



**To:** Kathy Winter, Secretary, Senate Graduate and Research Council  
**From:** Amanda McKenzie, Director, Quality Assurance (Academic Programs)  
**Cc:** Jeff Casello, Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs  
**Re:** Global Governance PhD Final Assessment Report

## MEMO

---

The cyclical review of programs joint with other institutions are led by one of the partner institutions and governed by the respective Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). The review of the PhD in Global Governance was led by Wilfrid Laurier University (WLU). The Final Assessment Report (FAR) for the PhD in Global Governance was approved by Wilfrid Laurier University in early 2019. The FAR was then reviewed at Waterloo by Jeff Casello, as well as Simron Singh, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies in the Faculty of Environment and Linda Warley, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies in the Faculty of Arts in March 2019.

According to the University of Waterloo IQAP, the FAR must also be approved by Senate Graduate and Research Council and reported to Senate for information. As per typical practice, this FAR was reviewed by two members of Senate Graduate and Research Council, Bernie Duncker and David Clausi. Feedback was generally positive, with specific comments such as: “The implementation plan does address which recommendations will be followed along with who will be responsible for each recommendation” and “It would have been helpful to have a synopsis of the self-study findings, but perhaps this is not the practice at Laurier.”

Because this FAR has already been approved by WLU, changes to the report are not possible at this time, though feedback from the reviewers was greatly appreciated.

To streamline this process, moving forward, FARs and Two-Year Reports for joint programs that are previously approved by a partner institution will be approved by Senate Graduate and Research Council without the assignment of reviewers. Comments and suggestions raised at SGRC about these approved reports will be captured in the meeting minutes and will be kept on record with the program files in the Quality Assurance Office for future consideration at their next cyclical program review.

## Final Assessment Report for the 2017-2018 Cyclical Program Review of the Joint PhD in Global Governance

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Laurier's Institutional Quality Assurance Procedures ([Policy 2.1](#)), this Final Assessment Report provides a summary of the review process for the PhD in Global Governance (PhDGG) program prepared by the Quality Assurance Office, along with an identification of strengths of the program authored by the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. All recommendations made by the external review committee are listed, followed by a summary of the PhDGG program's response, and the Dean's response. Recommendations not approved for implementation have been identified, and those that have been prioritized are listed in the Implementation Plan.

The Final Assessment Report is reviewed and approved by the Associate Vice-President: Teaching and Learning and the Vice-President: Academic. Following completion of the Final Assessment Report, it is approved by the Program Review Sub-Committee and Senate Academic Planning Committee. Approval dates are listed at the end of this report. Final Assessment Reports are submitted to Senate as part of an annual report on cyclical reviews, and to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance for information. Final Assessment Reports and Implementation Reports are posted on the public-facing page of the [Quality Assurance Office](#) website.

The PhDGG is a joint program with the University of Waterloo, housed within the Balsillie School of International Affairs (BSIA). As Directorship of the program was held by Laurier during the review, the review process followed Laurier's Institutional Quality Assurance Procedures, but was highly collaborative. The Self-Study was discussed and reviewed by the necessary constituents at both Laurier and UW. The site visit itinerary was arranged collaboratively and included meetings with senior administrators from both universities. The Final Assessment Report will be approved through the regular procedures at both institutions. Follow-up reporting will adhere to Laurier's process, outlined below.

The Implementation Plan for the recommendations prioritized in the Final Assessment Report can be found at the end of this report. Units will submit their first Implementation Report two years following approval of the Final Assessment Report at Senate. The Implementation Report will include comments from the unit on actions taken toward the completion of recommendations, comments from the relevant Dean(s) related to the progress made, and comments from the Program Review Sub-Committee, which is responsible for approving the Implementation Report and deciding if further follow-up reports are required. The Senate Academic Planning Committee will also approve the Implementation Report.

## SUMMARY OF REVIEW PROCESS

The last cyclical review of the PhDGG program was conducted by OCGS in 2010. The program was classified as GOOD QUALITY with no specific issues to be addressed in the next cyclical review. The lead author of the PhDGG Self-Study was Dr. Andrew Thompson, Program Officer, with input from the PhDGG faculty at both institutions through the Inter-University Programming Committee. In addition to the Self-Study (Volume I), the program also submitted a copy of associated faculty curricula vita (Volume II), a volume of course syllabi, and a list of proposed external reviewers (Volume III). A draft of the Self-Study was reviewed by the Quality Assurance Office and Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies at Laurier, and by the Quality Assurance Office and the Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs at the University of Waterloo prior to submission of the final version.

