

## Final Assessment Report for the 2020-2021 Cyclical Program Review of Business

### 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 Business programs within the Lazaridis School of Business and Economics (Lazaridis School) prepared by the Quality Assurance Office, along with an identification of strengths of the program(s) under review authored by the Vice Dean of the Lazaridis School and Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. All recommendations made by the external review committee are listed in order, followed by a summary of the department's response, and the relevant decanal responses.

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 Vice-Provost: Teaching and Learning and the Provost and 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 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 reports are required. The Senate Academic Planning Committee will also approve the Implementation Report.

### SUMMARY OF REVIEW PROCESS

The Business Department of the Lazaridis School of Business and Economics offers undergraduate, master's, and doctoral programs, all of which were last reviewed in 2013-2014.

The Self-Study was authored by Associate Deans in the Lazaridis School: Dr. Ignacio Castillo, Dr. Shelley McGill, and Dr. Patricia McLaren, with input from relevant Program Directors and Area Coordinators. In addition to the Self-Study (Volume I), the department also submitted a copy of 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, the Vice Dean of the Lazaridis School of Business and Economics, and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies prior to submission of the final version.

As per Laurier's IQAP, 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 December 3, 2020, and a virtual external review was scheduled by the Quality Assurance Office for the week of April 5-9, 2021.

The review committee consisted of Dr. Pamela Bryden from the Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education at Wilfrid Laurier, Dr. Gina Grandy from the Hill & Levene Schools of Business at the University of Regina, and Dr. Peter Tingling from the Beedie School of Business at Simon Fraser University. During the virtual external review, the review committee met with the following individuals and groups:

- Dr. Anthony Vannelli, Provost and Vice-President: Academic
- Dr. Lisa Keeping, Vice Dean of the Lazaridis School of Business and Economics
- Dr. Douglas Deutschman, Associate Vice-President and Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- Dr. Ignacio Castillo, Associate Dean, Academic Business Programs;; Dr. Patricia McLaren, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Business Programs; Dr. Robert Mathieu, Associate Dean, Faculty Development and Research; Ms. Hillary Beaudry, Academic Programs and Accreditation Coordinator; and Ms. Kailey Gomez, Financial Operations and Research Support Administrator
- Dr. Karin Schnarr, Bachelor of Business Administration Programs Program Director and Mr. Isaac Santi, Coordinator of Undergraduate Business Programs
- Dr. Bruce McConomy, Director, Graduate Diploma in Accounting; Dr. Michael Pavlin, Director, MSc in Management Analytics; Dr. Madhu Kalimipalli, Director, PhD and Research-based Master's Programs in Management
- Dr. Mitali De, Director, MBA Programs; Dr. Sebastien Fourné; Dr. J. Brad Davis, Associate Director, MBA Programs, and Dr. Ning Tang, Director, Master of Finance Program
- Full-time Faculty in the Lazaridis School of Business and Economics
- Student representatives from each graduate program
- Undergraduate student representatives
- Ms. Patrycja Gadomski-Cebo, Mr. Michael Lisetto-Smith, Ms. Sally Ramsammy, Lazaridis School Administrative Managers
- Mr. Karen McCargar, Ms. Laurie Lahn, and Ms. Amy Wolf, Co-operative Education Representatives
- Mr. Matt Thomas, Head of Collections and Acquisitions and Mr. Matt Rohweder, Business Liaison Librarian

The review committee submitted their completed report on May 17, 2021. The executive summary from the report is provided below.

## External Reviewers' Report Executive Summary

The Review Team for the Department of Business (the School) was comprised of Pam Bryden (Wilfrid Laurier University), Gina Grandy (University of Regina), and Peter Tingling (Simon Fraser University). Virtual meetings took place during the week of April 5.

The Review Team is grateful for the coordination and support provided by Jessica Blondin and Sally Heath during the process. The Review Team would also like to express its gratitude to the School's team who prepared the Self Report materials – the materials were extensive and thorough. The faculty, staff (within the School and across campus) and students who gave of their time so willingly and expressed so clearly the School's commitment to excellence, have made this process very enjoyable. There is no doubt that this review process is taken seriously by the School and that faculty and staff members are highly devoted to continuous learning.

The School is to be applauded for its continued demonstration of Advancing Academic Excellence and Expanding Experiential Learning – two of the strategic pillars for Wilfrid Laurier University. There is an incredible commitment to immersion- experiential learning by faculty (and staff) and this is widely recognized as core to the School's (and University's brand), especially for its BBA program. This was reiterated by students who were part of the review process at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and core to their decision to choose the program they did. It is a clear differentiator for the School and University. There is no doubt that there is a commitment to teaching and service excellence and the School (and faculty) relationships with alumni are positive and strong. The School's efforts to build a strong research culture are also evident and there are faculty members with reputations as exceptional national and international scholars.

Unfortunately, it is the view of the Review Team, in its current form, e.g., the School's operations, allocation of resources, and positioning, it is not a sustainable model. This concern was raised in the Self Report and emerged very strongly throughout conversations held over the week. Based on all of the materials provided and the experience of Review Team, it is concluded that the situation at the School is not a sustainable one. It is believed that a number of considerations feed into this situation.

First, it is recognized the pressures felt by the School reflect institution-wide pressures that all Schools /Departments (and other Universities) are facing (e.g., insufficient resources). Second, like the larger institution, the School is experiencing 'growing pains' as it matures from a primarily undergraduate teaching institution to a comprehensive institution where teaching and research are expected to be more balanced \*and\* the student base has grown dramatically. As part of those 'growing pains' the School is under-resourced to support that kind of growth, and in some ways it isn't structured most effectively to use the resources it has. We acknowledge that on the staffing side the School is engaged in an ongoing review and readjustment of staffing resources to better align staff given current operations (e.g., graduate office restructure / realignment). We also acknowledge that in many ways faculty and staff (and the Associate Deans and Vice Dean) are so incredibly swamped with ensuring current and new programming is delivered to a high standard, that there is not time to stop and reflect on how some aspects of operations and programming might be done differently. Third, the success of the School is in many ways a function of the commitment of faculty and staff who have built the experiential –immersive high touch model. In fact, staff and faculty burn out is a real risk, as is future risk of ineffective succession planning when long time committed faculty either retire or decide they can no longer sustain the level of service burden they carry. Faculty members also appear to feel that any changes to that model will threaten the quality of education that students have come to expect and faculty believe they deserve. The current model is not scalable in the way faculty members may want it to be and there needs to be both a greater commitment (espoused and

enacted) from the institution to protect and invest in the School's efforts \*and\* for the School to re-think how it conceptualizes and operationalizes experiential-immersive high touch education given its size.

## RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

The External Reviewers' Report included 23 recommendations, which have been listed verbatim below, followed by a summary of the department's response, and the decanal response.

**Recommendation #1:** To more fully align with the University's strategy plan \*and\* respond to critical needs of Canadian society, it is recommended that the School engage in a review of its programs, program learning outcomes, student recruitment and admissions practices, and faculty and staff recruitment with an EDII lens. Specifically, it is recommended it introduce learning outcomes, programming, practices and activities to account for and embed Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Indigenization in its culture.

This commitment needs to be espoused and enacted by the Dean and Vice Dean as a means to empower and enable the staff and faculty leadership (e.g., Associate Deans, Program Directors, Senior Administrative Officer, Managers), and in turn faculty and staff, to advance this as a priority.

**Unit Response:** We have begun the critical process of integrating EDII throughout the school, including curriculum, pedagogy, research, and hiring. We have projects underway at the Dean, Associate Dean, and individual instructor levels. To integrate EDII successfully and sustainably throughout the school will take thought, care, and time, and we are committed to taking the time necessary to have EDII embedded in the school, and not a surface-level response that will perpetuate problems.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with this recommendation. The university is currently engaged in strategic planning for EDII, which will affect each faculty. The Lazaridis School and the Business Department is also engaged in planning to examine and enhance EDII in different areas as indicated in the unit response. The School is also embarking on a strategic planning exercise, which will be an opportunity to include EDII in a more comprehensive and intentional manner than in the past.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** I agree with this recommendation and support the Lazaridis School and the Business Department. They are making a commitment to this process and I look forward to seeing the results.

**Recommendation #2:** To ensure the School is prepared to adapt to institutional and student expectations of increased flexibility (e.g., delivery modes), it is recommended that the School identify and invest now in activities, courses, etc. where synchronous and asynchronous remote delivery and hybrid delivery would be appropriate post-Covid.

**Unit Response:** This is a key priority indeed, as we simply cannot go back to the old normal. The new normal needs to incorporate the lessons learned during these unprecedented times. We are in the process of developing four new online undergraduate courses with both synchronous and asynchronous components. We are also in the process of developing a new graduate diploma and re-designing the part-time MFin stream to be delivered in a hybrid fashion. As we return to in-person teaching in the Winter 2021 semester, instructors will be assessing

their courses and integrating those elements of remote teaching that were pedagogically successful with their in-person courses.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** Although I agree with this recommendation in principle, the current faculty collective agreements prevent us from moving forward with hyflex or hybrid teaching at a program level. Should this situation change, we will move forward with new, innovative delivery formats. We will continue to move forward with adding online course offerings.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** The Business Department has proposed several modifications to programs that implementing online, hybrid and flexible elements in the program. The proposals can only be implemented after the university has addressed some significant policy and collective bargaining issues. The proposals were approved by the Graduate Faculty Council and the Senate Academic Planning Committee. The proposals will be discussed at the next Senate meeting. There is broad support for the program changes, but the implementation will depend on the resolution of the broader governance issues.

**Recommendation #3:** That the School re-evaluate its current list of program learning outcomes (and micro learning outcomes) to identify a more streamlined set which will continue to reflect the main desired learning outcomes while serving as a more manageable list to measure, document and report upon.

**Unit Response:** We recognize that we have an unwieldy number of program learning outcomes. In Winter 2020, we began the process of developing a new set of goals and learning outcomes and implementing a formal Assurance of Learning process, which included changes to our governance and committee structure. Over the past year, we have been collecting data to measure our learning outcomes, and we will continue developing goals and outcomes and measuring how well we are achieving them.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with the recommendation and believe that this has already been accomplished with our revamped assurance of learning structure that we developed for AACSB accreditation. Because the recommendation has already been completed, it has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** This recommendation was largely directed at the BBA program. Even so, it relates to similar recommendations to review and potentially simplify and realign graduate programs (e.g. recommendations 10 -13). I agree with the Unit response.

**Recommendation #4:** To better enable program management, the School should be more directly involved in the setting of admission targets with centralized Admissions.

**Unit Response:** We are indeed very involved with centralized admissions in terms of setting targets for all programs, and final decisions on admission targets are made by the School. One of the key issues at the undergraduate level, particularly the BBA program, is that we do not have accurate offers/confirmations predictive models that we can use to support our admissions decisions. In recent years, Institutional Research has taken responsibility for developing the decision models and they are slowly becoming more accurate.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** There appears to have been a misunderstanding as the School is very involved in setting targets. The dean's office works with individual programs in setting these targets and then

works closely with university admissions to meet them. We would, however, love to have access to more of the data associated with admissions to enable us to do our own analyses and develop more sophisticated processes. This recommendation has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #5:** It is recommended that the School develop a policy on class sizes which takes into account differences in pedagogical approaches across subject areas, thoughtful deliberation on trade-offs regarding year of study (e.g., smaller classes at 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year \*or\* 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>), the positioning of the program, average class sizes of AACSB accredited schools, and its need to meet AACSB accreditation requirements (e.g., participating and supporting faculty).

**Unit Response:** Over time, class sizes have been set for a variety of reasons, including space, instructor availability, cohort size, and pedagogy. We agree that a review and analysis of these reasons would be timely, particularly considering changing pedagogies following the pandemic and how they may affect ideal class sizes. Following the assessment, we will consider a policy, although guidelines may be more manageable as work within resource constraints.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I support this recommendation if it is something the department wants to do. However, I agree with the Unit Response that guidelines, rather than a strict policy, are more realistic. Resource constraints will continue to influence class sizes to a great extent and until this changes, policies are likely to be ineffective. The recommendation to establish a policy on class sizes has not been prioritized, but I support the department's willingness to undertake a review of class sizes in light of changes to teaching approaches coming out of the pandemic.

