ONE YEAR POLICY REVIEW PLAN

POLICY OFFICE FOR PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

FEBRUARY 2026

Executive Summary

Memorial University currently faces a significant backlog of policies that are past due for review under the University's Policy Framework. As of January 22, 2026, 67 policies either exceed their scheduled review date or will require review within the next 12 months.

This Policy Review Plan proposes a **time-limited, one-year initiative** to eliminate the existing backlog, bring all policies into compliance with the Policy Framework, and establish a sustainable review cycle going forward. The plan is intentionally designed to operate **within the existing Framework and governance structures**, relying on prioritization, inventory reduction (where appropriate), and process flexibility.

Key elements of the plan include:

- **Policy Inventory Reduction:** A systematic assessment to revoke, consolidate, or reclassify policies enhancing the effectiveness of the policy portfolio and improving long-term sustainability.

- **Use of Substantive and Non-Substantive Review Tracks:** Leveraging the 2025 framework updates, introduction of structured use of non-substantive reviews (where appropriate), while maintaining the requirement for full review at least every ten years.

- **Batching and Throughput Protection:** Policies will be reviewed in coordinated batches that balance complex, high-risk policies with lower-complexity, low-risk reviews, allowing approval throughput to be maintained while addressing institutional risk.

- **Streamlined Review Process:** Reviews will follow accelerated but compliant timelines, including targeted consultation.

- **Policy Review Task Group (Time-Limited):** A small, pan-institutional task group to support sponsors during the accelerated review period, reducing reliance on large working groups.

- **Clear Accountability and Reporting:** Progress will be monitored through enhanced monthly reporting in addition to the quarterly and yearly reporting, with explicit expectations placed on policy sponsors and their designates.

- **Time Limited Investment of Additional Resources:** Two Policy Analysts (either new or seconded to the office from other operations) will be dedicated to conducting research and redrafting on behalf of the policy sponsors based on batching.

Successful implementation of this plan will require strong sponsorship from senior leadership, disciplined adherence to timelines, and limited additional resources to support research and drafting. If executed as proposed, the initiative will restore compliance with the Policy Framework, reduce long-term policy maintenance risk, and leave Memorial with a more coherent, manageable, and resilient policy environment.

Purpose

This plan sets out a **compressed, one-year (≤12 months)** approach to review and update all Memorial University policies that are not current, in accordance with the Memorial University Policy Framework Process. The plan does not consider development of new policies.

The objectives are to:

- Eliminate the existing policy review backlog within one year,
- Bring all policies into formal compliance with the Framework, and

Guiding Framework and Assumptions

All policy reviews will follow the review process laid out in the Policy Framework and the Development, Approval and Administration of University Policies (DAAUP).

The DAAUP places the responsibility for Policy development, maintenance and review with the policy Sponsor. Under the policy, the Sponsor is defined as:

> A senior administrator, normally a Vice-President, with overall responsibility for an assigned policy, including, but not limited to, research and drafting of the policy; carrying out appropriate consultation/assessment; evaluating implications of the policy, including risks and costs, strategic considerations, legislation compliance, and seeking legal advice, where appropriate; developing and carrying out the communications and the implementation plans; writing any related procedures; monitoring compliance through regular review of the policy. The Sponsor may designate a delegate, who must be named.

As the Sponsor is typically a Vice-President it is common for them to assign Sponsor Designate to implement the review. Throughout this plan Sponsor Designate is used to indicate this person.

Step 1: Inventory, Triage and Reconcile (Month 1-2)

1.1 Policy Reconciliation and Reduction

As of January 22, 2026, there are currently 64 policies that are past-due for review and an additional 3 that will require review within the next 12 months. This is a **total of 67 policies requiring review**. Assuming a month of planning and one month of variation or slippage output to make this plan achievable would require **21 policies be ready for approval every Quarter**.

To meet the plan's goal under current inventory would require an approval rate of 7 policies per month which is not a typical review rate at Memorial. From the period of 2023 to 2026 the average was 4 policy approvals per Quarter (not all of which were reviews).