The external review committee for the review consisted of two external reviewers from outside the university, and one internal reviewer from Laurier but outside of the department. The review committee was selected by the Program Review Sub-Committee on September 14, 2017, and the site visit was scheduled by the Quality Assurance Office for January 4-5, 2018. The slate of reviewer candidates was submitted to the University of Waterloo's Quality Assurance Office in advance of the Program Review Sub-Committee meeting, and a ranking of candidates was brought forward by the Director of Quality Assurance at UW, who attended the meeting.

The review committee consisted of Dr. Suzanne Zeller from the Department of History at Wilfrid Laurier, Dr. David Black from the Department of Political Science at Dalhousie University, and Dr. Randall Germain from the Department of Political Science at Carleton University. During the site visit, the review committee met with the following individuals and groups:

- Dr. Dan Gorman, Director; Dr. Simon Dalby, Outgoing Associate Director, Dr. Andrew Thompson, Program Officer; Kelly Brown, Program Officer; Dr. Alistair Edgar, SIPG
- Dr. Douglas Deutschman, Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, Wilfrid Laurier University
- Dr. Paul Jessop, Vice-President: Academic and Dr. Kathryn Carter, Associate Vice-President: Teaching and Learning, Wilfrid Laurier University
- Faculty who teach and supervise in the PhDGG program from both universities
- Dr. John Ravenhill, Director of the Balsillie School of International Affairs
- Graduate students in the PhDGG program
- Library representatives: Ms. Charlotte Innerd, Head of Collections (Laurier), Ms. H  l  ne LeBlanc, Liaison Librarian (Laurier), Ms. Jane Forgay (University of Waterloo)
- Dr. Jeff Casello, Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, University of Waterloo
- Dr. Linda Warley, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Waterloo
- Dr. George Dixon, Vice-President, Academic and Provost, University of Waterloo

The review committee submitted their completed report on February 6, 2018. The executive summary from the report is provided below.

## External Reviewers' Report Executive Summary

The joint WLU-WU PhD in Global Governance is an outstanding program. It has benefited from a very high-quality faculty complement, including many productive researchers and dedicated teachers and supervisors. Indeed, largely as a legacy of the CIGI Chairs program, a significant number enjoy prominent international reputations. This in turn has been a key factor in attracting a diverse cohort of excellent students, who bring a wide range of disciplinary and professional experiences to the program. Although the PhDGG is rightly concerned with being able to attract and support a larger number of international students, the products of this relatively young program have already enjoyed success in a range of professional and academic careers. In addition to the high quality of faculty available to them, students are also attracted by the excellent facilities at the CIGI campus, the rich array of events and research clusters at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, and strong financial support, again rooted in the generous initial funding provided to the School and to the program. The curriculum and courses offered by the program have provided a balanced and cutting edge training in the emerging interdisciplinary field of Global Governance, which has prepared them for a range of post-graduate pursuits. Students express a high level of satisfaction with the courses they have access to, and the support they receive from program staff and faculty.

As with any program, there are areas that require periodic re-examination and refinement. Most are relatively routine, and part of the normal process for review of an excellent – indeed flagship - program offering. Two are more pressing, however, and if unaddressed, could compromise the future of the program. In the former category, there are a number of inter-related curriculum issues that would benefit from collective consideration, including: the status of the existing six 'fields'; the current means by which the core course requirements are met; and the existing comprehensive examination process, including a common core examination and a choice of six field examinations. A second set of recommendations concern procedures and processes of communication, in relation to student research and conference funding, website coordination, and processes of complaint and appeal, for example. A third set of recommendations is related to the desire of the two universities to grow the size of the incoming student cohort, and to provide adequate financial support for this process through the systematic introduction of teaching and research assistantships.

In the latter category, and most urgent, is the looming challenge of faculty renewal as the initial cohort of CIGI Chairs (and leading international scholars who were initially recruited as CIGI Chairs) move towards retirement, and/or take up positions in other institutions. This is closely related to a second concern, which is the program's byzantine governance structure. This structure, in effect, means that the program is unable to robustly represent its own interests in the process of faculty renewal, and must rely (problematically) on the goodwill of other units to renew its faculty complement. Since the program's outstanding faculty cohort has been critical to its initial success, a failure to address these linked issues could jeopardize the future of this unique, world-class program.

