REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
TO THE REGULAR November 2020 SENATE

FOR DISCUSSION

QUALITY ASSURANCE - CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEW OF LAURENTIAN
UNIVERSITY'S
INTERDISIPLINARY ARCHAEOLOGY PROPGRAM (IAP)
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, NOVEMBER 2020

In accordance with the Laurentian University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)**,** the Final Assessment Report has been prepared to provide a synthesis of the external evaluation and Laurentian's response and action plan. This report identifies the significant strengths of the program, opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources made necessary by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations; who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

SUMMARY OF THE CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEW OF THE INTERDISCIPLINARY
ARCHAEOLOGY PROGRAM (IAP)

This is the first academic review of the Interdisciplinary Archaeology Program, *per se*. To be sure, since the early 70's Laurentian has been teaching Archaeology, but until 2014-2015, it was a stream within the Anthropology program.

The new Interdisciplinary Archaeology Program was established in response to the Anthropology program review carried out in 2012. The review identified issues within that program that the external reviewer interpreted as arising from sub-disciplinary rifts. The review suggested changing the curriculum to include courses that crossed sub-disciplinary boundaries. The former Dean of Arts instead proposed that the B.Sc. in Anthropology be revised to focus on archaeology while the B.A. focus on cultural and medical anthropology. Under the then-new degree structure at Laurentian which allows for students to combine two 42 credit majors of their choice, those students who wished to obtain a degree similar to the traditional four-field anthropology degree could do so by combining anthropology and archaeology majors.

In the pre-existing programs in anthropology, because of the small number of courses offered in anthropology in general and the high number of anthropology courses needed to fulfill degree requirements, students who wanted to focus on archaeology were forced to take many courses in medical anthropology and some in cultural anthropology. The reverse was also true for students who wanted to focus on medical anthropology –their 'choices' included many archaeology courses. The establishment of an interdisciplinary degree in archaeology would allow students to take the same core archaeology courses that were previously offered, but to supplement these with courses that better aligned with archaeology than medical anthropology courses. Examples of such courses include Forensic Anatomy of the Human Skeleton, various courses in Geographic Information

Systems, Geomorphology, Introduction to Soil Science, and various courses in History, Indigenous Studies and Ancient Studies.

A committee consisting of faculty in programs that could contribute courses to an Interdisciplinary Archaeology Program was established. The original faculty members included Scott Fairgrieve (Forensic Sciences), Randy Dirszowsky (Environmental Science), Janice Liedl (History), Guy Chamberland (Ancient Studies), and Jacquie Litzgus (Biology).

The revision of the program occurred at the same time as the establishment of the School of the Environment (SOTE). Given the natural synergies that existed between archaeology and environmental science (another program in the School), housing the program in the SOTE appeared to be a natural fit. Changes to courses and programs are discussed by the archaeology committee (above), and from there are brought to the SOTE for approval before moving to the faculty level.

A significant concern with respect to interdisciplinary programs is the reliance on courses offered by other programs to fulfill degree requirements. This is a concern because of scheduling and course cycling and could lead to a situation in which students need a course to graduate but are unable to obtain it because it is not offered, or because of scheduling conflicts. Because of these concerns, the initial archaeology programs that were designed and implemented in 2014-15 had a very large number of possible course options offered by other programs. However, student feedback indicated three things:

      i. A small proportion of these courses were actually being taken.
      ii. Not all non-ARCL options were equally relevant to archaeology and
      iii. The large number of options made the program confusing, particularly for students at   the first-year level.

Based on this feedback, program revisions were introduced in 2017-18 to direct students into one of two streams and to reduce the number of non-ARCL course options. At the same time, the program made some revisions to the titles to make the content of some of the upper year courses clearer (ARCL 4036 and ARCL 4206) and it revised the third-year course on North American archaeology to ensure that it included Indigenous perspectives.

Currently then, Archaeology at Laurentian is an undergraduate interdisciplinary program that may be taken to obtain either a B.A. or a B.Sc. Students follow the general program requirements at Laurentian University for three- and four-year B.A. and B.Sc. degrees. The programs are offered in English, but in some cases individual courses in French may fulfill degree requirements. For four-year specialization and majors, typically students have the option of following one of two streams: Indigenous and the Classical World.

On 15 January 2019, the program submitted its self-study to the Office of Vice-President Academic and Provost of Laurentian University.

The self-study presented an overview of the program and then reviewed the program's self-perception of the faculty, physical resources, students, program regulations and courses, including how the program harmonized with the strategic goals and mission of

the University. It concluded with an overall assessment of the program's and weaknesses as well as its goals. There was also three Appendices: A. Program Requirements (various checklists for students);
B. Course Syllabi and C. Faculty CV's

On Monday 7 October 2019, after reviewing the self-study, the Review Team conducted a site visit. The external was Dr. Susan Blair, a full professor of Anthropology, specializing in Archaeology at the University of New Brunswick. In addition, the team consisted of two Laurentian professors, Dr. Eric Gauthier, from within the faculty of Science, Engineering and Architecture and Dr. Sara MacDonald from the Faculty of Arts. Finally, there were two students in the program, Sophie Belley, a francophone and Steven Andreyechen, an Anglophone.

