Implementation Report on the 2017-2018 Cyclical Review of the PhD in Global Governance

Authored by: Timothy Donais, Jasmin Habib, Andrew Thompson

Date: July 2021

INTRODUCTION

This is the first implementation report for the PhD in Global Governance cyclical review that took place in 2017-2018. For each recommendation, the full language from the External Reviewers' Report has been included, along with the corresponding information about implementation from the Final Assessment Report. For each recommendation, the unit has provided an update on the progress or action made toward the implementation of that recommendation, followed by comments from the relevant dean(s) and the Program Review Sub-Committee. Taking into account the updates provided by the unit and the comments from the dean(s), the Program Review Sub-Committee will review the report and determine if all recommendations have been implemented satisfactorily or if a subsequent report will be required.

RECOMMENDATIONS PRIORITIZED FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: 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.		
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Anticipated Completion Date**
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.	Program Director or designee(s)	July 2019

Unit Update: As of Spring 2021, UW has granted approval for the design and development of a standalone Global Governance Program webpage which will go live in Summer of 2021. This site will link to BSIA's site as well as to Laurier SIPG's pages as appropriate. SIPG, for its part, is in the process of hiring a co-op student to

update and harmonise its own webpages to ensure consistency. This has all taken some time to sort through, but we are confident that this recommendation will be fully implemented by Fall 2021.

FGPS Decanal Comments: My own perusal of the three independent webpages is consistent with the observations of the External Reviewers' report. All joint graduate programs face this challenge, and I appreciate the efforts made by the unit to coordinate content. As of this writing (17 August 2021), I do not believe the standalone page is yet live, but will be key to addressing this recommendation. From my perspective as a member of the Waterloo-Laurier Graduate Program in Geography, perhaps there is some content and design of its joint program website that may serve as useful examples: https://uwaterloo.ca/waterloo-laurier-graduate-program-in-geography/

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: Quite a bit of time has elapsed between the comments provided by the Unit and the Dean and the committee's review of this report. The committee was able to locate what appears to be the new website for the program, the creation of which would satisfy the intent of the reviewers' recommendation. This recommendation is considered to be completed, and no further reporting on it is required.

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: 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.		
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Anticipated Completion Date**
Recommendation #2: Addition of learning outcomes related to teaching and research skills.	Program Director or designee(s)	September 2019

Unit Update: A full review of the PhD program's learning outcomes will be placed on the agenda of the Inter-University Program Committee (IUPC) for its Fall 2021 meeting; we will look to address this recommendation in full at this point. In the meantime, we have moved towards institutionalizing some of these teaching and research skills-development opportunities, and more effectively communicating to students the existence of such opportunities. On teaching and learning, see the comments under Recommendation #9, but both universities have now moved to formalize TA opportunities at the second year for PhD GG students. Students are also encouraged to complete the relevant professional development programs offered through each partner university (Certificate in University Teaching at UW, and the ASPIRE program at Laurier). For the past three years, PhD students have also been invited to serve as co-mentors for the Graduate Fellows project. On research, in addition to orienting the core PhD methods course towards practical research skills, the program has also taken advantage of broader developments at the BSIA to encourage doctoral students to develop research competency. Specifically, students have been hired as research cluster support officers, working closely with

faculty leads in the development of programming, while the research clusters themselves have begun to offer one-off events on research methods (the international political economy cluster also runs an annual dissertation workshop). Given these developments, as we emerge from the pandemic now is the appropriate time to incorporate these as additional learning outcomes.

FGPS Decanal Comments: The unit describes some initiatives (formalization of TAs, Graduate Fellows project) but remains in the process of addressing this recommendation and implementation of new measures. As the unit recognizes, Laurier's ASPIRE program through its partners offers content recommended by the External Reviewers. This includes Teaching & Learning and its offerings of teaching certificates: https://students.wlu.ca/work-leadership-and-volunteering/student-teaching-development/certificates.html and the Library, which tends to have a full slate of workshops on the ASPIRE site during the fall and winter terms: https://students.wlu.ca/academics/graduate-and-postdoctoral-studies/aspire/index.html. Thus, at least some of the content recommended by the External Reviewers is available to GGPhD students without the need for additional faculty resources. Some graduate programs set requirements for their students to take ASPIRE offerings and the unit may want to consider this option.