Following receipt of the External Reviewers' Report, the Department collaborated on a Unit Response, which was submitted on May 24, 2018.

## RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

The External Reviewers' Report included 21 recommendations, which have been listed verbatim below, followed by a summary of the program's response, and the decanal response from the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies at Laurier.

**Recommendation #1:** It is important for the PhDGG's **websites** at the two partner institutions to provide the same information about the functioning of the program, and the various options available to students. Fields and course codes should be listed in identical order on both sites.

**Unit Response:** The program agreed to conduct a review of the websites over the summer.

**Decanal Response:** It is important to note that information for current students leads (from students.wlu.ca) only to the BSIA website and hence we have no access to update that site. Nonetheless, the FGPS agrees a review of the website would be useful.

**Recommendation #2:** The PhDGG should consider adding to its **Learning Outcomes:**

- a) a series of skills related to **Teaching and Learning** –including the Teaching Certificate available at WLU-- especially as the program is likely to add Teaching Assistantships to its student funding packages during the next cycle; and
- b) a series of **research skills** with training offered by the WLU/ UW Libraries. Such skills might usefully be promoted as components of the core course in Research Methods, and/ or as Doctoral Seminar milestones.

**Unit Response:** The program agreed with the recommendation and indicated that they would add learning outcomes related to both areas.

**Decanal Response:** The FGPS supports this recommendation and proposed action, which is related to a broader curriculum review that includes recommendations #3 and #5.

**Recommendation #3:** That the program undertake a formal review of the six **thematic fields**, with a view to reaching agreement on the following questions:

- a) can the field on Multilateral Institutions and Diplomacy be integrated into the core field on Global Governance, and/or can issues of institutions and diplomacy be integrated into the remaining thematic fields?
- b) can the field on Global Justice and Human Rights be made regularly and reliably available over the next cycle, or alternatively integrated into the remaining four thematic fields (and therefore removed as a discrete field option)?

**Unit Response:** Following the reviewers' visit, the program consulted students about the importance of the fields and have decided to leave them intact. For the 2019-2020 academic year, the program will remove the requirement that students are required to take two courses in their field of concentration.

**Decanal Response:** FGPS still has significant concerns about the current field structure. In the last 5 years, only 4 of 43 students (9%) took their comprehensive exams in the fields of Multilateral Institutions and Diplomacy or Global Justice and Human Rights. There were no exams in either field in four of the past five years. If these fields have not attracted more students before the 2-year implementation report, I would strongly recommend that the program consolidate the fields as suggested by the external reviewers.

**Recommendation #4:** That the program inform students in their acceptance packages which field courses will be offered during their first year in the program.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that it will aim to inform students in early summer about which field courses would be offered, and to offer suitable alternatives should there be a case where a core field course cannot be offered.

**Decanal Response:** The FGPS agrees that students should have access to full information about course availability and alternative options as soon as is practical.

**Recommendation #5:** That the program review the existing **core course sequence and structure**, with a focus on: a) the relationship between the History of Global Governance and Globalization and Global Governance core course requirements; b) the means through which the Economics requirement should be met; and c) the focus and purpose of the Research Methods course.

**Unit Response:** The program agreed with the recommendation to undertake a review of the course sequence and structure and indicated that any curriculum changes that resulted from this review would be submitted for approval in Fall 2018.

**Decanal Response:** The FGPS supports the recommendation that course sequencing and progression requirements should be assessed with some regularity and would be pleased to discuss this further with the program.

**Recommendation #6:** That the program review the structure and format of the **comprehensive examination process**, to:

- a) ensure that comprehensive options align with the range of available core courses and fields; and
- b) consider whether to maintain the current practice of setting a core and a field exam, respectively, or tailoring the second comprehensive exam to the specific research interests of the candidate.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that a review of the comprehensive examinations was connected to Recommendation #5, and would take place over the summer with any changes being submitted for approval in Fall 2018.

**Decanal Response:** FGPS supports a more streamlined process and would be pleased to discuss this further with the program.

**Recommendation #7:** That the program reconsider the time involved in its internship option and its follow-up requirements, given the tight timelines laid out for the completion of the degree, and therefore whether it should continue to be advertised as a program option.