As a part of the site visit, there was an extensive tour of campus facilities, which included visiting spaces used by the IAP, including teaching and research laboratory spaces (S-408, FA-040), administrative and office spaces, including the CAE office space, the Indigenous Learning Centre, and the Library (with meetings in JND 30-344).

The team conducted interviews with a wide range of stakeholders and participants, including core faculty, university leadership (a representative of the office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost (Shelley Watson, Associate VP Learning and Teaching), the Dean of the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Architecture (Osman Abou-Rabia) and the Director of the School of the Environment (SOTE) (Brent Buchanan), members of the archaeology committee (Alicia Hawkins, Randy Dirszowsky, Janice Liedl, Guy Chamberland), sessional instructors involved in the program (Cortney St-Jean, Andrée Beauchamp and Sarah Hazell), students in the program, and external stakeholders consisting of industrial archaeologists who interact with the program, most notably through the hiring of IAP graduates.

In their report dated 20 January 2020, the reviewers noted that:
> *The Interdisciplinary Archaeology Programs at Laurentian University offer high-quality, carefully constructed curriculum and student experiences. They fundamentally support the tri-cultural mandate of Laurentian University, and a number of key planks in the university strategic and academic plans. Furthermore, there are a number of factors that make the IAP important in the larger university context.* ***It is not a suite of programs that are duplicated elsewhere, and through them, Laurentian University is positioned to be THE place to study archaeology in Northern Ontario, and to obtain training necessary for participation in the assessment work that will take place as a part of the development of the north.*** *Where it can be compared to other archaeology programs in Ontario, it is highly competitive, and is viewed as producing top quality, highly training graduates, more so that significantly larger programs in the south. Core faculty of the IAP are developing a number of new directions, including job placement programs and community relationships around archaeological training that are a part of a proactive, innovative approach. With investments, these programs will pay significant educational dividends.*
> *Our review of the IAP indicates that it meets and exceeds the evaluation criteria established for program reviews at Laurentian University. Furthermore, the*
review   revealed that the IAP has the potential to ***be a shining star of***

Laurentian's hands-on ***training and experiential learning****. This view is reinforced by feedback received from both students and from industry stakeholders*.

More specifically, the reviewers noted:

- The IAP program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and in alignment with the institution's statement of undergraduate and/or graduate Degree Level Expectations

- It was an excellent decision to place the program within the School of the Environment. This positioning has opened several collaborative possibilities with other units, including with Architecture, Earth Sciences and Indigenous Studies. These programs have strong affinities with the IAP, and the flexibility afforded by having multiple program streams will enable these collaborations. In fact, the IAP has grown and flourished since it left Anthropology.

- The admission requirements for the IAP appear to be appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.

- The curriculum of the IAP is consistent with the current state of the discipline of archaeology. Further, there is evidence of both innovation in the implementation of the program, and excellence in terms of modes of delivery and the meeting of identified learning outcomes.

- Students repeatedly mentioned that the archaeological field program was transformative and changed their whole university experience. They also clearly saw the link of this experience to employability.

- The IAP has attached to it one full-time faculty member, four full-time faculty who are situated in other units and provide support through courses and guidance, and a range of contract academic staff (sessionals.

- The excellence of the program can traced to a very high workload for a few. Currently the primary core faculty member wears many hats, serving as a teacher, mentor, field director, collections manager, research, recruiter, program advisor and community liaison.

- The core faculty involved in the program provide excellent mentorship and leadership. They are committed to a pragmatic, long-term vision for the program, and put enormous amounts of energy into ensuring that the program succeeds. The primary faculty are highly qualified, with a very high rate of obtaining major grants, with participation in and leadership of high quality, community-based research programs. The contract academic staff involved in the program are highly committed to it and to the students involved in it.

Amidst these encomiums, there were some concerns expressed about the program in the body of the report.

- The IAP has attached to it one full-time faculty member, four full-time faculty who are situated in other units and provide support through courses and guidance, and a range of contract academic staff (sessionals).

- The only negative feedback from the students around the experiential components of the program related to the fact that they didn't know how transformative an experience it would be. They felt that, given the great experience, it was unfortunate that it wasn't being promoted to students in their first and second year. This view was echoed in terms of recruitment; the field programs of the IAP have the potential, if properly resourced, to become flagship programs in experiential learning.

- The single biggest resource need for the program relates to space. Laurentian has several archaeological spaces that are devoted to teaching and research lab-based activities, as well as storage of both collections and equipment. The distinction between these functions is not clear cut.

- Students face challenges in terms of forming a community of like-minded students. They expressed that it was difficult to identify who is an archaeology student, and to find all the students who might be interested in archaeology but are not formally declared archaeology program students.

- Budgetary pressures on the library system could compromise growth. For example, some licensing in cognate disciplines has been dropped. Book purchases and subscriptions will need to be maintained and carefully grown to continue to allow the IAP to flourish.