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: It sounds like there are several initiatives that have either been newly put in place, or formalized, since the external review that satisfy the intent of this recommendation. Presumably, the Fall 2021 meeting of the Inter-University Program Committee has now taken place, and the experiences described above have been included in a revised set of program learning outcomes. Once this has been done, the recommendation will be considered completed. The committee trusts that if the review of program learning outcomes has not yet taken place, the program will follow through on this, and therefore, does not require any further updates on this recommendation.

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: 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)?		
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Anticipated Completion Date**
Recommendation #3: That the program undertake a formal review of the six **thematic fields.**	Program Director	September 2019

Unit Update: Since this report was completed, we have attracted a number of very strong students in each of these fields; as such, at the program level we continue to believe that the six fields remain viable as currently structured. The main field-specific challenge we face is that we no longer have full-time faculty available to

teach the core courses in GJHR, and with upcoming retirements, the Multilateralism field may also be of concern in coming years. That said, we see no urgent need to radically restructure the fields at this point, and continue to be creative in finding relevant courses for students in the GJHR field.

FGPS Decanal Comments: Given the demand for, and ability to attract strong students to each of the six thematic fields, I concur with the unit's preference to maintain status quo for the time being. As the unit recognizes, faculty complement will likely dictate if and when thematic restructuring becomes necessary to consider the directions offered by the External Reviewers.

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: Based on the comments provided by the Unit and the Dean, it sounds like there is rationale to leave the current fields as they are, until such time as the faculty complement requires additions or deletions to the six existing fields. No further reporting on this recommendation is required.

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: Recommendation #4: That the program inform students in their acceptance packages which field courses will be offered during their first year in the program.			
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	Responsibility for Implementation	Anticipated Completion Date	Additional Notes
Recommendation #4: 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 #9)	Program Director, FGPS	December 2019	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.

Unit Update: Timing remains an issue here, as offers of admission go out to students before teaching schedules are finalized (and Laurier and UW operate on different schedules with regard to course scheduling). Cognizant of this, and of the complex nature of course registration procedures in any joint program (students are often required to complete cumbersome OVGS forms in order to get into required courses), we stay in very close contact with the incoming cohort (both collectively and individually) between their acceptance of their offers of admission and the beginning of the academic term, in order to support them through the course selection and registration process. As long as the incoming cohort remains relatively small (12 or so students), we continue to believe this is a viable approach, and largely unavoidable given the peculiarities of course registration.

FGPS Decanal Comments: I concur with the unit – this is an entirely appropriate response and approach.

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: The committee recognizes that the specific recommendation itself may not be implementable, given the timing of setting teaching schedules and confirming course builds at each institution. The approach that is currently being taken is supported by the Dean of FGPS; therefore, the committee sees no reason to request further updates on this recommendation.

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: 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.			
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Anticipated Completion Date**	**Additional Notes**
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.	Program Director	September 2020	This is an essential part of the review of the thematic fields (#3) and the comprehensive examination (#6).

Unit Update: (a) We are encouraging faculty to coordinate their syllabi in order to minimise overlap and maximise complementarity; **(b)** the core economics course (GV730/ECON 637) has evolved in recent years to better adapt to the challenges of teaching a PhD-level economics course in an interdisciplinary context (where the majority of students are non-economists); as currently taught, the course focuses on selected themes of particular relevance to global governance, including contemporary challenges to neoclassical economics, competing approaches to issues of economic inequality, the economics of trade and globalization, and competing policy approaches to climate change. **(c)** Productive discussions between and among those teaching Research Methods have occurred and the course has shifted focus away from the Philosophy of Science to a more applied approach. The course now supports students in the development of their dissertation research proposals.

FGPS Decanal Comments: The unit describes initiatives and developments that address the recommendation. I suspect that incorporating applied aspects and support for the development of the dissertation research proposal regarding recommendation 'c)' is likely to be very well received by students. I encourage the unit to seek input and contribution from ASPIRE partners to support dissertation research proposal development, specifically the Library and Writing Services. Staff from these units can enhance delivery of this important content.

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: The activities described by the program are all good examples of ways in which the curriculum structure has been examined and revised in response to this recommendation. Curriculum review should be an ongoing activity, and the committee encourages the program to revisit its program learning outcomes and their alignment with the courses and other curriculum components on a regular basis to ensure that the program design is meeting student needs. No further reporting on this recommendation is required.

