice Cusson<br>Ecole de criminologie<br>Université de Montréal

Leslie W. Kennedy School of Criminal Justice

Rutgers University

Laureen Snider
Departement of Sociology
Queen's University

## Introduction and general overview

To arrive at its conclusions, the External Review Committee consulted the following written sources : 1- The Self Srudy Report of the School of Criminology SFU prepared by the Director, the Associate Directors and the School administrator based upon the deliberations of the School's main committees and a School faculty discussion during a meeting in June 2002; 2- The different appendices attached to the Self-Study; 3- The SFU 2002-2003 Calendar, 4 The Faculty's curriculum vitae; 5-Various other documents, including the drafts outlines of the new programs projected by the School.

In addition, the External Review Committee visited the School site between October 2-4, 2002. During these three days, the Committee met with the SFU senior administrators, the School Director, the School execurive committee, the School research ethics committee, undergraduate and graduate students, and the School's staff. The Committee also met the library's staff and the Director of Research Service.

During those meetings, we were assisted and enlightened by Dr. Nancy Olewiler of the Department of Economics, SFU. Everybody spoke openly and answered our questions in a straightforward manner.

The general impression the committee had from both the written material and the site visit is that the people who make up the School operate, in general, in a collegial way. Faculty members appear enthusiastic and busy, and are involved in a number of interesting, and very different, projects. The School's leadership appears democratic and generally accepted by its members. However, the panel was struck by the difficulties the School is currently facing in sorting out prioriries about its resources and programs. The collegial model of decision making, well established in the School, has been successful in promoting good relations among colleagues (which has been an issue in the past); however it may make it difficult to take the tough decisions necessary to set priorities for the next five year period. The panel believes, given the external and internal pressures on the school, it is now time to make some difficult decisions on reallocating scarce resources.

## I- Undergraduate studies

## 1. The magnitude of the programs

It is obvious that the undergraduate programs put a heavy burden on the shoulders of the faculty and staff of the School of Criminology. Moreover, this burden risks becoming even heavier in the near future, as indicated by the following:

- The average undergraduate FTE in criminology from 1996-2002 was 500-600. Over the last six years, the number of approved majors has ranged from 405-470 with a further 182-278 students declaring an intention to become criminology majors (Self Study Report, p. 23).
- Students are offered a wide variety of programs and degrees: major, major with honours, minor, extended minor, post baccalaureate diploma, general cerificate, advanced certificate. Many of these may be taken in class or by correspondence.
- A wide range and high number of courses are listed in the calendar - in 2002-03, a total of 56 , excluding the practicum, field practice and thesis, were set out.

Over and above this already heavy load, the School plans on increasing enrolments by approximately 10 percent a year. The long term goal is to allow the number of majors, minors, and others to increase until every qualified applicant is automatically admitted (Self Report Study, p. 30).

This plan puts additional strain on a professoriate already putting much energy and time into undergraduate teaching. Increasing the workload in this way, and to this extent, is a matter of grave concern for the committee. Inevitably it will drain resources, leaving only scraps for the graduate studies and for research. The review committee of 1995 recognized the danger of this strategy at that time, and advised: "There is no need for the SFU School of Criminology to be consumer driven: they have, and will continue to have more "consumers" than they can accommodate" (p. 9).

We agree. Moreover we question the assumption that increasing the size of the undergraduate programs will increase resources for the School overall. The panel sees this as an "adventure" or gamble and, in particular, questions the assumption that this will necessarily benefit crucial goals such as increasing the excellence in the graduate program or facuity research.

## 2. Field Practice

In our discussions concerning the Field Practice Program, we were impressed with the value that this brought to the School's overall undergraduate education. The present programme appears to be operating in a sound fashion. We note that the field practice instructor is eager to take on additional responsibilities, and keen to work on the graduate practicum. A major concern is the botleneck created by the limited access of undergraduates to the ethics course. Increasing undergraduate seats in this course, by offering additional sections, would facilitate the number of students able to take advantage of field practice experiences.