- Program enrolments seem to be very low on paper. We frame this as "seems to be" because there was some evidence that suggests to us that there are several factors that need to be considered in the discussion of success as measured by program enrolments.

  o Students report that the in the process of attempting to identify enrolled archaeology majors for the purposes of club formation, they discovered some ambiguity or in some cases errors, in that student who assumed they were archaeology students were not formally registered as such, and in some cases were registered formally in other programs. This view was reinforced by feedback from faculty, who indicated that students get counted in other programs even when they are primarily taking archaeology coursework.

  o The program does a huge amount of service teaching, which appears not to be factored in as a part of program success. Some of this high service load is due to the interdisciplinary nature of the program.

  o There are some inconsistencies in how courses are counted. For example, for BA students, archaeology is counted as a Sci elective, and for BSc students it counts as an Arts elective.

- o Course structure reciprocity is required; archaeology students are required to take non-archaeology courses, but archaeology is not being listed as an option in other programs.

- o Classroom assignments may be artificially capping class sizes as archaeology courses have, at least on some occasions in the past, been assigned classrooms that impose limits to class size below the number of interested students.

- The program is not well promoted.

On 19 March 2020, the program submitted its comments on the Recommendations of the Review Team, and on 5 July 2020, the Dean, Dr. Osman Abou-Rabia submitted his comments both on the Review Team's recommendations as well as the program's reaction to them.

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEW TEAM'S RECOMMENDATIONS (R) THE PROGRAM'S (P) RESPONSES AS WELL AS THOSE OF THE DEAN OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURE(D)

R1a: **It is important that major infrastructure issues be addressed. The current laboratory and teaching spaces are inadequate, and inappropriate for collection storage. Spaces are needed that consolidate the disparate activities that take place around archaeological lab work, and provide secure, safe, environmentally appropriate storage (and in particular, is not threatened by flooding). If these spaces cannot be contiguous or adjacent to each other, some resources should be available to mitigate against the dangers of moving them (i.e. moving trolleys). Ideally, archaeological spaces would entail the following:**

- **proper artifact storage that can expand when new collections are acquired through field work, and when collections arrive on loan for analysis by Laurentian faculty ("proper storage" means in spaces that are secured, in shelving that can be secured, in areas not prone to flooding or subject to potential breakage from being in stacked boxes, accessible to researchers and community members, and in a way that can be organized and tracked).**
- **layout space for faculty research projects and individual student research projects (necessary for honours and directed research courses)**
- **space and equipment for processing materials including creating zooarchaeological collections (i.e. a fumehood)**
- **teaching laboratory space for larger course teaching**
- **storage of field equipment in a way that makes it accessible and maintainable**

R1b: In addition to space issues, the management of collections in terms of monitoring their condition, organizing them, coordinating student and faculty activities relating to them is of sufficient importance that it warrants support in terms of hiring a technician, at least on a part-time basis. [See also R3 below].

R1c: **While these are the primary space concerns, should space become available through reallocation or restructuring, some attention should be paid to creating spaces for students to undertake community and cohort-building activities, and for contract faculty to undertake their core responsibilities.[1]**

---

1 Neither the Program nor the Dean commented upon this recommendation.

P1a. The first recommendation pertains to infrastructure. The team raises a number of concerns, primary of which is "secure, safe, environmentally appropriate [artifact] storage." They outline the need for five types of spaces, summarized below with our evaluation of the degree of need for each of these types of spaces. They furthermore suggest that contiguous spaces would be optimal, but that if this is not attainable, then trolleys should be used for moving materials. We do make use of a trolley at this time, but a second, larger and more versatile trolley would make logistics easier.

Type of space	Archaeology Program assessment of urgency of need
Safe, secure artifact storage; accessible to researchers and community members; lockable cabinets; area not prone to flooding	**Very high** - Suggest that there are two types of collections: those under active study, those that are maintained for future study - Suggest that the former remain in the research lab (S-408) and that a system is put in place to monitor who has card access to the room; consider the possibility of lockable cabinets in this room, but owing to space limitations this may not be possible; ask for installation of poly sheeting underneath pipes running along the ceiling in order to divert water if pipes leak - Suggest that a permanent home be sought for collections not in active study. These collections were brought into the university by previous Laurentian archaeologists in the course of research or field courses (e.g., Helen Devereux, Ken Buchanan) who have since passed away. Laurentian is obliged to care for the artifacts in perpetuity or to find a different public institution where they may be housed. At this time, we suggest beginning a dialogue with the Laurentian Archives to determine whether: a) they would consider housing the artifacts; b) climate control in the archives is appropriate for artifacts; c) lockable cabinets are possible within this space; and d) they would work together with the Archaeology program to establish a protocol for access and borrowing by researchers, including members of Indigenous communities and academics. Wherever these collections are housed, the location should fulfill the above criteria. Note that a collection held by a university was accidentally destroyed at a high cost to institutional reputation: https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/280-boxes-of-artifacts-at-u-of-t-carted-off-to-dump/article25577190. It is imperative that Laurentian take seriously its responsibility to care for collections made in the course of teaching and research by former faculty members.