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: 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.		
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	Responsibility for Implementation	Anticipated Completion Date
Recommendation #6: That the program review the structure and format of the **comprehensive examination process**, 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.	Program Director	September 2020

Unit Update: We consider this recommendation to have been fully implemented, as the IUPC initiated a review of the comps process in Fall 2018, with new procedures being put in place for the September 2019 cohort (who wrote their comps starting in Fall 2020). Essentially, the IUPC opted to leave the core exam essentially as is, but to move to individually tailored field exams, involving unique committees, unique reading lists, and unique exams for each student. While this has involved more work for the faculty involved, it has enabled a situation where the field exams (and preparations for them) are more directly relevant to the research interests of the individual student, while still keeping the ability to test them on their breadth of knowledge in a particular field.

This new exam format was implemented for the first time in 2020, and was complicated (as was everything that year) by the COVID-19 pandemic. The 2021 exam cycle will give us another opportunity to review the strengths and weaknesses of this new model, and the IUPC will review in Fall 2021 based on feedback from students and faculty members.

New language from the PhD Handbook describing the comprehensive exam format is excerpted below:

Students complete two comprehensive examinations.

1) Students write the core Global Governance exam based on a reading list of fifty (50) works, normally made up of a mix of journal articles, chapters in books, and monographs, set by the core examination committee which is normally comprised of three faculty members, at least one of whom would have taught the Global Governance, Methods, History or Economics courses. The list of readings will be agreed upon by all committee members, reviewed and approved by the Program Director and Associate Director of the PhD Program, and then sent to the students by May 1. Normally, the students will write the Global Governance exam in the beginning of September of Year Two.

2) Students then write a Field exam based on a reading list of fifty (50) works, normally made up of a mix of journal articles, chapters in books and books, related to the field of their proposed dissertation topic. The Field exam is set by a committee normally comprised of the student's supervisor, the faculty member who taught a/the field course, and a third faculty member. The field exam reading list will be developed by the field committee in consultation with the student after which it will be reviewed and approved by the Program Director and Associate Director of the PhD Program. The finalized and approved list will normally be sent to the student by May 1. Normally, the students will write their Field Exam two weeks after their core Global Governance exam.

FGPS Decanal Comments: I applaud the unit for investing considerable time and energy to assess and develop a new comprehensive exam process. An outcome that is designed to accommodate both the research interests of the individual student while also ensuring breadth of knowledge in a particular field is to be commended. Ongoing review and evaluation based on feedback from faculty and students, as planned by the IUPC, will help to ensure the recommendation continues to be positively addressed.

This is simply an observation: The comprehensive exams certainly appear 'comprehensive', but they are entirely in the written format. Would there be scope and value in an oral component, perhaps associated with the Field exam, to ensure the candidate can defend their knowledge of the literature and their own ideas, engage in discourse etc. and to provide some opportunity to practice in advance of the dissertation defence?

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: The committee appreciates the level of detail provided by the program in outlining the steps that it has taken to implement this recommendation, the intent of which has been completed. The committee encourages the program to take the suggestion offered by the Dean of FGPS into consideration in any future discussions about the comprehensive examination process. No further reporting on this recommendation is required.

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: 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.			
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	Responsibility for Implementation	Anticipated Completion Date	Additional Notes
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.	Program Director	September 2020	Two more years of data will inform the decision about maintaining this option.

Unit Update: Due to the pandemic, this recommendation has of necessity been downgraded as a priority but we will invite the IUPC to consider removing this as an option in the Fall meeting. PhD students have not taken up internships per se, but partnership networks have evolved in ways that have allowed our students to take up visiting scholar positions in the course of conducting their research. The program has established formal visiting scholar arrangements with the University of Warwick and American University in Washington, as well as with two think tanks -- the Bonn International Centre for Conversion in Germany and the Global Arena Research Institute in the Czech Republic. There has been more uptake of these opportunities on the part of students.

FGPS Decanal Comments: From the description provided, it appears that there are some potentially excellent internship/experiential opportunities available. The response indicates that students have not generally taken on internships, but this appears to be changing with the new arrangements that have been established with other institutions and so perhaps this is now becoming a more viable component of the program. Given restrictions that have been imposed by the pandemic, but which perhaps will continue to lift, it does seem wise to hold off on making a decision on this recommendation. Seeking feedback from students who have recently completed an internship would likely be useful to inform decision-making.

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: The principle behind this recommendation is that the program review its internship option and decide if it should be sustained or deleted as an option for students. From the comments provided by the program, this discussion may have already taken place at the IUPC Fall meeting; if it did not, it should be included on a future meeting agenda. Completion of this discussion, regardless of the outcome, would satisfy the intent of the recommendation. The examples of visiting scholar and think tank opportunities provided by the program indicate there may be some merit in retaining this degree completion option, a decision that seems best left to the program itself. The committee does not require any further updates on this recommendation.

| Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: 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. |

Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	Responsibility for Implementation	Anticipated Completion Date	Additional Notes
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.	Program Director, VPA/Provost, 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.