**Recommendation #6:** To provide an opportunity for students to be better prepared for the ICE initiative, move BU 481 to the third year of study and review BU491 to ensure it offers another integrative experience to students in their fourth year of study.

**Unit Response:** We support this recommendation in theory. We will explore the interest in, and ability to, implement it. Moving a 4<sup>th</sup> year course to 3<sup>rd</sup> year requires an associated move of a 3<sup>rd</sup> year course to 2<sup>nd</sup> year, etc., so a detailed plan and significant faculty buy-in is needed.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I support the exploration of this recommendation as part of a wider review. I do not think that isolating BU481 in particular, however, is an immediate priority. Students seem quite prepared for the ICE competition so changes to this course for this reason alone seems unwarranted.

**Recommendation #7a:** In an effort to increase student and unit flexibility, and incorporate more contemporary content of strategic importance, it is recommended that one to four of the existing specified required core courses in the BBA be removed.

**Unit Response:** This is an interesting recommendation that has not been previously discussed at the program-level. We will begin an assessment of the feasibility in terms of both curriculum coverage and program learning outcomes for our students and interest from the faculty.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** A review of the BBA program is currently under way that will explore this topic as part of the review. Many discussions of decreasing required courses have taken place in the past and we have made changes over the years. However, examining this question again as part of continuous improvement makes sense. I would not dictate that there must be a reduction, just that this possibility be examined.

**Recommendation #7b:** In an effort to enhance the alignment of the BBA curriculum to the changing needs and expectations of industry and broader society, it is recommended that the BBA more explicitly include specified core curriculum or co-curriculum content in the areas of Business Analytics, Diversity, and Indigenization.

**Unit Response:** We have started exploring and researching ways to bring diversity and Indigeneity into our curriculum. We will continue this work at the faculty, program, and instructor-level. We have a new analytics elective being offered in the 2021-2022 academic year, and we will continue to work on building this curriculum in the BBA program.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with this recommendation. As we work to include more diversity, Indigeneity, and analytics, we will evolve with respect to where and how it fits into the curriculum.

**Recommendation #8:** In an effort to enhance student accessibility and flexibility and reduce student stress, it is recommended that the requirement to complete all first attempts of required courses in-person be reviewed and revised (to a smaller list of courses or hybrid delivery options), and an investment made to develop BU111 or BU121, and a number of other courses (possibly electives) into online options (or synchronous remote options) for BBA students post Covid.

**Unit Response:** We will continue to require that all first attempts of required courses be taken in-person. The in-person experience is one of the key elements of our program. We have started the process of developing four new online courses which BBA majors will be able to take if they need to repeat a course and which Business Administration Diploma, Management Option, and Laurier and University of Waterloo students will be able to take for their first attempt.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with the Unit Response and we will not be moving ahead with this recommendation, therefore it has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan. However, this recommendation is one that may be considered in the future, depending on the post-COVID landscape.

**Recommendation #9.** In order to better align with student interests and more effectively manage scheduling of courses / teaching resources, it is recommended that the following concentrations be reviewed, and possibly phased out or replaced with micro-credentials: Insurance & Risk Management; Entrepreneurship; Brand / Marketing Communication; Business & Sustainability; Human Resources; Supply Chain Management; and International Business.

**Unit Response:** We started conversations about BBA and MBA concentrations a few months ago. We have received input from potential applicants, from career services in terms of employers' expectations, and also from the functional areas within the department. The recommendations above are well taken and will be shared with our faculty as we are working on the list of courses to support the potential new concentrations.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with the recommendation to review the concentrations identified. I do not see that we have capacity to at this time to replace them with micro-credentials, however.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** In the report, the suggested review of concentrations was largely framed around the undergraduate program. This recommendation is one of several where the review committee is suggesting that all programs take a step back and look at what is working and what should be revised. That is true of the graduate programs as well.

**Recommendation #10.** It is recommended that the School consider phasing out the on-site Toronto Graduate Diploma in Accounting program and possibly introduce a synchronous remote delivery option for students based in Toronto to join the Waterloo delivery of the program.

**Unit Response:** This refers to the MBA with CPA stream in Toronto. (The Graduate Diploma in Accounting is only offered in the Waterloo campus.) Indeed, MBA with CPA program was recently closed: no new admissions as of 2020-2021. However, we are still committed to fulfill graduation requirements for the students that we currently have in progress.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** As noted in the Unit Response, there was a mislabelling of this program. We began phasing out the MBA/CPA program last year so this recommendation is already complete, and has therefore not been include in the Implementation Plan.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** Nothing to add.

**Recommendation #11:** In an effort to focus attention on ensuring a healthy enrolment funnel for fewer graduate programs overall and increase the likelihood of the long-term sustainability of at least one MBA program, it is recommended that the School engage in a rationalization of its MBA programs. This could include reducing the number of 'fields of study', the number of courses and or sections of courses, and possibly the number of programs (e.g., phase out the Toronto MBA programs; phase out the Waterloo day-time program and combine the evening and day-time cohorts; identify opportunities for hybrid delivery whereby Toronto students might join Waterloo cohorts).

**Unit Response:** All these ideas are interesting. See recommendation #9 connecting to the concentrations (fields of study).

Note that the so-called daytime program is full-time, while the so-called evening-time program is part-time. We already combine full-time and part-time cohorts for elective courses in the Waterloo campus. Combining mandatory, core courses is not feasible due to the full- vs part-time nature of the programs. A more meaningful, reduced set of concentrations will be used to rationalize elective courses in the future.

In recent years, there has been a shift from generalist master's programs (MBA for instance) towards more specialized programs in business schools. In order to be current and competitive, we will need to offer some specialized programs at the graduate level. The Toronto programs are important revenue generators and it is important to keep and grow enrolments in these programs.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I do not agree with the recommendation to rationalize the MBA programs at this time. Each continues to generate significant revenue and adds to the life of the School in offering a comprehensive set of business programs. We have enhanced our marketing and admissions processes through our restructured graduate staffing structure and hope that this will result in increased enrollment moving forward. However, when the MBA fields are examined per Recommendation #9, I support the elimination of one or more of them as part of that process.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** I think the unit response is very insightful. The Department has been looking critically at what programs (current and new) will best support their efforts to maintain excellent. They have been very thoughtful about emerging sub-disciplines. They also recognize that their programs must appeal to a diverse group of students. I support the careful review of each program as a separate entity and as a collection of programs. But recommendation #11 is not necessarily the best path forward.