Layout space for faculty research projects and student research projects	**Moderate to high** At this time, we have been able to "make do" with the two current spaces available to us through creative use of a tray-holder that can be used for artifacts under analysis, and the fact that the only recent student thesis that required a lot of layout space was written over the summer months when FA-040 sees minimal usage. With an increasing number of students in the program, we can anticipate a growing need for layout space. A temporary solution would be to allow students to use the small room at the end of FA-040 for storage of materials for their theses. This is contingent on finding a permanent storage location for the collections not under active study, and this space is not optimal because it is prone to flooding.
Space and equipment for processing of materials including for the zooarchaeological reference collection	**Moderate** The zooarchaeological collection is an important research and teaching tool and does require occasional additions to the collection. In recent years, in light of the lack of a fume hood and appropriate equipment for processing animal carcasses, most of the processing has occurred out of doors and off-campus. If the School of the Environment is able to obtain space that includes a dedicated fume hood, it would be beneficial to the Archaeology program. An alternative possibility that could be pursued would be to determine if a different academic unit already holds a fume hood that is used for the same purpose and which could occasionally be used for ARCL. Such units include Forensic Science and Biology. Give the small amount of usage that is anticipated, compensating a different department for costs incurred for use of their equipment would be a more effective use of resources than purchase of a dedicated fumehood for preparation of zooarchaeological reference specimens.
Teaching and laboratory space for larger class teaching	**Moderate** At this time the enrolment limit in ARCL 2017 is occasionally reached because the room in which the course is held only accommodates 24 students. It is important to hold this class in a room where fossil casts and artifacts are readily available and where there are large stable benches. As this course grows, a similar but larger teaching space must be sought. Such space should have secure storage capability for fossil casts and the teaching artifact collection. The other courses currently taught in this room (ARCL 2116, ARCL 3066, ARCL 3095, ARCL 4036) can be accommodated in the space available. It should be noted, however, that ARCL 4036 requires use of the zooarchaeological collection which is housed in S-

	408. This room is a faculty research laboratory that can only accommodate one or two student research projects in addition to faculty research. In the past been used for students in ARCL 4036 to carry out the analysis portion of this course. If this is to continue, it will be necessary to find a solution to secure storage of artifact collections under study.
Storage of field equipment in a way that is accessible and maintainable	**Low** While a more accessible space for storage of field equipment is desirable, at this time the field school is offered only once every two years, meaning that although some equipment is used in the interim for special projects, the majority of the equipment is not accessed regularly. Materials are mainly housed in waterproof containers, so while the space they are stored in has flooded on multiple occasions, there has been little damage to equipment.

D1a: I understand the importance of the need for a secure storage and I will work on providing the requested space.

R2. The IAP should remain in the School of the Environment, and within the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Architecture. This position has allowed the program to be both flexible and to capitalize on the advantages of interdisciplinarity. Student success within the program and post-graduation are facilitated by this positioning. As a corollary, the IAP should explore options to further capitalize on its interdisciplinary framework, including investigating the possibility of thematically arranged, pre-packaged collection of outside courses that can be taken alongside the IAP (for example, geoarchaeology combining Earth Sciences and archaeology, or community-approaches, combining Indigenous studies and archaeology).

P2. We fully agree that the program belongs within the School of the Environment. We are working with other programs in the School to identify a group of core courses that would be taken by all students in the School.

The idea of a "prepackaged collection of outside courses that can be taken alongside the IAP" is interesting and could appeal to students enrolled in majors. It may be that minors already exist in the university that would fulfill this role. We will examine existing minors in Environmental Science, Earth Science, Biology, Forensic Science, History, Indigenous Studies, and Ancient Studies to determine if any of these would serve as logical complements to the IAP major or specialization. We will also explore the idea that a suite of courses not currently captured by a minor may be a useful complement (e.g., courses in Earth Science, Environmental Science, and Geography). Digital archaeology is a growing field, and we may find that a series of courses in COSC could be combined in a creative and interesting way for ARCL students (or vice versa).

D2. The School of the Environment is the perfect and natural fit for the IAP.

I agree that the program should increase its visibility on campus by publicizing its courses to other units as well as to increase its interdisciplinarity by using more courses from other units.

R3.   **Staffing and complement shape many of the challenges of the IAP. As discussed   above, the archaeological programs would be greatly enhanced by the addition of an archaeological technician who can help with collections management. In addition, the   continued provision of regular stipends for teaching archaeology courses (in the absence of additional complement) is necessary to continue to offer sufficient courses. The program is near the bottom limit in terms of size, and this is manifested as a challenge in offering sufficient numbers of courses. The interdisciplinary position of   the program does help with this, but also causes the IAP to rely on other programs in a   way that can lead to unpredictability and occasional gaps. Finally, the opportunity to   hire (either on a contract basis or permanently) someone from regional First Nations   communities who has archaeological background would be transformative of the   program and would enable a number of incipient community projects to reach   potential. This potential includes drawing members of Indigenous communities into   archaeology, and through this, into the university. The university should consider   ways to consolidate some of these staffing needs—for example, a person who could   be a collections manager, field support person, and community liaison**.