**Unit Response:** The program believes that there is value in keeping the internship option available to students and does not wish to remove the option at this time.

**Decanal Response:** As described in the brief, the interest in the internship option is low in part because of demographics of the PhD students. Internship are likely to be more attractive to students coming directly from a Masters' program. Unless the program shifts its target market, it will have to actively advertise the benefits that students gain as a result of participating in the internship. FGPS thinks that there is a need for an ongoing discussion about the internship option.

**Recommendation #8:** That all comprehensive examinations be verified for authenticity of authorship and checked for plagiarism, to ensure their Academic Integrity.

**Unit Response:** The program will include this recommendation as part of its curriculum review process.

**Decanal Response:** The value of routine screening of graduate exams and theses for plagiarism using software tools like Turnitin is being discussed at the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies. FGPS supports further discussion on this matter. As this is related to several other initiatives that are part of the curriculum review process, it has not been included as a separate item in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #9:** The program should move towards the incorporation of TA and RA duties as part of funding packages, and in the interest of enhancing student training. This is important not only to enable program growth and fifth-year support, but to link the program more visibly and organically to main campus programs. While both the Self-Study and the students express the hope that future funding packages will limit TA duties to Years 2 and 4 of the program, it may be more realistic to recognize that most other doctoral programs include such duties as essential to student training and support from Year 1.

**Unit Response:** The program outlined the challenges associated with the incorporation of TA and RA opportunities for PhD students, including the absence of a related undergraduate program and the necessity of consistent practices across institutions. The program reiterated its commitment to identifying suitable teaching opportunities for its students.

**Decanal Response:** While it is true there is no direct access to an undergraduate program, there are TA opportunities for the students. FGPS agrees with the external reviewers that most other doctoral programs include such duties as essential to student training and support from Year 1.

**Recommendation #10:** That WLU confirm its commitment to its joint programmes by offering students admitted to these programs funding equal to that offered by partner institutions.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that the funding packages offered by both universities are currently consistent.

**Decanal Response:** FGPS agrees that maintaining funding parity across the university is an important goal. At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that the two universities have access to different resources, so it is not possible to guarantee parity in the future. Given this, this recommendation has not been included in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #11:** That the program provide transparent and regular communication about the procedures for accessing student research and travel funding.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that it agreed with this recommendation and had already begun to implement it. Related information had been communicated to students, and would be included in the program's student handbook.

**Decanal Response:** The FGPS has also made the request that any BSIA research/travel funds allocated to WLU students should be communicated (and made available to Laurier students) via the institution's standard means, thereby ensuring that each student's financial record is current and reflects the full level of financial support provided.

**Recommendation #12:** That WLU's Office of Graduate Studies consult with its graduate students to clarify its student policies and procedures with respect to program registration and the disbursement of funding, to align these with the experience of students enrolled through the University of Waterloo.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that it would defer to Laurier's Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies on this recommendation.

**Decanal Response:** FGPS uses a multi-channel communication approach through its website, bi-weekly news bulletin. Students are supported by FGPS staff, and that of the program officer and graduate program coordinator. Institutional policies and procedures are available online for all Laurier students (including the Laurier registrants in the global governance program). While the degree program requirements in this joint program are consistent across both institutions, as registrants in a joint program, the students are bound to policies and procedures of their home institution.



**Recommendation #13:** That the two universities and the program consult on common rules regarding student complaints and appeals, and ensure that these rules are clearly known to both students and instructors.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that students are bound by the rules of their home institution, but that they would add information about relevant policies and procedures to the program handbook.

**Decanal Response:** The FGPS agrees with the unit response and would be pleased to see the program handbook enhanced to reflect current information equally from both institutions in this regard. It is also appropriate to expect PhD students to take responsibility for being informed about their own degree program.

**Recommendation #14:** That the two universities agree on an administrative arrangement for the program that ensures strong representation of its interests in university level strategic and appointments decision-making.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that its administrative arrangement was a matter for senior administration at both universities to address.

**Decanal Response:** The FGPS agrees that the program deserves and needs strong representation in university-level strategic planning. The dean of FGPS has discussed this issue with the Provost/VPA.