Unit Update: Both universities have now agreed to offer TAships for students in year two of the program. As of Fall 2021, the offer letter to UW students includes a TAship for year two which will be paid over and above the Balsillie Scholarship. Laurier has had a similar arrangement in place since 2018-19, although up to this point TA contracts have been considered as an element of the overall year two funding package for Laurier students, rather than an additional add-on (as will be the case for UW students). This discrepancy will not be an issue until the 2022-23 academic year (when this year's cohort of incoming UW students takes up their TA duties), but at that point it is something that may need to be addressed in the interests of fairness. At Laurier, a growing number of upper year students are now offered course instructor positions through the posting-exempt provisions of the collective agreement. UW students are regularly notified when courses are available in the Department of Political Science, but must compete for these positions.

FGPS Decanal Comments: The unit has responded positively to this recommendation by offering TAs in year 2 and encouraging senior PhD students to instruct courses through posting-exempt offerings. It is unclear why TAs are not also offered in year 1. As noted by the External Reviewers, this is common among PhD programs and an important element of student training. The unit update does not address the recommendation to incorporate RAs in funding packages.

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: The committee appreciates the update provided by the program about the decision by both universities to offer TAships to students in Year 2 of their program. This decision achieves the recommendation made by the external reviewers, although as the Dean of FGPS notes, there is no information included in the program's update on opportunities for students to work as Research Assistants as part of their funding packages as well. Unless there are reasons that RAships cannot be offered, the program is encouraged to consider this as another important funding opportunity for graduate students to support their professional development. No further reporting on this recommendation is required.

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: Recommendation #11: That the program provide transparent and regular communication about the procedures for accessing student research and travel funding.			
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	Responsibility for Implementation	Anticipated Completion Date	Additional Notes
Recommendation #11: That the program provide transparent and regular communication about the procedures for accessing student research and travel funding.	Program Director, VPA/Provost, 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.

Unit Update: Prior to the pandemic and the suspension of travel for university business, students received regular communication about funding opportunities through BSIA, and the application forms are easily accessible on the BSIA website. Moreover, information about compliance with university travel safety protocols is included in the program handbook that is given to students prior to beginning the program, and can also be downloaded from the BSIA website. During the pandemic, students have received funding support for virtual conferences.

FGPS Decanal Comments: The response indicates that the unit does provide regular communication to its students regarding research and travel funding opportunities available through the BSIA. FGPS also offers a Travel Award Program to support graduate students to attend and present at conferences, and this could be communicated by the unit to its students (see: https://students.wlu.ca/registration-and-finances/graduate-funding-and-awards/internal-scholarships.html).

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: The updates provided indicate that this recommendation has been completed, and no further reporting is required.

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: 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.			
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Anticipated Completion Date**	**Additional Notes**
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.	FGPS with input from PhDGG 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.

Unit Update: Since the external reviewer's report, there have been discussions with FGPS about clarifying for students in particular what the procedures are for the disbursement of funding. At the program director level, however, we are unaware of whether measures have been taken to ensure better alignment across the two universities on this issue. We defer to FGPS on this matter.

FGPS Decanal Comments: FGPS has little influence to affect procedural change of disbursement of funding, which is handled by the university's students accounts team. Operationally, this is not something we would endeavour to customize for one program, and other joint graduate programs with UW exist. Graduate students of joint programs are aware, or can be reminded, that they follow the procedures of their home university, including accounts management. Further information for graduate students, regarding TAs, RAs, studentships and scholarships, can be found at: https://students.wlu.ca/registration-and-finances/graduate-funding-and-awards/index.html.

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: The comments provided by the program and dean suggest that full implementation of this recommendation may not be possible due to the different procedures for disbursement of student funding at each institution. Given this, while the spirit of the recommendation makes sense, it may not be possible to complete; therefore, no further reporting is required on it.

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: 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.			
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	Responsibility for Implementation	Anticipated Completion Date	Additional Notes
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.	VPA/Provost, Dean of FGPS, 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.