P3.   The review committee proposes an intriguing and innovative approach to ameliorating some of the staffing issues evident within the program, while also addressing some of   the larger issues in archaeology in the province and assisting Laurentian to fulfill its tri-   cultural mandate. Specifically, they suggest hiring "an archaeological technician who can   help with collections management" and further propose "someone from regional First   Nations communities who has archaeological background would be transformative of   the program and would enable a number of incipient community projects to reach   potential." We think that the idea of hiring a person with an archaeological background   who could support the program in a number of ways, including by helping with   collections management, outreach to First Nations communities, development of   programming that is appropriate and accessible to First Nations is an innovative   approach that could have the benefit of making both archaeology and Laurentian   University more accessible to local First Nations community members. There is a tremendous need for capacity building in archaeology within First Nations, and this is   best accomplished through leadership by an Indigenous archaeologist(s). A hybrid   position, possibly shared between the Archaeology program and another office of the   university (ISLC, AVP Academic and Indigenous Programs, Liaison??) would be unusual   at Laurentian, but we suggest that discussions be undertaken with both the office of the   VP Academic and Indigenous Programs, and with Liaison Services to gauge interest.

 D3.   Increasing contact with the First Nations can only enrich the program and might   lead to increasing interest of young First Nations students to pursue career in this important area.

R4.   **The potential for expansion of Indigenous components of the program. For example, a   number of initiatives, such as the Trillium funded indigenous monitoring training   program have promise. These could also be supported through recognizing non-   conventional learning and program structures (i.e. micro-credentials, non-degree certificates, etc.).**

P4.   We have already had some preliminary discussions with the AVP Academic and Indigenous Programs about diversifying how the program is offered and considering how to make it more accessible and relevant to members of Indigenous communities, where we have identified, through a Trillium funded project, an interest and a need for capacity building. We suggest continuing these discussions, including brainstorming on revenue streams that may assist in hiring someone to fulfill a role such as that outlined above.

D4.   See comment D3.

R5.   Attention should be given to advertising and recruitment of students into the   program. This is a unique and important program and is eminently marketable. The   stakeholders interviewed for this review indicated that this program produces the   some of the best archaeological employees in Ontario. Furthermore, northern   archaeologists are going to be in much demand in the future and Laurentian is positioned to be the place to train them. Currently, the IAP does not have good visibility for incoming students, and there is no recognition that this is a major place of   employment, with ties into the resource extraction fields, and Indigenous   engagement. Recruitment activities should be integrated into faculty-level efforts, and   broad initiatives within the university relating to heritage should include archaeology. Other mechanisms to increase program visibility should be pursued, such as improved   website navigation.

P4.   We agree that the program lacks visibility and that this may contribute to the issues   around low enrolment. We suggest opening up discussion with Dr. Yves Peltier (AVP,   Francophone) and Marie-Lynne Michaud (Marketing) to consider how best to address   this low visibility issue.
D5.   I also suggest for the program to have more discussion with the Office of Liaison to make the Liaison Officers more aware of the program structure and potential employability of its graduates when they talk to high school students.

R6.   Service and support units, and in particular, the library system, need to be maintained and   adequately resourced to ensure that the program continues to flourish.
P6**.**   We agree that support units, such as the library and the Centre for Academic Excellence,   need to continue to be resourced in order for the program to flourish.
D6.   N/A
R7.   The field programming is a particular strength of the IAP, and results in high student   engagement and success. These field programs should be particularly supported and   reinforced. Students describe these experiences as transformative, and they are the   basis for post-university success of Laurentian archaeology graduates.

P7.   We also agree that the field program needs to continue to be resourced. The field school, unlike any other in Ontario, is certified by the Register of Professional Archaeologists. It could be a strong recruitment tool and is an important experiential learning experience for Laurentian students. The field course requires a high instructor to student ratio in order to both ensure that students have a rich learning experience and that the archaeological site where we work is

excavated as carefully as possible. Private sector stakeholders acknowledge the importance of field schools across the province and we are currently holding informal discussions about how the field school experience can be further enriched, possibly along the lines of the Ontario University Field Biology programs (http://www.oupfb.ca/index.html). Finding support for human resources, including teaching assistants during the field school, and post-excavation lab assistants, to support this field school is an ongoing challenge. Additionally, the report identified an issue with respect to reciprocity in course offerings. Specifically, the ARCL program brings students to courses in many other programs (ANCS, BIOL, ENSC, ENVI, FORS, GEOG, GEOL, HIST) but very few other programs include ARCL course on a suggested electives list or within their programs. We note that ENSC and ENVI have listed a few ARCL courses within their course offerings, either as suggested electives or required courses. We suggest that there are several courses that would logically help to fulfill degree requirements in other programs. Please see the following list for courses that we believe could be of interest and benefit to students in other programs:

Course	Programs for which ARCL course content could be of interest
ARCL 2017 – Human Evolution and Palaeolithic Archaeology	BIOL (currently listed for biomed only)
ARCL 2116 – Archaeology and the Environment	GEOG
ARCL 3095 – Archaeology Field School*	HIST, ENSC, ENVI, FORS, GEOG
ARCL 3066 – Archaeological Laboratory Methods	ANSC
ARCL 3206 – Old World Archaeology	ANSC, HIST
ARCL 3207 – Indigenous and Collaborative Archaeology*	HIST, ENVI, INDG
ARCL 4036 – The Archaeology of Animal Bones	BIOL, FORS
ARCL 4206 – The Archaeology of Death and Dying	ANSC, HIST

* Fulfills requirement for Indigenous Content for the B.A.

D7. The field program is an integral and a very attractive component of the PIA and will continue to be resourced as needed.

ACAPLAN'S RESPONSE

ACAPLAN notes that there is one recommendation that requires no further action:

R2. The IAP should remain in the School of the Environment, and within the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Architecture.