## 3. Distance Education and E-Learning

In addressing the problem of allowing a limited increase in the size of the undergraduate programme without sacrificing graduate studies and research, the committee was impressed with the opportunities afforded by the distance learning programs. The School of Criminology should build on its historical advantage and jump on the band-wagon of e-learning by expanding its offerings and adding more students to these courses. This has a number of adrantages, particularly in terms of relieving pressure on the Faculty. This would be a cost effective way of allowing undergraduate eniolment to increase, as the expanded registants in these course would likely pay for the added tutor markers needed.

In addition, such a strategy might relieve pressure on classroom-space demands on campus, and address the high course tum away rate. The added bonus of this growth is the possibility that more money would be made available for graduate students in turor marking positions. The panel was also impressed with the publication possibilities, as we were told that course development resulted in textbook development by the Faculty.

We are aware that distance education cannot replace the teaching environment made possible by student-faculty interaction in the classroom, particularly as the social as well as physical distance of students from campus is markedly increased. However, with the heavy demand already existing, this appears to be a sound strategy to address some part of this excess flow of sudents.

## 4. Legal Studies

The panel examined new initiatives that have been considered in the undergraduate area, including the proposed legal studies program. We recognise that this is a revival of a previously developed program. The panel heard that some Faculty members felt that they were inadequately consulted in the latest version of the proposal. We would encourage the administration of the School to remember that, when planning new programs and conceptualizing substantive offerings, it is important to actively seek input from those most directly affected by these changes.

As for the merits of the legal studies program, the committee feels that no initiatives that require additional resources devoted to undergraduate training should be undertaken at this time. However, if the legal-studies program can be viewed as a more intelligent use of resources, or as more pedagogically sound, such a programme is justified. The panel is divided on the intrinsic merits of adding a legal-studies program but we leave it to school to sort this out.

## II- Graduate program

## 1. Admission

The School's graduate program, in our opinion, is too small: not enough students, not enough courses, not enough faculty participation and involvement. In particular, the school does not admit sufficient numbers of Ph.D. students to meet existing or future market demands, or to maximize the research of faculty. Although the numbers have increased during recent years, the admission system appears to constrain growth in the number of students entering the program.

According to the documents we received, during the last three years; the graduate students intake was as follows:

| $\underline{\text { Year }}$ | Masters | $\frac{\text { Ph.D. }}{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 10 | 3 |
| 2001 | 18 | 5 |
| 2002 | 18 | 4 |

Keeping in mind that the School has 24 faculty, the panel is of the opinion that the School, Faculty and prospective students would benefit from increasing these numbers, especially at the $\mathrm{Ph} . \mathrm{D}$. level.

The low enrolment cannot be explained by the School receiving a small number of applications. In the Self Study Report, we read: «We receive many more qualified applications than we can take. For the 2002 fall semester intake, we had 84 applicants. Our rejection rate was 56 percent. Virtually, all of these applicants met the University's minimum standards for admission to graduate studys (p. 36).

Why are many good students rejected? Is it because the faculty members are already stretched to the limit? With less than 24 faculty, many other university deparments admit considerably more graduate students. The Committee is of the opinion that the Malthusianism of the School of Criminology in SFU has to do with a philosophy that requires all students to receive financial support. It was said that the School cannot admit more students because it can only fund a limited number of students. The panel finds no reason why admission decisions need to be connected to funding decisions. Why refuse students who could pay for their tuition with their oun or parents' money? Some of the pressure to keep numbers small may also come from graduate students, who sit on admission committees. Although they do not set admission policy, graduate students expressed concern that too many students would negatively affect their own access to office space and computers. This leads us to examine the role of students in the admission process.