**Recommendation #12:** It is recommended that the School engage in a cost benefit analysis of the MFin Toronto program to determine if the program should be phased out or provide a remote delivery option to students to join the Waterloo program, rather than on-site delivery from Toronto.

**Unit Response:** The plan for MFin is to re-design the program to offer two streams: an in-person, full-time, co-op only stream (Waterloo campus) and a hybrid, part-time stream. The hybrid, part-time stream will effectively replace the current Toronto program.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with this recommendation. The MFin Toronto program has struggled to gain a critical mass and should be examined for feasibility. As noted in my response for Recommendation #2, however, the current collective agreements prevent us from moving forward with a hybrid design at this time.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** The unit was aware of the challenges facing the MFin in Toronto and have been working on plans to revise what flavors of MFin program will be offered. COVID has forced us to perform a sudden experiment in hybrid learning. There are specifics that need to be ironed out (See Lazaridis Decanal Response above), but the program is exploring options. As with recommendation #11, I understand the review team's concerns, but I think the unit and the Lazaridis School are in a good position to modify their programs in a careful and thoughtful way.

**Recommendation #13a:** To enhance the student shared learning experience and reduce the excessive faculty resources required to deliver the program and fields of study, it is recommended that the MSc Management programs be revised to contain a larger common core of courses (e.g., four).

**Unit Response:** See below.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** Although I agree with the spirit of the recommendation, we will not be moving forward with it at this time, and it has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan. The current fields share some courses, as noted below. However, the specific knowledge of each field must be taught and we feel we have consolidated where we can already.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** I agree with one aspect of the recommendation. A set of common core courses can provide a rich peer group and academic environments for graduate students in a program or department. In other cases, there may be too little common material to support that approach. Academically, I am a biologist. Many biology departments offer multiple masters and PhD programs because the sub-disciplines are very different. I see the MSc Management in the same way. The fields of study cover a number of sub-disciplines. In other recommendations, the unit is reviewing its degree programs and fields within programs.

**Recommendation #13b:** To enhance the student shared learning experience and reduce the excessive faculty resources required to deliver the program and fields of study, it is recommended that the PhD program be revised to contain a larger common core of courses (e.g., four to six) and substantially reduce the overall number of specialized required courses.

**Unit Response:** Our different curriculum committees have argued rather extensively about the issue of achieving discipline-specific learning outcomes with common core courses. Currently, MS700 and BU800 are offered jointly for Marketing, OB/HRM, and Accounting for both all MSc and PhD students. In the PhD program, BU801 is offered jointly for Marketing and Accounting.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** Although I agree with the spirit of the recommendation, we will not be moving forward with it at this time, and it has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan. The current fields share some courses, as noted below. However, the specific knowledge of each field must be taught and we feel we have consolidated where we can already.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** As I wrote in 13a, there are important reasons to structure programs and/or fields that share some common courses or other requirements. But those benefits are less important than the discipline-specific knowledge required to conceptualize, implement, and defend an original research project in each of the fields. The unit is aware of the costs and benefits of requiring common core courses and I think they do so where appropriate.

**Recommendation #13c:** To reduce placing PhD students in an unnecessary vulnerable situation, it is recommended that comprehensive exams occur before the end of year three for all programs.

**Unit Response:** We believe there has been some miscommunication or confusion here, if there are no deviations from the prescribed curriculum plans, all the PhD courses have the comprehensive exam scheduled by year two of the program.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree that there has been a misunderstanding. We already have students complete comprehensive exams before year three of their program. This recommendation is therefore not applicable, and has not been included in the Implementation Plan.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** I can confirm the accuracy of the responses from the unit and the Vice-Dean. In the past, there have been PhD students in Management (and elsewhere at Laurier) that have been working on their comprehensives into their 3<sup>rd</sup> year. In the five years I have served as dean, the PhD in Management has focused on providing substantive and timely feedback to PhD students. Timely comprehensive exams are a part of this broader effort. It does not need to be in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #14:** To ensure students are exposed to and learn from diverse and mixed groups within courses, across courses and across programs, instructors should implement an EDII lens to ensure group diversity.

**Unit Response:** As mentioned in recommendation #1, we have begun the critical process of integrating EDII throughout the school, including curriculum, pedagogy, research, and hiring, noting that projects at the individual instructor level would capture this recommendation. We are also in the process up looking at various EDII related issues including diversity in the classroom and in student groups.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** This recommendation appears to be encompassed by Recommendation #1.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** This recommendation appears to be encompassed by recommendation #1. Recommendation #1 seems targeted at strategic, systemic change at the Lazaridis School. I interpreted this recommendation as being more focused on adding EDII relevant content in courses as soon as possible, even while the more strategic work is proceeding. From that perspective, I would like the unit to take think about both short-term and medium-term approaches to this fundamental and time-sensitive issue.

**Recommendation #15:** To ease unnecessary over assessment of students and reduce pressures on faculty members who feel compelled to design a large number of assessments for a course, it is recommended the School create guidelines on generally acceptable number of assessments per course or per level (e.g., 100 versus 300) for each program, differentiating between individual and group work.

**Unit Response:** At the beginning of the pivot to remote learning caused by the pandemic, the Teaching & Learning Office at the university encouraged instructors to re-design their courses to have a large number of minor assessments to help students manage their time. Students found that having large numbers of small assessments over five courses was extremely difficult to manage, and for the following semesters, instructors were advised to follow the more traditional evaluation plan of fewer assessments. As we return to an in-person teaching environment instructors will be able to re-design their courses to include the successful changes from the past year and retain the successful elements from their in-person offerings. Instructors have autonomy over how their courses are structured, and the program does not compel instructors in one particular direction.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I do not agree with this recommendation and it has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan. Instructors have academic freedom and although our courses are coordinated to a great extent compared to many other disciplines, this feels like it would be taking this standardized approach too far.