Reason: ACAPLAN can see no reason to place the Interdisciplinary Archaeology Program elsewhere. The reasons for keeping it in the SOTE are convincingly set out above in the program's and the dean's responses to the recommendation

13

For the other recommendation, COU's *Quality Assurance Framework* requires ACAPLAN to "prioritize those that are selected for implementation."[2] Complicating this process is a decision by the Vice-President Academic and Provost to suspend *all programs* offered by the Interdisciplinary Archeology Program.

While these have been summarized earlier in this report, the following chart embedded in the self-study will set out the specifics:

Interdisciplinary Archaeology Programs

Program	Number of credits	Streams	BSc requirements	BA requirements
Specialization (4 year)	60 cr out of 120 total required for degree	Stream A – Indigenous Stream B – Classical world	Combine with 60 cr in science (e.g., CHEM, PHYS)	60 other cr Arts degree regs: - 6 cr linguistic awareness - 6 cr scientific literacy - 6 cr Indigenous content
Major (4 year)	42 cr out of 120 total required for degree	Stream A – Indigenous Stream B – Classical world	60 cr in science And combine with: - Second major or - Second major and a minor - two minors or - a minor	Combine with: - Second major or - Second major and a minor - two minors or - a minor Arts degree regs: - 6 cr linguistic awareness - 6 cr scientific literacy - 6 cr Indigenous content
Concentration (3 year)	36 cr out of 90 total required for degree	No streams defined	Half of the completed 90 cr are in science	Arts degree regs: - 6 cr linguistic awareness - 6 cr scientific literacy - 6 cr Indigenous content
Minor	24 cr	No streams defined		
Minor in Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Landscapes	24 cr	No streams defined This minor suggested for students interested in Earth Sciences and related disciplines		

So, if admissions are suspended, does that mean that all these programs are on their way to closure? Certainly, such an announcement telegraphs to incoming students that there is not much point planning to enter any program in archaeology at Laurentian.

---

2 COU. *Quality Assurance Framework*, 2019, p. 23. See: https://oucqa.ca/framework/4-2-institutional-quality-assurance-process-requirements.

14
While ACAPLAN acknowledges that the Vice-President Academic and Provost has the authority, as an agent of the Board of Governors to suspend admissions to any program on financial grounds, ACAPLAN would challenge both the VPAP and Senate to consider whether any part of the Interdisciplinary program could be salvaged.

Certainly, a strong case for continuing at least some part of the existing program has been made by the IQAP review. The Review Team emphasized **in bold** how the program is consistent with Laurentian's strategic vision and academic plans (with key concepts from the plans in boldface):

- The IAP creates **conditions for student success** through close mentorship of students and comprehensive student advising and support.
- The IAP provides education and training that is broad-based and fundamentally **interdisciplinary,** enabling students to be highly sought-after generalists who nonetheless have the necessary key skills and training.
- The IAP provides students with expertise, equipping them to "**practice… and contribute as employees of choice… throughout the North and beyond**" (Imagine 2023).
- The IAP emphasizes **relationships with communities (and in particular, with Indigenous communities**), among students, and between various academic units.
- The IAP explicitly focuses on **experiential learning across the institution, in community and industry settings**, through lab-based and field-based programs (including a range of directed research opportunities), and through work-placement programs with private-sector archaeology firms.
- The IAP provides the necessary background to participate in the growing field of private-sector archaeology (sometimes referred to as Cultural Resource Management, or CRM archaeology); this field is not formally subject to **accreditation,** but provincial regulations across Canada, including in Ontario, consistently require the educational background provided by the IAP for participation at a mid- to senior level in this work.
- The IAP fosters **reconciliation** through a vision for engagement with Indigenous communities, and through efforts to integrate teaching and learning with responsive community-based programming

A second factor in favour of maintaining at least some form of the existing program is the presence on campus of a tenured faculty member who is also a skilled teacher and Tri-Council funded researcher. Unless the plan is to declare her redundant because of financial exigency or keep her but to turn her into someone who offers scattered electives, because of the highly interdisciplinary nature of the program she could, with a bit of creativity, still offer a pared-down archaeology program. This could be done without or with only minimal use of sessionals. *To be sure, a one-person program normally makes little sense—but because this is an Interdisciplinary program, that disadvantage can be offset.*

A third consideration is the provincial context.

Currently, is that there are 8 tenured professors teaching Ontario archaeology in the province. This is down from 11 only a couple of years ago. It is likely that a few more of those faculty will retire in the next few years. Archaeology is an industry that is

considered "essential"— during the COVID shut-down, archaeologists were working because infrastructure projects need to go ahead. The people who work in the industry require licensing and licenses are based, in part on education (which Laurentian provides). If the province requires that archaeological assessments be carried out, these should be done by people who have local training and expertise.