**Recommendation #15:** That the PhDGG program consult with its students regarding their Support Service needs, and liaise with appropriate administration and staff to mitigate students' concerns.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that it would add information about support services to the orientation session held at the beginning of each year at both institutions.

**Decanal Response:** The FGPS agrees that Support Services available at each institution should be identified in a program handbook.

**Recommendation #16:** That the School and the partner universities explore the feasibility of a mechanism by which the share of research overheads generated by BSIA affiliated faculty be transferred to the school in proportion to the share of their time devoted to BSIA program responsibilities.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that this recommendation was a matter for senior administration at both universities.

**Decanal Response:** This recommendation falls outside of the expectations of a program review and is a matter for senior administration at both universities. Thus, it has not been included in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #17:** That the two universities commit to a plan for recruiting high-level research chairs who will be substantially committed to teaching and supervision in the PhDGG and other BSIA programs.

**Unit Response:** The program agrees with this recommendation but responded that its implementation was outside of the program's control as hiring decisions are not made by the PhDGG program itself. The program is committed to discussion with senior administration at both universities, which would be required to implement this recommendation.

**Decanal Response:** This recommendation falls outside of the expectations of a program review and is a matter for senior administration at both universities. This is tied to recommendation #14, which calls for the identification of the person who will advocate for the program at the highest levels of the administration. This recommendation has not been included in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #18:** That the program carefully monitor its Teaching and Supervisory capacities over the next cycle, to ensure that its commitments to students do not exceed these capacities.

**Unit Response:** The program responded that it would ensure any growth would be sustainable and in alignment with available faculty resources.

**Decanal Response:** Enrolment targets are managed at the institutional level, and are established consultatively at the graduate level to ensure that faculty teaching, supervisory and financial resources are sufficient. As this is an ongoing operational process, it has not been included in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #19:** That the program compile more detailed data regarding its applicants' institutional and disciplinary origins over the next cycle.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that it was already collecting this information and would continue to do so throughout the next review period.

**Decanal Response:** The FGPS welcomes this suggestion, and is prepared to assist in any way possible. As this reflects a current and ongoing rather than new initiative, it has not been included in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #20:** That the universities and the program continue to explore innovative means to enable and support increased international student recruitment as part of the effort to increase entering cohort numbers.

**Unit Response:** The program agreed with the importance of attracting international students and is committed to working with the administration at both universities to implement this recommendation.

**Decanal Response:** Laurier strives to attract a diverse graduate student cohort, including international students. Early recruitment of strong prospects may strengthen the quality of Vanier applicants, which may lead to greater success. Adequate and sustainable financial support contributions from faculty research grants would also strengthen the program's ability to attract and fund additional international students. The scope of this recommendation is institutional rather than program-specific, so it has not been included in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #21:** That the program compile more detailed data regarding the sources of its students' external funding over the next cycle.

**Unit Response:** The program indicated that it already tracks this data and would continue to do so.

**Decanal Response:** The FGPS agrees with this recommendation and would be pleased to discuss this further. As a current and ongoing initiative, it has not been included in the Implementation Plan.

## STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)

- The program benefits from the unique arrangement supported at the Balsillie School. It is important to continue to leverage that strength in planning for the future.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

- There are two sets of issues where the program and university need to do a better job of collaborating on decision-making and clearly communicating this to the students.
  - The first set of issues are about tactical details like policies, procedures, and day-to-day management of the program (e.g. recommendations 4, 11, 12, 13 and 15).
  - The second set of issues have to do with identifying and institutionalizing the person or people responsible for advocating for resources for students and faculty in strategic planning (e.g. recommendations 14, 16, 17, and 18).