**Recommendation #16:** In order to allow for better planning, *felt* control, and a stronger sense of ‘we are in this together’, it is recommended that the institution engage in a more transparent and consultative approach on budgeting and costing with the School.

**Unit Response:** We leave this recommendation for the Dean’s response, as budgeting is managed at the decanal level.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with this recommendation, although it is obviously beyond the control of the Lazaridis School, so it has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan. The Provost's Office has communicated that the university must return to some form of an RCM budget model. We hope that this will happen sooner rather than later. The Lazaridis School has engaged the Provost's Office in several discussions regarding the tax we pay for shared services and our desire to have this both elucidated and modified. We hope that further discussions will result in changes made in this regard.

**Recommendation #17a:** To better utilize the existing staff complement it is recommended that the School undertake a review of pedagogical functions that may have migrated from faculty to staff or are sub-optimally located with staff areas.

**Unit Response:** In regards to this recommendation, the reviewers refer specifically in their report to the ICE competition. All academic aspects of ICE are currently handled by faculty members, including selecting the case company and writing the case, preparing the students for the competition, judging the competition (together with alumni and industry professionals), and assigning the grades. Staff support is provided in scheduling presentations, booking rooms, and compiling grades. A review of the existing structure of staff within the graduate programs was undertaken and the review committee recommended a task-based approach to staffing, rather than a program-based one. A manager for graduate programs staff has been hired and the suggested changes will be implemented over the next few months. At the current time, all pedagogical functions are the responsibility of faculty members, with staff support at an operational level for our immersive and experiential-learning events.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with the Unit Response. There seems to have been a misunderstanding and this recommendation is unnecessary, therefore, it has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #17b:** To better utilize the existing staff complement it is recommended that the School undertake a review of support functions currently being performed by faculty that are either displacing teaching and research or for which faculty are being otherwise compensated but may be better suited to staff.

**Unit Response:** Support functions for the undergraduate programs were re-structured two years ago with the introduction of a staff manager for the Lazaridis Undergraduate Programs Office. This year, we have re-structured the Graduate Programs Office following the success at the undergraduate level. The new structures required a substantial re-design of the job descriptions for academic program directors at both undergraduate and graduate levels. We believe the new structures will achieve the intention of the recommendation.

The reviewers refer to program directors doing significant student advising, but do not indicate if the issue was raised for undergraduate or graduate programs, or both. The program director roles do include student advising, particularly for complex situations that the academic advisors need support with and also for career advising. At the undergraduate level, the BBA Program Director provides advising support in these areas, and the academic advisors do the significant bulk of the advising.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I believe that we have already completed this recommendation through our staff restructuring at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, as indicated by the Unit Response. Since the recommendation has already been completed, it has not been included in the Implementation Plan.

**Recommendation #17c:** To increase coordination and alignment across professional and research programs, it is recommended that the current program director structure be changed (e.g., one program director for research programs, and one or two for professional programs).

**Unit Response:** A review of the existing structure of staff within the graduate programs was undertaken and the review committee recommended a task-based approach to staffing, rather than a program-based one. The review committee also recommended a revision of the current program director structure.

It is not clear at this time what the new structure could be. The recommended structure above is well received and will be evaluated. Other structures will be evaluated as well. For instance, we have discussed the possibility of differentiating new vs. established programs, and to perhaps staff a new program with its own, non-aggregated program director for 3-6 years. After this time period, the new program would be considered established and join the corresponding research-intensive or professional-based structure. This is indeed work in progress.

A final note here to indicate that we continuously strive for increased levels of coordination and alignment across professional-based and research-intensive programs: our new committee structure now includes the following committees that were previously siloed, Graduate Programs Strategic Planning Committee, Professional-Based Graduate Programs Curriculum Committee, and Research-Based Graduate Programs Curriculum Committee.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I think that this is an interesting recommendation. I support the consideration of this recommendation, perhaps in the next two years. As indicated in the response, we have already made some progress in coordinating professional and research-based programs. Alignment in the form of director positions might be part of further evolution. I would not enforce this outcome at this time but think the department should consider it.

**Recommendation #18:** To better allocate resources between graduate, undergraduate and external facing staff, and facilitate a greater understanding of the support that administrative staff can and do provide, it is recommended that the School document and communicate (possibly through an internal portal) a summary of functions (and associated contact details) completed by various staffing positions and areas to both staff and faculty on a regular basis (e.g., who to contact for X, Y, Z).

**Unit Response:** We recognize the confusion amongst faculty and staff as to which role is responsible for which tasks. We will create a document summarizing all academic and staff administrative roles and contact information and share it with all staff and faculty in the next six months.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I think this is an excellent idea. This would, of course, require time and dedicated resources to implement. I think this is very achievable, however, and I would support the allocation of resources to complete this task.

**Recommendation #19:** To enhance cooperation between the graduate and undergraduate it is recommended that the School encourage movement between faculty teaching in various programs and encourage newer tenure track faculty to teach in the undergraduate. In particular, until faculty preferences and strengths are fully identified or developed it is recommended that the School establish a requirement for all faculty to have some teaching responsibilities in the undergraduate program.

**Unit Response:** We do not agree with this recommendation. The Business Department has a large number of graduate programs that have to be taught by tenure stream faculty members. Hence, without additional faculty

positions, it will not be possible to have all faculty members teach in the undergraduate program. Further, newer tenure track faculty are the ones who are at the cutting edge of research in their fields of expertise and it is critical that they transfer this knowledge to PhD students.

We recognize the internal concerns amongst faculty about the distribution of full-time faculty teaching across all program levels. We have recently conducted statistical analysis of our teaching ratios and determined that the full-time faculty ratio is the same across all programs up to the MSc and PhD programs. MSc and PhD courses require full-time faculty. The ratios have shown us that all of our programs are under-staffed and we have begun advocating for additional full-time faculty.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I do not support this recommendation, and it has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan. I think it is too restrictive and unnecessary at this time. The majority of faculty who teach a full course load teach at least one course in the undergraduate program. We need flexibility to deploy faculty based both on their preferences as well as our needs.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** I was not aware of any real or perceived problems with how faculty teaching assignments were made. I have not seen any issues about teaching assignments that impacts graduate students or the quality of graduate programs. From my limited vantage point, I do not see this as a problem.