The policy inventory has been assessed by the Office of the General Counsel and policies have been identified as candidates for combination or elimination. Reduction of the policy inventory will reduce the burden on policy sponsors and may reduce the complexity of multiple policies on the same overall topic. Additionally, it is important to remember that:

- A **policy** is a broad statement of an organization's principles intended to guide expected behavior
- A **procedure** is the steps to implement a policy.
- A **program** is a set of activities that fulfill the intention of policies and their associated procedures.

A table of possible areas for condensing can be found in **Annex A.** There are 41 policies identified for assessment to be combined or revoked including some policies that may be more appropriate as procedures or programs. However, this is based on legal requirements and like subject matter. In some cases, it might be advantageous for the University to have some policies remaining as they are. As several of the identified policies are up to date it will not affect the inventory of those past due. Based on these factors, a conservative estimate of policy reduction would be 20 to 30.

If this is achieved, the inventory requiring review would stand at 37-47 policies requiring a review rate of 12 per quarter to achieve the 1-year review goal.

1.2 Use of Substantive and Non-Substantive Review System

When the DAAUP was updated in July, 2025 elements were added to advance policy at a faster rate while balancing effective policy renewal: the creation of the Policy Advisory Group (PAG) and the introduction of substantive and non-substantive review.

The PAG, overseen by the Policy Office, enhances oversight by providing an additional layer of scrutiny while bolstering policy expertise at the University. By providing operational oversight in policy development and review, the PAG complements the strategic oversight of PEC.

Under this plan, PEC would direct sponsors to complete a Policy Review Checklist for past due policies and submit them for review by the PAG. Should the remaining policies with a review date within the last 5 years be assessed as needing non-substantive reviews, only six would automatically require full review.

To ensure completion of such a checklist will require research either by resources within the Policy Office or the Policy Designate or VP's Office. If the resources are located within the Policy Office, it is estimated that research and checklist completion for each policy could advance in less than two weeks.

Substantive and non-substantive review track determinations occur when the policy proposal advances to PAG before PEC. The PAG will review the proposal and determine if a full process is needed. If it is determined that the level of review required is non-substantive, it is not required to have a consultative period, as per step 17 of the Framework Process. The non-substantive review then ends with a submission forwarded for approval by PEC. The Policy Office has been

directed by the Board of Regents to report on a list of all policies in which this has occurred annually. If the Board disagrees, they can request a full review. Further, policies are prohibited from having 2 non-substantive reviews consecutively, meaning once every ten years a policy must have a full review.

1.3 Policy Prioritization

There are multiple methods for prioritizing the policy review process. However, the initiation of a policy review under the DAAUP is up to the Sponsor. Best practice indicates assessment of policy priorities based on risk.

A batching approach would balance focused attention on complex policies concurrently with less complex policies. Approval of batches would occur at the same time as an assessment of policy reduction is considered. Potential Batches are identified in **ANNEX B**. These proposed batches and policy reductions will need to be approved by PEC at a later date.

Step 2: Setting Review Working Groups (2 Weeks)

The Working Group is fundamental to applying best practice to the policy review process. These groups typically assist the Sponsor's Designate in drafting the relevant policy and are composed of individuals with subject matter expertise, multi-campus perspective and those that may not have subject matter expertise but may be impacted by the policy.

While the working group model is best practice it has resulted in a lag in policy development due to competing priorities for working group members and the Sponsor's Designate as well as scheduling difficulties as the size has ranged from 5-14 members.

2.1 Use of PAG in conjunction with a Policy Review Task Group

Traditionally the Sponsor VP designates an individual to be the Sponsor's Designate and the working group is formed based on the policy proposal. Adopting a batching and accelerated system may not make this a viable approach.

The creation of a **Policy Review Task Group** for the one-year review initiative is proposed.

This task group would be less fully representative than the traditional working groups but will offer key value and have a strong understanding of institutional history and culture. Other perspectives would be incorporated and considered during targeted internal consultation (which this task force would suggest) and by the normal role of the PAG.

The proposed membership of the Policy Review Task Group is below:

- **Rhyder Evans, Board of Regents Office:** Chair of the Task Group and provide assistance in review.

- **Matthew Raske, General Council:** Matthew has regularly participated in policy working groups

- **Renee Elliot/Dennis Peters, Provost Office:** Both understand policy work and have policy development experience.

- **Jinghua Nia/Karen Follett, VP Research Office:** Both have experience with policy.