## 2. Students Voting on Admission

To pull the graduate program out of its present state of underdevelopment, the panel is concerned about the School's policy that allows students to vote on the admission of their colleagues. We are united in our opposition to the practice of allowing students to making funding decisions. Confidentiality and contlict of interest concerns are raised regarding access to private files. Involvement in admissions decisions, as well, can lead to a suspicion that some students might try to drive the competition out, allowing a small number to have access to available office space, computers, TA contracts, scholarships, and the like. While we would encourage the School to involve stadents in program policy and curriculum development, care needs to be taken in involving them in admissions and funding. A point from the students in support of this pracrice relates to the need to maintain a clear and transparent process in decision making. We feel that this could be ensured through a clear statement of criteria for selection and decisions about funding.

A last objection was raised against the suggestion of admitring more graduate students. The panel was told that there were not sufficient employment opportunities for students after they graduate. We do not believe this to be a correct assessment of the employment sector from a national and intemational perspective. In addition, we feel that there is a real problem in developing a national and international reputation for excellence in the absence of a strong and productive Ph.D. program.

## 3. Additional Course Offerings

The Self Study uncovered another problem: the need to offer more graduate courses. In 1999, the School apparently offered 7 graduate courses, 8 in 2000, and 7 in 2001. Also, in «most years we mount none of the advanced courses needed by Ph.D. students» (...) «This is clearly an issue that we need to address" (p. 42).

The small number of graduate courses mounted each year presents particular problems for students who come from the MA program into the Ph.D. because they have already taken all the graduate courses available. The panel does not consider dual listing of courses an appropriate way to address this problem. Having Ph . D. students sit in seminars with undergraduates is just not acceptable. However, admitting more graduate students, and more from other universiries, would allow the school to diversify its course offerings. .

Teaching more graduate students presents resource problems for a School facing financial pressure such as this one. However, one way to achieve this would be to reallocate teaching resources from the undergraduate to the graduate level. Currently, the School offers 56 undergraduate courses as opposed to 7 graduate courses (although 15 graduate courses are listed in the calendar). If undergraduate teaching was to be rationalized, this could be achieved without additional cost. Note that the SFU 2002-2003 Calendar lists over 40 undergraduate CRIM 300 and CRIM 400 courses.

With more students, it will be possible to mount key $\mathrm{PhD} / \mathrm{MA}$ courses on a regular basis and to have more faculty teaching at the graduate level. With only 7 courses offered, as is now the case, at least 17 faculty members have no opportunity to teach at the graduate level.

This recommendation means that the School should re-evaluate both its graduate and undergraduate programs and re-allocate some resources from the latter to the former.

## 4. MA by Coursework and Practicum

The panel also reviewed the new initiatives in the graduate area. The plan for the MA by coursework and practioum appears to meet a distinct need in the criminal justice fields and is a welcome alternative to the existing MA by thesis. If carefully administered, it can offer a way of addressing the lengthy completion period of the current program. It is cost effective in its use of existing faculty resources, and the field practice supervisor is prepared to provide staff support for this program.

In looking at cobort based strategy for MA students, we have mixed feelings abour this approach. We like the idea of encouraging quick movement and peer support to improve completion times. However, we are not yet convinced that this program is practical, given the different work habits, life styles and studying interests of graduate students. If the programme is to be introduced, the School will need to carefully monitor it, and certainly plans to do this. It may work well, given the School's record of success with a similar programme at the honours level.

## 5. The Executive MA Program

The executive MA program appears to address a real need in the local professional criminal justice community. It is touted as being self-sufficient and seen as a possible source of revenue for the School. Based on the experiences of similar programs, such as the MBA, this may be true. However, these types of programs are not widely offered and may end up being more costly to administer, in terms of faculty and staff time, than is expected. Care should also be taken to ensure that implementation of this program takes place only after wide and extensive consultation with all faculty members, especially those who would not be directly involved in the course offerings or contract spin-offs of such a program and, therefore, might feel excluded from the benefits of such an enterprise.