**Recommendation #20:** In order to direct resources and attention to ensure the continued development of the School's research culture, it is recommended that a School level research strategy be developed.

**Unit Response:** The Lazaridis School will be undertaking a strategic planning exercise in the academic year 2021-2022 during which the research strategy will be addressed.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with the department's response that research will be part of our overall strategic plan. The university also has a strategic research plan and the department currently works within this framework as well.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** This recommendation is peripheral to the needs of graduate students. Clearly, PhD students benefit from research-active faculty that are making significant contributions to their fields. But broader strategic decisions about the direction and coordination of research falls to the administrative and academic leaders of the Lazaridis school in conjunction with the VP Research and Provost / VP Academic.

**Recommendation #21:** To maintain faculty morale, it is recommended that the School leadership team identify and implement a set of practices which recognize, reinforce and celebrate the importance of teaching excellence and innovation, commitment to immersive activities, student responsiveness, and external engagement (e.g., with alumni, professional bodies).

**Unit Response:** The Business Department will identify and celebrate excellence and innovation in research, teaching and service through announcement of successes by students and faculty at departmental council meetings, organizing department level events and through a newsletter.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with this recommendation. The Business Department has already committed to doing this and I support the ideas presented.

**Recommendation #22a:** To ensure that the School continues to anticipate the changing landscape of demand, it is recommended that closer ties with the central admission be developed with regular debriefs of the annual entry and application data.

**Unit Response:** The School works closely with admissions to develop entrance requirements, admissions averages, and targets. We meet regularly with the admissions group and the School makes the final decisions on all aspects of admissions. Admissions provides data when requested, although the data is often in an extremely difficult format to work with. See also response to recommendation #4.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I do not agree with this recommendation, and it has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan. I agree with the response provided that we already work closely with university admissions throughout the entire recruitment and admissions cycle and thus, the recommendation is unnecessary.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** This recommendation lives in the “Undergraduate Student Quality Indicators” section of the report. As I read it, the recommendation is focused on undergraduate admissions. I have no information on that. I can say that the programs work closely with the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies throughout the application process.

**Recommendation #22b:** To ensure that the students are kept aware of various opportunities that may not have been kept at top of mind, it is recommended that these be emphasized not only with advising but in second and third year in order to allow students to more effectively plan and consider ways to tailor their degrees and pursue options that are more closely aligned with their personal interests.

**Unit Response:** All of the program concentrations and options are clearly outlined on the BBA web pages and in the Undergraduate Academic Calendar, and are presented at the second-year orientation that students are required to attend (although many do not). Academic advisors are always available to support students in planning their degrees. We will put links from our Undergraduate Business Students MyLearningSpace page to the relevant information in the academic calendar.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree with the sentiment expressed in the recommendation that students should be aware of opportunities to tailor their degree to meet their interests. However, I also agree with the response that we are providing this information to students in several venues already, therefore, it has not been prioritized in the Implementation Plan. We can, perhaps, advertise these opportunities more often but I do not see further action needed on this recommendation.

**Recommendation #22c:** The School is doing an excellent job of connecting with alumni and surveying its undergraduates. It is recommended that output from these surveys be used to refine future surveys and that this information be shared more broadly with new students through events and materials such as orientation as validation for having selected a high quality school and to increase school spirit.

**Unit Response:** Our switch to remote recruitment due to the pandemic has led us to significantly expand and improve our social media presence in which we celebrate our student, faculty, program, and alumni successes. We are actively seeking out success stories and sharing them internally and externally, for both recruitment and culture purposes. We will continue to seek feedback and share these stories.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** I agree that celebrating the successes of our students and graduates is important. I believe that the department has ramped up this activity, as indicated in the response, and therefore the intent of the recommendation has been completed and it does not need to be prioritized further in the Implementation Plan. I would like to see more funding provided to take this even further, but in the current budget model, I do not think this is possible. If/when we return to a RCM budget model, increased attention to this will be a key priority.

**Recommendation #23:** To better serve students in general it is recommended that the School take a longer-term view of remote education. Rather than consider this as a temporary stopgap it can be viewed and supported as more of a strategic delivery option that is integral to the programs.

**Unit Response:** Noting that, as mentioned elsewhere, the new normal needs to incorporate the lessons learned during these unprecedented times, there are two elements expressed by the reviewers behind this recommendation. The first – that we should use what we have learned during the pandemic to implement pedagogical methods other than “sage on the stage” - we completely agree with. Even prior to the pandemic, we had many faculty members who incorporated multiple pedagogical methods beyond lecturing, and we will continue to incorporate the successes we had with aspects of remote teaching, such as flipped classrooms, discussion boards, and different types of assessments.

The second element – that we allow students to complete their degree by taking some core courses remotely – we do not agree with. As the pandemic ends and we return to campus, courses will be offered in either in-person or online versions, where online is completely asynchronous. The BBA program is an in-person, full-time, immersive program and both students and faculty are extremely anxious to return to in-person.

Finally, at the graduate level, the potential hybrid programs will serve us well in terms of predicting what might be possible within the Laurier environment.

**Lazaridis School Decanal Response:** My response to this item is already captured in my response to Recommendation #2.

**FGPS Decanal Response:** I support the unit’s response to this recommendation. The faculty have already demonstrated their interest in taking full advantage of what has worked well during the pandemic. As importantly, I think there are some students who crave in-person learning and benefit hugely from more traditional modes. There is no reason to make this an either/or decision. Innovation in online and hybrid instruction should proceed alongside continued innovation in traditional in-person programs.