- **Carol Tibbo, VP Finance and Administration Office:** Extensive policy knowledge.

The plan proposes this group meet for 2-3 hours bi-weekly. Multiple Sponsor's Designates could present at each meeting presenting specific clauses, seeking advice etc.

This requires the Sponsor Designates and Policy Analyst research and take a "first pass" at comparing their policy against jurisdictional comparators and drafting proposed edits before discussing with the working group. This is somewhat labour intensive. April 2024-Feb 2025, the Policy Office offered some research and redrafting support. **This support could be offered again with an investment of 2 Policy Analysts with the Policy Office for a 1-year period.** When the Policy Office had this capacity, it assisted the Provost's Office and the Vice-President of Administration, Finance and Advancement with several policies. Research and revisions were conducted with assistance of policy office staff. These policies include:

- Delegation of Authority
- Use of University Seal
- Training and Development
- Extraordinary Salary Increases
- Use of Copyright Material
- Protected Disclosure
- Travel

While the proposed investment is smaller in number than the previous staff complement, this plan will progress work at a faster rate. If approved, the batching of policy will mean no down time between assignments.

Step 3: Streamlined Substantive Policy Review Process (Per Policy)

Each policy review will follow the Memorial Framework:

3.1 Initiation (1-2 weeks)

- Research and jurisdictional scanning (Scanning typically includes 21 Universities, comprised of a mix of the 8 approved comparator universities and U15 members)
- Complete a short **Policy Review Brief** to supplement the work of the earlier checklist. This can be completed by Sponsor Designate and the Policy Analyst

3.2 Drafting and Consultation with Policy Review Task Group (3 weeks)

- Use the approved policy template
- Consult with specific constituencies (where required)

3.3 Public Consultation (where required) and incorporation (6 weeks)

- Post online for the 4-week consultation period.
- Incorporation of feedback or changes and meeting again with Policy Review Task Group is estimated to take no more than 2 weeks

3.4 Approval (2–4 weeks)

- Route approvals per the Framework through PEC or Board as appropriate

Step 4: Accelerated Review Schedule

Using the process and batching method outlined above a timeline will be provided.

This timeline is achievable and ambitious. It requires PEC approval of the plan and the batches as well as individual VP support for the continued prioritization of their Sponsor Designates on timelines and the advancement of policy through the approval stages in the policy process.

Step 5: Communication and Implementation

Each reviewed policy will require:

- Targeted communications including updated content on the Policy website
- Update relevant procedures as required
- Development of implementation guidance or FAQs (where applicable)

Step 6: Tracking and Reporting

Propose monthly reporting to PEC on progress in addition to the quarterly and annual reports.

Risks / Pressure Points

- **Sponsor discipline**: timelines are vulnerable if policy prioritization is reduced
- **Resource**: without 1–2 Policy Analysts to support research/drafting supports, the plan may be delayed as Sponsor Designates will be required to complete research and drafting on their own
- **Change fatigue**: repeated reliance on the same institutional experts' risk burnout

Annex for Review and Feedback

- Suggested Policy Reduction Inventory
- Suggested Policy Batching
- Suggested One Year Time Schedule
- Policy Checklist

Next Steps

1. Approval and endorsement by President and advancement to PEC.
2. Presentation of the strategy and Plan to PEC for discussion, feedback and approval.

If approved by PEC, the following steps are foreseen:

1. PEC approve batches and confirm targets for revocation, combination or revision
2. Sponsors (President and Vice-Presidents) identify their Sponsor Designate for each policy
3. PEC to approve the creation and membership of Policy Review Task Group

ANNEX A
Reduction Inventory

Below is a list of policies identified for consideration. There are five (5) policies in green that while candidates for this review, are currently up to date and do not require review currently:

Policy	Possible Remedy	Notes Rationale
Art Collection	Combine	This policy largely deals with the acquisition, management and divestiture of art as an asset. Explore the possibility of combining with other asset management or financial policies as a procedure.
Building Access Control	Combine	This Functions as a keyholder policy could merge into Space
Computer Standards	Combine	OCIO policies could merge. This was suggested in last review however not pursued. Given that this policy is updated I would not pursue now
Controlled Goods	Combine	This policy broadly speaking is that statement that we will abide by legislation and designation responsible parties. Controlled goods could be a OHS concern. However, if we wish to maintain stand-alone Statement this policy is short and could be reviewed quickly if prioritized
Data Removal	Combine or Revoke	Data removal can be an element of data governance and security which is a current priority within the university. As that work progresses this policy could combine with the larger governance system
Determination of Employee or Independent Contractor Status	Merge	This policy is standard guidance on employment status. This could merge with Recruitment. The unique nature of academic employment may require a standalone statement
Donor Prospect Clearance	Reduce to a Procedure	The terms of this policy function as an internal procedure. If policy is deemed appropriate at the operational level suggest a single fundraising policy, which would house Naming, gift acceptance and Donor clearance
Employee Training and Development	Combine	This is a program. Could merge with other HR and employment policies. It is however a common stand-alone policy in other universities more consideration required.

Employing and Hosting Foreign Nationals	Combine with Recruitment	This could easily become a procedure under Recruitment.
Enterprise Risk Management	Revoke	It could be a candidate for removal but needs input from content experts.
Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in Employment	Combine	We could embed the element of equity Diversity and Inclusion into Recruitment and retention related policies, while directing related complaints to Respectful Workplace or other human rights-based complaint processes within the University.
Establishment of Permanent Positions	Combine	This is an aspect of position management that could possibly merge with other policies that deal with workforce management.
Exit Interview	Revoke	This is a program not a policy. Another option would be to combine with other employee lifecycle policies.
Gift Acceptance	Combine	Create one Fundraising policy and merge Naming, Gift Acceptance and Donor prospect Clearance Substantial input needed from content experts.
Graduate Student Field Trips	Combine	Largely deals with the financial reimbursement of student field trips. Could be incorporated into Research funding policies or travel policies depending on particularities.
Harlow Campus Usage	Revoke	The issues of this policy may largely be covered by the governance documents for Harlow Campus. The AG report raised there is not a Harlow governance policy however some aspects of governance are included here.
Information Request	Reduce to Website	This is broadly a statement that we adhere to ATIPP legislation. This could be stated online on the Privacy office site or with some elements incorporated into Information management
Insurance Coverage - Property and Liability	Remove	Insurance Coverage is a legal requirement. The purpose of this policy is "To reduce the financial risk exposure through purchased insurance policies and to outline procedures related to certain insurance coverages." As a highly procedural policy it could be incorporated as part of the Risk based policies. We also do not have insurance coverage policy for the various other insurance coverage.
Internal Audit	Remove or Combine	Elements may be captured in the existing internal audit charter or may require change to both given recent resource allocation. Additionally this policy captures Fraud which is not included in the charter

Networks and Communications	Combine	OCIO policies could merge this was suggested in last review however not pursued. Currently up to date.
On Call	Combine with Compensation	The purpose of this policy is "To provide for the establishment of appropriate compensation for employees who are required to be available on stand-by after hours or on holidays or on weekends to immediately respond to a call back to work". This could be incorporated into the Compensation policy.
Probationary Review Process	Combine	This is a process and can be merged with other employee life cycle policies.
Relocation Guidelines - Postdoctoral Fellows	Combine	Incorporate as a procedure for Postdoctoral Fellows or travel expense
Retirement Recognition	Remove/Combine	This is not a policy it is a program. Could merge with other employee life cycle policies as one policy or simply remove as a policy and post program T&C on HR website
Service Recognition	Combine	This is not a policy it is a program. Could merge with other employee life cycle policies as one policy or simply remove as a policy and post program T&C on HR website
Smoking	Revoke	Most Universities have something akin to a smoking policy. However, this one is not typically enforced. There are some elements of use of cannabis here, but this could be added to alcohol if that policy was expanded to be about substances and moderation not just contract administration.
Space	Combine	Space and space leasing could be merged.
Space Leasing	Combine	Space and space leasing could be merged.
Student Employment	Combine	This policy deals with compensation for work. The difference is treating students as a different class from others compensated at the university. This could be a procedure under compensation, if scope were sufficiently broad.