It is increasingly recognized that meaningful consultation with Indigenous communities about archaeology must occur before development. The Provincial Policy Statement, for example, revised in Feb. 2020, states that "Planning authorities **shall** engage with Indigenous communities and consider their interests when identifying, protecting and managing cultural heritage and archaeological resources." While this relates to the *Planning Act*[3], archaeology is also implicated in the *Environmental Assessment Act*[4], the *Aggregate Resources Act*[5], and the *Renewable Energy Approval Regulation*[6], and others. Currently, there is little capacity within First Nations to assess impact of proposed projects on archaeological heritage. As a result, First Nations hire non-Indigenous archaeologists to evaluate the work of another non-Indigenous archaeologists. This underscores the need for capacity building among Indigenous communities in this area. It is possible that a certificate program or "short courses" would be more attractive to First Nations staff than the current BA. For the time being, we can assume that many non-Indigenous people will continue to be involved in the management of archaeological heritage. In northeastern Ontario, far better that these archaeologists be trained here rather than in the South[7], especially since some of the training at Laurentian has been led by a sessional here who is from Nipissing First Nation.

All this is to say that recommendations set out in the review must be altered.

As a start, ACAPLAN recommends that, given with few credits involved (24) the **minor be retained** except for the Minor in Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Landscapes which even the program admits has hardly attracted any applicants.

The minor requires only 9 cr of Archaeology: ARCL 1006, ARCL 2017, ARCL 2116. All have consistent decent enrollments, and all are taught by the archaeologist on faculty. To be sure the enrollment in the minor has never been strong, but it costs nothing to keep it on the books.

ACAPLAN's top recommendation however is that an **Archaeology major** (42 credits) be retained by Laurentian *with a focus on the Indigenous stream*, given the need for graduate archaeologists with this background in Northeastern Ontario and a strong background in Indigenous Studies.

---

3 See: https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13

4 See: https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90e18?search=Environmental+Assessment+Act

5 See: https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90a08?search=Aggregate+Resources+Act

6 See: https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/900334?search=Renewable+Energy+Approval+Regulation

7 Lakehead has an anthropology program which is strong in archaeology, but its program is really focused on the northwest, and research and culture-wise they are more oriented towards Manitoba than Ontario.

This means that ACAPLAN is prepared to recommend to Senate the end of the specialization (60 credits) and the termination of the classical stream.

With the following course offering, Laurentian could offer the major without any additional sessional resources:

- Year 1: ARCL 1006, ARCL 2116, ARCL 3095 (6cr)
- Year 2: ARCL 1006, ARCL 2017, ARCL 3027, ARCL 4036 or 4206[8]
- Year 3: repeat year 1
- Year 4: repeat year 2

Currently ARCL 4095 and ARCL 4905 are offered without remuneration and could continue to be offered to give students a richer experience.

There is no difference in terms of course offerings for the BA or the BSc—it is entirely a question of other courses they take.

A new student consultation form for the major in Archaeology would look like this (~~with deletions from current form marked~~):

42 credits total

Exactly specified courses (15 credits) space below	**Enter cr earned in**
FIRST YEAR 3 credits: **ARCL 1006 – Introduction to Archaeology and Physical Anthropology (3 cr)**	_____
SECOND YEAR 9 credits: *ARCL 2017 – Human Evolution and Palaeolithic Archaeology (3 cr)* *ARCL 2116 – Archaeology and the Environment (3 cr)* STAT 2126 – Introduction to Statistics (3 cr) **or** STAT 2246 – Statistics for Sciences (3 cr)	_____ _____ _____ _____
THIRD YEAR 3 credits: *ARCL 3207 – Indigenous and Collaborative Archaeology (3 cr)*	_____ Total: **15 cr**

---

[8] Here are the enrolment status in these courses over the past years as supplied by the Program Coordinator.

Selected courses from specified lists (cr)

Advanced Archaeology Courses (9 cr required, 3 cr of which must be at the 4000 level) ARCL 3066 – *Archaeological Laboratory Methods* (3 cr) *ARCL 3095 – Archaeology Field Procedures (6 cr)* *ARCL 4036 – The Archaeology of Animal Bones (3 cr)* ARCL 4206 – Archaeology of Death and Burial (3 cr)	_____ – _____ – _____ – _____ –	Total cr_____ **Max = 9 cr**
Methods (6 cr required): ARCL 4036 – *The Archaeology of Animal Bones* (3 cr) ARCL 4905 – *Archaeological Placement* (6 cr) ENSC 3716 – Environmental Impact Assessment (3 cr) FORS 3036 – Forensic Anatomy of the Human Skeleton (3 cr) FORS 4106 – Forensic Analysis of the Human Skeleton (3 cr) GEOG 3036 – Air Photo Interpretation (3 cr) GEOG 3056E –Topics in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Application or ENVI 2616 Géomatique appliquée à l'étude de l'environnement GEOL 2066 – Near-surface geophysical methods (3 cr)	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	Total cr_____ **Max = 6 cr**
Indigenous Stream ENVI 2506 – Cultural Representations of the Environment (3 cr) INDG 1116 – Foundations of Aboriginal Peoplehood (3 cr) INDG 1117 – Implications of Aboriginal Peoplehood (3 cr) INDG/POLI 3105 – Canadian Law, Politics and Aboriginal People (6 cr) INDG 2316 – Foundations of Indigenous Ecological Knowledge (3 cr) INDG 3215 Native Community-Based Research Methods (6 cr) HIST 3216 – The History of Canada's First Nations (3 cr) ~~Culture and History (6 cr required from List A or List B):~~ ~~List A~~ ~~ANCS 2526 – Greek Art and Archaeology (3 cr)~~ ~~ANCS 2527 – Roman Art and Archaeology (3 cr)~~ ~~ANCS 3006 – The Hellenistic World (3 cr)~~ ~~ANCS 3046 – Hellenistic Egypt (3 cr)~~ ~~ANCS 3426/4426 – Greek History: Athens and Sparta (3 cr)~~ ~~ANCS 3427/4427 – Roman History: the Late Republic and Early Empire (3 cr)~~ ~~ARCL 3206 – Old World Archaeological Culture History (3 cr)~~ ~~HIST 2056 – History of Ancient Civilizations (3 cr)~~	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	Total cr_____ **Max = 6 cr**
Natural Science (6 cr required): ~~ANTR 2016 – Human Biological Variation, Adaptations, and Health~~	_____ _____	