## **STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM(S)**

**Vice Dean of the Lazaridis School of Business and Economics:**

- Competitive, high-demand undergraduate programs with high admissions standards, recognized brand, and excellent post-graduate employment rates
- Strong, comprehensive graduate programming tailored for diverse markets

- Dedicated faculty with a commitment excellence in both teaching and research; despite increased class sizes, faculty continue to innovate and to anticipate and meet market demands;
- Strong research culture; both the quantity and quality of the research conducted has continued to increase; commitment among faculty to enhance supports and culture for research-based graduate students
- Excellent co-op program; key differentiator for our programs with high quality placements and a high volume of students enrolled
- Highly immersive program delivery; commitment to continue this tradition while evolving to meet challenges of growth

#### **Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies:**

The review team provided a very thoughtful and comprehensive report. They lauded the faculty for their commitment to graduate education. Moreover, they praised the engagement and productivity of the faculty. Some key strengths include:

- One of the most significant points made by the committee is captured in the final sentence of the first paragraph in the executive summary (page 19). The review team wrote, *“There is no doubt that this review process is taken seriously by the School and that faculty and staff members are highly devoted to continuous learning.”* Quality Assurance processes are intrusive and time consuming. Some programs (at all universities) try and minimize the effort needed to pass the cyclical review. I think it is very important to acknowledge and commend the faculty, staff, and administrators for their investment of significant time and effort in the review process at all stages.
- The faculty were praised for their commitment to experiential and immersive learning. Experiential learning is a high-impact practice that takes significant planning and expertise. The program provides these high-quality experiences despite its large size and resource constraints.
- An example of commitment to experiential learning, Co-Op programs are available across the spectrum of graduate programs. This is not common and provides an immensely positive opportunity for graduate students.
- The programs have been creative and innovative, particularly with respect to the development of programs in emerging fields. The review committee also acknowledged the success of the faculty at pivoting programs to fully remote during the pandemic.
- The review committee complimented the graduate programs on the attention paid to program learning objectives in terms of admissions, curriculum management, and innovation.
- The review team singled out the Management Analytics program as innovative and exciting even though the program was too new to be part of this review. The faculty have shown an ongoing commitment to offering graduate degrees that are at the forefront of the discipline.

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

### Vice Dean of the Lazaridis School of Business and Economics:

- Continue to examine graduate programs for feasibility and balance expertise with meeting market demands
- Incorporation of more equity, diversity, and Indigeneity in the curriculum at both undergraduate and graduate levels
- Address high level of overload teaching to mitigate burnout among faculty
- Continue to examine administrative structure to increase efficiency and clarity among roles
- Return to RCM budget model would enable department to invest in program innovation and staffing to better support students, faculty, and research.

### Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies:

In some respects, one of the strengths of the graduate programs also poses the greatest risk to continued delivery of high-quality graduate programs. Across the board, the programs are being delivered very efficiently – in fact so efficiently that the resources may be inadequate and some programs may not be sustainable. This is an important point and should be kept in mind when reviewing all of the recommendations from the review team.

Specific opportunities for improvement are:

- A key recurring theme was that the department review the entire suite of programs threw a cost-benefit lens. Some programs are very costly to deliver and have relatively small enrolments. This may be an advantage to current students, but they are not sustainable.
- In light of the concern that resources are stretched too thin, the review committee recommends a careful re-examination of the value of the graduate programs offered in Toronto.
- Another aspect that strains resources is the large number of programs, fields, and concentrations. The collection of programs needs to be assessed in a synoptic and holistic fashion. Some difficult choices may need to be made in order to ensure that the best programs are sustainable.
- The university's incomplete and shifting implementation of an RCM budget model has been a significant disadvantage to graduate business programs. More clarity and stability in the university budgeting process would allow the programs to make better decisions about investment in faculty, students, and research infrastructure.
- The reviewers noted that many of the graduate programs were course intensive and specialized. As a result, there are few common classes and many specialty classes with very low enrolment. Restructuring programs to have several common courses would be more efficient and also give graduate students more options to engage with their peers.
- The review team identified the lack of diversity in the graduate student population as an important weakness. They noted the relative lack of diversity in international students as well as a need to improve the interaction between domestic and international students.

- Greater commitment to considerations of equity, diversity, inclusion and Indigenization are needed across the programs.

## SIGNATURES

Dr. Mary Wilson

February 3, 2022



Dr. Anthony Vannelli

February 16, 2022



Approved by Program Review Sub-Committee:

March 1, 2022

Approved by Senate Academic Planning Committee:

March 22, 2022

Submitted to Senate (for information):

April 11, 2022

Implementation Report Due Date:

April 11, 2024

## RECOMMENDATIONS PRIORITIZED FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND ACTION PLAN

The following Implementation Plan was created by the Vice Dean of the Lazaridis School of Business and Economics and Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies as part of the Decanal Response.

Recommendation to be Implemented	Responsibility for Implementation	Responsibility for Resourcing (if applicable)	Anticipated Completion Date	Additional Notes
<p><b>Recommendation #1:</b> To more fully align with the University’s strategy plan *and* respond to critical needs of Canadian society, it is recommended that the School engage in a review of its programs, program learning outcomes, student recruitment and admissions practices, and faculty and staff recruitment with an EDII lens. Specifically, it is recommended it introduce learning outcomes, programming, practices and activities to account for and embed Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Indigenization in its culture.</p> <p>This commitment needs to be espoused and enacted by the Dean and Vice Dean as a means to empower and enable the staff and faculty leadership (e.g., Associate Deans, Program Directors, Senior Administrative Officer, Managers), and in turn faculty and staff, to advance this as a priority.</p>	<p>Dean’s office; Business department administrators; faculty at large</p>	<p>Dean</p>	<p>Plan should be developed by Fall 2022</p>	