Supporting and Accommodating Breastfeeding	Website or procedure	Breastfeeding is now a standard accommodation across employment and public space. It does not raise to the level of a Policy requiring the approval of the Board. Another alternative could be a procedure under those policies that handle human rights complaints.
Travel - Familiarization Visit	Combine	Under consideration for combination as one Travel policy with multiple procedures
Travel - General	Combine	Under consideration for combination as one Travel policy with multiple procedures.
Travel - Guests Lecturers and Other Official Visitors	Combine	Under consideration for combination as one Travel policy with multiple procedures.
Travel - Pre-Employment Interview	Combine	Under consideration for combination as one Travel policy with multiple procedures.
Travel - Regents (Board)	Combine	Under consideration for combination as one Travel policy with multiple procedures.
Travel - Relocation and Removal	Combine	Under consideration for combination as one Travel policy with multiple procedures.
Travel (Chancellor)	Combine	Under consideration for combination as one Travel policy with multiple procedures.
Travel Outside of Canada	Combine	Under consideration for combination as one Travel policy with multiple procedures.
Vehicles - Employee Owned	Combine	Under consideration for combination as one Travel policy with multiple procedures.
Weapons	Combine	Deals with the storage of weapons and use at the university could be merged into OHS.

Annex B
Proposed Batching

This are proposed batches; feedback on precise placement is welcomed. Batching excludes the Travel and Purchasing Policies under the purview of the Transformation Office. Batching excludes the policies intended to seek Board Approval in February

Batch 1
Compensation (VPFA)
Visual Identity (VPFA)
Information Management (VPFA)
Indirect Costs of Externally Funded Research (VPRI)
Research Chairs (Provost)
Single E-Mail for Students and Employees (VPFA)

Batch 2
Extraordinary Salary Increases (Provost)
Employee Training and Development (VPFA)
Insurance Coverage - Property and Liability (VPFA)
Integrity in Scholarly Research (VPRI)
Supporting and Accommodating Breastfeeding (VPFA)
Harlow Campus Usage (Provost)

Batch 3
Trust Funds (VPFA)
Leave Administration (VPFA)
Ethics of Research Involving Human Participants (VPRI)
Research Pool – General (Provost)
Recruitment and Selection of Non-Academic Employees (VPFA)
Graduate Student Field Trips (VPRA)
Kullik Lighting and Smudging (President)

Batch 4
Employee Life Cycle Policy (VPFA): Composed of 4 existing HR policies
Tangible Asset Administration (VPFA)
Establishment of Permanent Positions (VPFA)
Respectful Workplace (VPFA)
Accessibility for Students with Disabilities(Provost)
Weapons (VPFA)
Internal Audit (President)

Batch 5
Institutional Animal Care (VPRI)
Alcohol (VPFA)
Controlled Goods(VPFA)
Determination of Employee or Independent Contractor Status (VPFA)
Research Contracts and Agreements (VPRI)
Vehicles Employee owned (VPFA)
Enterprise Risk Management (VPFA)

Batch 6
Information Request (VPFA)
Workplace Accommodation (VPFA)
Smoking (VPFA)
Relocation Postdoctoral Fellows (VPFA)
Space (VPFA)
Space leasing (VPFA)
Contract Administration (VPFA)

Batch 7
Naming Opportunity (VPFA)
University Operating Budget (VPFA)
Health and Safety (VPFA)
Capitol Projects (VPFA)
Privacy(VPFA)
Hosting(VPFA)
Sexual Harassment and Assault (President)

Proposed Checklist for Review Track

Question	Yes	No
Is the policy still applicable, necessary, and enforced?		
Is the policy aligned with the practices?		
Is the policy consistently interpreted?		
Are there outstanding audit recommendations regarding this policy?		
Is the policy consistent with the University's vision, mission and values, and strategic objectives?		
Does the policy reference/comply with current legislation?		
Does the policy comply with current collective agreements?		
Are deviations common place? If yes, this may be a sign that an element of the policy has become ineffective		
Have end users and policy and administers noticed gaps or blind-spots in the policy that need to be addressed?		
Is the policy easily understood? Is it clear to the end users?		
Have you compared it to our comparator institution? If yes, was it broadly consistent with tends?		
Have you considered practices and standards set by the government?		
Does the policy align with accreditation requirements, if relevant?		
Who are the key stakeholders that should or could help with the review of this policy?		