~~ENSC 2707 – Ecology of Human Populations~~	_____	
BIOL 2105 – Human Anatomy and Physiology (6 cr)	_____	
BIOL 2706 – Vertebrate Form and Function (3 cr)	_____	
BIOL 3006 – Evolutionary Biology (3 cr)	_____	
ENSC 1406 – Earth's Environmental Systems (3 cr)	_____	
ENSC 2106 – Introductory Geomorphology (3 cr)	_____	
FORS 3036 – Forensic Anatomy of the Human Skeleton (3 cr)	_____	
FORS 4036 – Forensic Analysis of the Human Skeleton (3 cr)	_____	
~~GEOL 1006 – Introductory Geology I (3 cr) or GEOL1021 Understanding the Earth I (3 cr)~~	_____	
GEOL 3397/BIOL3397 – Introductory Soil Science (3 cr)		Total cr_____
		Max = 6 cr

Credits earned_____

Note: Students wishing to obtain a BSc must ensure that they obtain 50% of their courses in sciences (ARCL courses are excluded).

Students wishing to obtain a BA must ensure that they obtain 42 credits in Arts. By graduation, students must have obtained six credits in linguistic awareness, six credits in Indigenous content and six credits in scientific literacy.

So what are some of the creative options that could be explored to make an Archaeology option *financially feasible*?

1. One possibility would be to see if one or more university would consider some kind of agreement to allow for registration in courses in each other's programs. For example, Laurentian has an Indigenous and Collaborative Archaeology course that should be taken by every student in the province, but only exists here (a similar course also existed at WLU-Brantford, but the prof there retired this year). This could theoretically reduce the number of courses Laurentian need to teach and attract some students from outside into Laurentian courses.

2. Assuming ARCL 2017 and ARCL 4036 continue, these should be taken to Science, Engineering and Architecture Council to get them classified as science courses (which they are) and this would mean that at least 6 cr of ARCL would count as science for students wanting at BSc.

LAURENTIAN QUALITY ASSURANCE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAM IN ARCHAEOLOGY

Recommendation	Proposed Follow-up	Responsibility for Leading Follow-up	Timeline
1. Retain the Archaeology Major	i. Explore options 1-2 above, and particularly 1, to contribute to the financial sustainability of program	Program Coordinator and Vice-President Academic	June 2021 and report to ACAPLAN with a recommendation concerning the ongoing suspension of admissions
	ii. Add Indigenous faculty member to	ii. Program Coordinator	ii. November 2020

	Interdisciplinary Steering Committee		
2. Retain Archaeology Minor (except for Minor in Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Landscapes)	Obtain sign-off from Dean and accept admissions into the Minor	Program Coordinator and Vice-President Academic	December 2020
3. Eliminate all other programs as well as Classical stream in Archaeology	Recommendation to Senate	Vice-President Academic	June 2021
4. Explore cross-listing of various ARCL courses with other programs as outlined in P7 above	Identify most likely participants and start from there; bring changes to CELP	Program Coordinator with other relevant Chairs	December 2020 and ongoing
5. Address infrastructure issues	i. Start with Safe, secure artifact storage; accessible to researchers and community members; lockable cabinets; area not prone to flooding ii. Continue addressing issues spelled out in list of priorities created by program (See P1a above).	Dean	December 2020 and ongoing
6. Explore creation of provincial-wide field school modelled on the Ontario Field Biology program http://www.oupfb.ca/index.html	Contact other programs to assess interest	Program Coordinator	June 2021
7. Support capacity building of Indigenous community members	i. Explore various funding opportunities ii. Examine creation of non-degree Certificate (micro-credential), or maybe short intensive special course	Program Coordinator	December 2021
8. Hire a person who could be a collections manager, field	Examine external funding	Program Coordinator	December 2020 and ongoing

support person, and community liaison.			
9. Enhance program's visibility	Contact liaison and marketing	Program Coordinator	December 2020 and ongoing
10. Support library, CAE	Enhance budget	Vice-President Academic	October 2020 and ongoing

The Dean of Science, Engineering and Architecture shall be responsible for monitoring the implementation plan. The details of progress made shall be presented in the Dean's Annual Report and filed with the Vice-President Academic and Provost. The executive Summary and the monitoring reports will be posted on Laurentian University's web site.

CONCLUSION

The Major/Minor programs in Archaeology are approved to continue and it will be reviewed in the fall of 2028.