## SIGNATURES

Dr. Douglas Deutschman

August 2, 2018



Dr. Kathryn Carter

September 18, 2018



Dr. Rob Gordon

October 5, 2018



## RECOMMENDATIONS PRIORITIZED FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND ACTION PLAN

| Recommendation to be Implemented  | Responsibility for Implementation      | Anticipated Completion Date | Responsibility for Resourcing (if applicable) | Additional Notes  |
|---|--|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <p><b>Recommendation #1:</b> It is important for the PhDGG's <b>websites</b> at the two partner institutions to provide the same information about the functioning of the program, and the various options available to students. Fields and course codes should be listed in identical order on both sites.</p>                    | <p>Program Director or designee(s)</p> | <p>July 2019</p>            |   |   |
| <p><b>Recommendation #2:</b> Addition of learning outcomes related to teaching and research skills.</p>   | <p>Program Director or designee(s)</p> | <p>September 2019</p>       |   |   |
| <p><b>Recommendation #3:</b> That the program undertake a formal review of the six <b>thematic fields</b>.</p>  | <p>Program Director</p>                | <p>September 2019</p>       |   |   |
| <p><b>Recommendation #4:</b> That the program inform students in their acceptance packages which field courses will be offered during their first year in the program. (Notice, this should also be reflected in the revisions to the website mentioned in #1 and the university policies and funding packages described in #2)</p> | <p>Program Director, FGPS</p>          | <p>December 2019</p>        |   | <p>The offer letter for all graduate students are generated within FGPS and contain information on funding and deadlines. The Program Director and FGPS need to coordinate communication so that the information is sent at the same time, whether in a separate communication or combined into a single communication.</p> |

| Recommendation to be Implemented   | Responsibility for Implementation | Anticipated Completion Date | Responsibility for Resourcing (if applicable) | Additional Notes  |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <p><b>Recommendation #5:</b> That the program review the existing <b>core course sequence and structure</b>, with a focus on: a) the relationship between the History of Global Governance and Globalization and Global Governance core course requirements; b) the means through which the Economics requirement should be met; and c) the focus and purpose of the Research Methods course.</p>  | Program Director                  | September 2020              |   | This is an essential part of the review of the thematic fields (#3) and the comprehensive examination (#6). |
| <p><b>Recommendation #6:</b> That the program review the structure and format of the <b>comprehensive examination process</b>, to ensure that comprehensive options align with the range of available core courses and fields; and consider whether to maintain the current practice of setting a core and a field exam, respectively, or tailoring the second comprehensive exam to the specific research interests of the candidate.</p> | Program Director                  | September 2020              |   |   |
| <p><b>Recommendation #7:</b> That the program reconsider the time involved in its internship option and its follow-up requirements, given the tight timelines laid out for the completion of the degree, and therefore whether it should continue to be advertised as a program option.</p>  | Program Director                  | September 2020              |   | Two more years of data will inform the decision about maintaining this option.                              |

| Recommendation to be Implemented   | Responsibility for Implementation                      | Anticipated Completion Date | Responsibility for Resourcing (if applicable) | Additional Notes  |
|--|--|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Recommendation #9:</b> The program should move towards the incorporation of TA and RA duties as part of funding packages, and in the interest of enhancing student training.  | Program Director,<br>VPA/Provost,<br>Dean of FGPS      | September 2020              |   | If the program has aspirations for growth, the incorporation of TA and RA opportunities may prove integral to funding a larger cohort. In accordance with the university's funding policy for doctoral students, the opportunity to TA or to teach a course is deemed integral to the program and student training. |
| <b>Recommendation #11:</b> That the program provide transparent and regular communication about the procedures for accessing student research and travel funding.  | Program Director,<br>VPA/Provost,<br>Dean of FGPS      | September 2020              |   | Related to Recommendation #9 above: while funding currently is reasonably comparable between institutions, increasing the variety of sources from which funding can be drawn will help diversify the opportunities available to students.   |
| <b>Recommendation #12:</b> That WLU's Office of Graduate Studies consult with its graduate students to clarify its student policies and procedures with respect to program registration and the disbursement of funding, to align these with the experience of students enrolled through the University of Waterloo. | FPGS with input from PhDGG<br>Program Director.        | July 2019                   |   | Alignment of our policies and procedures will be harmonized with the University of Waterloo as much as possible. FGPS will communicate policies and procedures and highlight any areas where the two schools operate under different systems or constraints.  |
| <b>Recommendation #14:</b> That the two universities agree on an administrative arrangement for the program that ensures strong representation of its interests in university level  | VPA/Provost,<br>Dean of FGPS,<br>Associate Dean (SIPG) | September 2019              |   | This is an important recommendation to ensure that the programs in SIPG have strong advocacy and adequate representation at Laurier.  |

|   |                                 |                |  |  |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| strategic and appointments decision-making.   |                                 |                |  |  |
| <b>Recommendation #15:</b> That the PhDGG program consult with its students regarding their Support Service needs, and liaise with appropriate administration and staff to mitigate students' concerns. | Program Director or designee(s) | September 2019 |  |  |