Unit Update: Governance issues have arisen and continue to be a challenge. While neither the Director nor the Associate Director of the PhD program have been invited to engage on the matter at any time, we believe that a revised version of the BSIA Governance Document which outlines the School's relationship to the Academic programs has been under review by the BSIA's Board of Directors (and perhaps others) for at least the past three years. The BSIA's Board is comprised of representatives from the 3 partners (CIGI, Laurier and UWaterloo); and the Director and Associate Director have been acting in accordance with the CAUT decision to protect the Program from donor/non-academic partner influence.

We can report on the academic programming side that at UW, the steering committee comprised of the Dean of Environment and the Chairs (or their delegates) of the three partner departments, Political Science, History and Economics, has begun to meet and/or its members regularly consulted as issues have arisen. That said, securing staff hires and replacement for retiring faculty is going to become ever more critical and we currently have no official representation on, for example, departmental hiring committees, budget meetings, or departmental graduate committees where decisions may be taken that will affect Global Governance students, faculty and staff. As per reporting in the initial review, the Director/Associate Director on the UW side is left to negotiate on behalf of the program's needs on an individual basis – approaching individual chairs of affiliated departments to ask that they support staffing the core and field courses along with releasing faculty to perform key administrative roles.

On the Laurier side, the Associate Dean of SIPG has been in consultations with both the Dean of FGPS and the Vice President-Academic about putting a committee in place to recommend new arrangements aimed both at streamlining program administration and ensuring stronger program representation in strategic decision-making. In the interim, the Dean of Graduate Studies, who also serves on the BSIA Board, has pledged to ensure that SIPG interests are heard at the level of senior administration.

FGPS Decanal Comments: As the Acting AVP/Dean of FGPS, I have not participated in these discussions, but I am confident that the AVP/Dean will continue to advocate for SIPG.

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: This recommendation seems like an ongoing one, rather than one that can be easily checked off as completed. The comments provided indicate that this recommendation is being attended to at both universities, as it is able to be. As an ongoing issue, the committee recommends that the program and SIPG continue to advocate for its representation in decision-making opportunities, as appropriate, but for reporting purposes, this recommendation is considered to be completed.

Full Recommendation from External Reviewers' Report: 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.		
Recommendation to be Implemented (from Final Assessment Report)	Responsibility for Implementation	Anticipated Completion Date
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.	Program Director or designee(s)	September 2019

Unit Update: Handbook updates and new webpages (see recommendation #1, above) are streamlining information on support services available at each of the universities. More broadly, the pandemic – and the associated shift to online learning – has exposed some of the gaps in student support services across both universities. As we slowly return to campus, we will consult with students on these experiences in an effort to identify ways of more effectively mitigating student concerns.

FGPS Decanal Comments: The unit identifies that they will consult with students to identify how to better address Support Service needs. It is unclear what prompted this recommendation, but the ASPIRE program may help to address some of these needs and concerns. If there is interest, FGPS can provide a session to introduce GGPhD students to the ASPIRE program.

Program Review Sub-Committee Comments: The updates to the program handbook and website are examples of how the program has worked towards implementing this recommendation since the cyclical review took place. The committee supports the program's idea to consult with students to ensure that their concerns are heard and their support needs are being met. The committee encourages the program to examine the ASPIRE program offerings to see if there are any existing opportunities that may be of value to PhDGG students. No further reporting on this recommendation is required.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

FGPS Acting AVP/Dean (Brent Wolfe): I commend the unit for making strong strides to actively respond to the recommendations of the External Reviewers. While joint programs typically possess excellent strengths in the diversity and depth of academic programming and training opportunities it can provide to its students, I recognize the operational challenges of instituting change when another university and its practices may need to be considered in some instances. Implementation of some recommendations is completed, and while others remain in progress, I believe that sufficient progress has been demonstrated that further reporting is not required.

Program Review Sub-Committee: The committee thanks the PhDGG program for the updates provided on the recommendations prioritized for implementation in its 2017-2018 cyclical review. The committee acknowledges that the implementation of these recommendations has been occurring during an especially challenging time, and applauds the program for completing those recommendations that it has been able to. Acknowledging the gap between the completion of this report and the committee's review of it, there is likely additional work on the implementation of recommendations that has taken place since the report was submitted. Several of the recommendations are in areas that deserve ongoing attention (e.g. curricular structure, student support needs, SIPG representation) and the program is encouraged to follow through on any commitments identified in this report and continue to monitor these areas. No further Implementation Reports will be required in advance of the program's next cyclical review, currently scheduled for 2024-2025.

Subsequent Report Required: No

Next Cyclical Review: 2024-2025 (to be coordinated with the University of Waterloo's review schedule)