## III- Research

## 1. The Organization of the Research

Within the School of Criminology, one finds a number of Research Centers, Research Groups and Research Laboratories. The Criminology Research Center is currently administering 30 projects for nine faculty members. Overall, 285 work study students were supervised through the CRC over the past seven years (Self study, p. 52). Other centres, instirutes and laboratories are also active: the Centre for Restorative Justice, the Institute for Studies in Criminal Justice Policy, the Feminist Institute for Studies on Law and Society, the Institute for Canadian Urban Research Studies, the Crime Prevention Analysis Laboratory, and The Forensic Entomology Laboratory. Researchers in these groups complain about not having staff to facilitate grant writing and to administer the projects.

The CRC suggests that the School should locate funds for a half- time administrative position to provide grant writing and fund management expertise to faculty. A convenient solution to such a need would be for the diverse research centers, groups, institutes, and laboratories to unite in a decentralised federation under the umbrella of the Criminology Research Center in order to pool resources to pay for a research coordinator and part or full time support person. This regrouping represents an appropriate and cost effective sharing of resources without threatening the independence of researchers.

## 2. The Research Productivit'

In reviewing the research producrivity of faculty, the panel was impressed with the high level of activiry by faculty in the School. Many rexts, many reports, and a great deal of
engagement in professional and community acrivities are evident. The faculty appear to be very busy in institutes and have established excellent contacts with research, policy, and community groups both locally and across the country.

The faculty appear to have responded well to the previous review panel which encouraged greater grant activity and more intensive research. Particular success has been achieved in building partnerships with other disciplines, and in attaining SSHRC-based funding.

However, the panel is concerned that many faculty do not publish in high prestige peer reviewed joumals (such as Theoretical Criminology, Criminology etc.). This has a direct impact on the School's reputation and status. In addition, the reporting format of research activities in CVs should be standardised. Refereed publications should not be mixed with research reports. Monographs should be kept separate from book chapters, etc. In addition, faculty should provide information on the number of graduate students supervised, the tiles of their dissertations, date of graduation or year of study, and about their participation in supervisory committees, in setting comprehensive examinations, etc. Faculty should also provide biographical information (e.g. list of recent publications) on the School's web site.

## 3. Bottlenectes in Administration of Grants and Contracts

It has been reported by many in the School that the Office of Research Services poses a bottlenech to the contracts and grants activity of the School. Researchers simply make their contracts outside of the Universiry with the consequence that the University does not benefit from these funds. According to both the researchers and Research Services, a major obstacie appears to be charging for indirect costs (but the department maintains that it does not receive any of these funds, further discouraging researchers from mounting research projects through the University). While both faculty and administrators acknowledge that large amounts of money are not being channelled through the University, they disagree on the reasons for the impasse, and on whether amelioration is possible. The result is a tense, unhealthy situation in which both sides lose. The panel urges the office of research services to meet with faculty and staff at the School and hammer out ways to address this issue. While we do not think that the university will recover $100 \%$ of the research and contract monies now going outside, the percentage that can be recovered represents a substantial amount of money. It is not in the interests of faculty or university to allow this situation to continue.

## IV- Staff

Staff appear dedicated and committed to the mission of the School. Human relations appear to be good both among staff and between staff and faculty. However, University cutbacks, offloading of administrative tasks, and increased student numbers have dramatically increased workloads and staff stress. In addition, new efforts at upgrading technology for admissions and other activities have not been accompanied by technical support for the school, nor by logistical arrangements to facilitate staff training. Within a
limited school budget, it is difficult for the School to make and fund these arrangements itself. These expenses should be paid by the University.

## V- Governance

The current Director of the School of Criminology devoted a lot of time and energy during his first term to building consensus, facilitating cooperation, and to peace-making. While peace is always a work in progress, the School appears to be, at the present time, a collegial environment. One result is that the School is blossoming with projects, a delightful sigh. However, because resources are limited, choices between projects, and tough decisions about priorities, must be made. From what we know about the current leadership and the school climate, it should be possible to make those choices in a collegial style, with a minimum of acrimony. However it is absolutely crucial that senior officers in the school make sure that all faculty feel involved in the decision-making process.

## VI- Relations of the School with senior University administrators

There is a long history of misunderstanding and strained relations between the faculty of the School of Criminology and SFU senior administrators. Solutions acceptable to both parties must be worked out, but this can only happen after frank and full discussion of all the contentious issues. Both sides should make every effort to dissipate the misunderstandings and to start their relation on a new footing.

## Summary and recommendations

Overall, the School of Criminology has flourishing research groups, good levels of external funding, and significant involvement with both professional and non-professional communities. Facuity take their responsibilities to undergraduate and graduate students seriously. As in any department, there are tensions and rivalries, as well as marked differences in politics, preferred style of research, and orientation to the much fragmented "discipline" of criminology (which is really many different disciplines and approaches). With good and careful leadership the divisions and rivalries have been kept in check in recent years. School administrative staff appear to be well integrated into the school, although severely overstretched.

Tensions with senior University administration are palpable and should be addressed. Part of the problem here lies in the administration's desire to steer a more graduate student oriented, research intensive course in the future than was the case in the past. While members of the School of Criminology, on the whole, agree with this objective and already carry out reasonable levels of funded and unfunded research, many of the School's policies, practices and habits of mind are still focused on delivering an excellent undergraduate program. This is where the bulk of the School's resources are presently directed and faculty, rightly or wrongly, believe that securing more resources and support for the School hinges on excellence at this level. It does not appear that all the implications of such a change, fiscal, administrative and psychological, have been addressed by senior administration. For the benefit of everyone, this should be done.

To sum up, the committee offers the following recommendations:

## R-1

It is recommended that the School reduce the number of courses offered at the undergraduate level even at the cost of reducing its overall number of undergraduate students. This also means living with a rate of student turn away that is higher than that of many other disciplines. Reducing the number of courses could be compensated in part by increasing the number of students in the distant education courses, in the ethics courses, and in the field practice.

## R-2

No new undergraduate programme that would require additional resources should be undertaken.

## R-3

The School of Criminology should admit more graduate students, in particular Ph.D. students. Only academic or pedagogical reasons should justify rejecring applicants meeting the Liniversity's standards for admission.

R-4
Involving students in admission and funding decisions which apply to their colleagues is unethical and introduces Malthusian tendencies in the admission process.

R-5
The School should increase the number of courses offered at the graduate level. One way to achieve this would be to redesign and renumber some courses presently offered at the undergraduate level and offer them exclusively as graduate courses. This will lead to an increased participation of faculty in the graduate programs and will address a major problem in the graduate program. To realise this change in a coherent manner, the School will have to rechink its graduate programs.

## R-6

The School should go forward with the projected MA by coursework and practicum and the executive MA program but those initiatives should be monitored carefully.

## R-7

The School should consider the creation of a federation of its research centers, institutes and laboratories under the umbrella of the Criminology Research Center in order to consolidate and share administrative and grant-facilitation resources.

R-8
More faculty should publish in peer reviewed journals.
R-9
The Office of Research Services should take the initiative to conduct a full scale consultation with the faculty of the School to find ways to smooth the process in which grant and contract projects are processed and to remove bottlenecks in acceptance procedures.

R-10
The School of Criminology and the Senior Administrator of SFU should make every effort to dissipate misunderstandings and improve their relations with one other.


[^0]:    
    
    $2002-1002$
    $2002-1002$
    $8002-1002$
    $2002-0002$
    $000^{\prime} 000^{\prime} \mathrm{G} 6 \$$
    $00 \cdot 000^{\prime} \angle \$ \$$
    $090^{\prime} 66 \$$
    $000^{\prime} 0 \mathrm{~S} \mathrm{I}^{\prime} 1 \$$