<p><b>Recommendation #2:</b> To ensure the School is prepared to adapt to institutional and student expectations of increased flexibility (e.g., delivery modes), it is recommended that the School identify and invest now in activities, courses, etc. where synchronous and asynchronous remote delivery and hybrid delivery would be appropriate post-COVID.</p>				<p>This recommendation cannot be implemented until faculty collective agreements change.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #3:</b> That the School re-evaluate its current list of program learning outcomes (and micro learning outcomes) to identify a more streamlined set which will continue to reflect the main desired learning outcomes while serving as a more manageable list to measure, document and report upon.</p>				<p>This recommendation has already been met.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #4:</b> To better enable program management, the School should be more directly involved in the setting of admission targets with centralized Admissions.</p>				<p>This recommendation is not applicable as it is already our practice.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #5:</b> It is recommended that the School develop a policy on class sizes which takes into account differences in pedagogical approaches across subject areas, thoughtful deliberation on trade-offs regarding year of study (e.g., smaller classes at 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year *or* 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>), the positioning of the program, average class sizes</p>				<p>This recommendation has not been prioritized.</p>

of AACSB accredited schools, and its need to meet AACSB accreditation requirements (e.g., participating and supporting faculty).				
<b>Recommendation #6:</b> To provide an opportunity for students to be better prepared for the ICE initiative, move BU 481 to the third year of study and review BU 491 to ensure it offers another integrative experience to students in their fourth year of study.	Associate Dean of Business; Undergraduate Programs, BBA Director, faculty at large	n/a	Review completed by Fall 2022	Recommendation for consideration only at this time as part of larger program review.
<b>Recommendation #7a:</b> In an effort to increase student and unit flexibility, and incorporate more contemporary content of strategic importance, it is recommended that one to four of the existing specified required core courses in the BBA be removed.	Associate Dean of Business; Undergraduate Programs, BBA Director, faculty at large	n/a	Review completed by Fall 2022	Recommendation for consideration only at this time as part of larger program review.
<b>Recommendation #7b:</b> In an effort to enhance the alignment of the BBA curriculum to the changing needs and expectations of industry and broader society, it is recommended that the BBA more explicitly include specified core curriculum or co-curriculum content in the areas of Business Analytics, Diversity, and Indigenization.	Associate Deans of Business, BBA Director, faculty at large	Dean	Program review competed by Fall 2022. EDII initiatives by Spring 2023	Recommendation for consideration as part of larger program review but also specific consideration will be given to diversity and Indigenization as part of other initiatives.
<b>Recommendation #8:</b> In an effort to enhance student accessibility and flexibility and reduce student stress, it is recommended that the requirement to complete all first attempts of				This recommendation has not been prioritized.

<p>required courses in-person be reviewed and revised (to a smaller list of courses or hybrid delivery options), and an investment made to develop BU111 or BU121, and a number of other courses (possibly electives) into online options (or synchronous remote options) for BBA students post-COVID.</p>				
<p><b>Recommendation #9.</b> In order to better align with student interests and more effectively manage scheduling of courses / teaching resources, it is recommended that the following concentrations be reviewed, and possibly phased out or replaced with micro-credentials: Insurance &amp; Risk Management; Entrepreneurship; Brand / Marketing Communication; Business &amp; Sustainability; Human Resources; Supply Chain Management; and International Business.</p>	<p>Associate Deans of Business, BBA Director, MBA Director, Area Coordinators</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Spring 2023</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation #10.</b> It is recommended that the School consider phasing out the on-site Toronto Graduate Diploma in Accounting program and possibly introduce a synchronous remote delivery option for students based in Toronto to join the Waterloo delivery of the program.</p>				<p>Recommendation refers to MBA/CPA program, which is already being phased out. As such, this recommendation has already been completed.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #11:</b> In an effort to focus attention on ensuring a healthy enrolment funnel for fewer graduate programs overall</p>	<p>MBA Director, Associate Dean: Graduate</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Spring 2023</p>	<p>Recommended that we examine the possibility</p>

<p>and increase the likelihood of the long-term sustainability of at least one MBA program, it is recommended that the School engage in a rationalization of its MBA programs. This could include reducing the number of 'fields of study', the number of courses and or sections of courses, and possibly the number of programs (e.g., phase out the Toronto MBA programs; phase out the Waterloo day-time program and combine the evening and day-time cohorts; identify opportunities for hybrid delivery whereby Toronto students might join Waterloo cohorts).</p>	<p>Business Programs</p>			<p>of decreasing fields within the MBA but not the programs themselves.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #12:</b> It is recommended that the School engage in a cost benefit analysis of the MFin Toronto program to determine if the program should be phased out or provide a remote delivery option to students to join the Waterloo program, rather than on-site delivery from Toronto.</p>	<p>Dean, Vice Dean, Associate Dean: Graduate Business Programs</p>	<p>Dean</p>	<p>Fall 2022</p>	<p>Feasibility and remote delivery are separate issues. The remote recommendation will have to wait for collective agreements to change.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #13a:</b> To enhance the student shared learning experience and reduce the excessive faculty resources required to deliver the program and fields of study, it is recommended that the MSc Management programs be revised to contain a larger common core of courses (e.g., four).</p>				<p>This recommendation has not been prioritized.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation #13b:</b> To enhance the student shared learning experience and reduce the excessive faculty resources required to deliver the program and fields of study, it is recommended that the PhD program be revised to contain a larger common core of courses (e.g., four to six) and substantially reduce the overall number of specialized required courses.</p>				<p>This recommendation has not been prioritized.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #13c:</b> To reduce placing PhD students in an unnecessary vulnerable situation, it is recommended that comprehensive exams occur before the end of year three for all programs.</p>				<p>This recommendation is not applicable as it is already our practice.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #14:</b> To ensure students are exposed to and learn from diverse and mixed groups within courses, across courses and across programs, instructors should implement an EDII lens to ensure group diversity.</p>	<p>Dean's office; Business department administrators; faculty at large</p>	<p>Dean</p>	<p>Plan should be developed by Fall 2022</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation #15:</b> To ease unnecessary over assessment of students and reduce pressures on faculty members who feel compelled to design a large number of assessments for a course, it is recommended the School create guidelines on generally acceptable number of assessments per course or per level (e.g., 100 versus 300) for each</p>				<p>This recommendation has not been prioritized.</p>

program, differentiating between individual and group work.				
<b>Recommendation #16:</b> In order to allow for better planning, <i>felt</i> control, and a stronger sense of ‘we are in this together’, it is recommended that the institution engage in a more transparent and consultative approach on budgeting and costing with the School.				This purview of this recommendation rests outside of the Lazaridis School.
<b>Recommendation #17a:</b> To better utilize the existing staff complement it is recommended that the School undertake a review of pedagogical functions that may have migrated from faculty to staff or are sub-optimally located with staff areas.				This recommendation is not applicable as it is based on a misunderstanding.
<b>Recommendation #17b:</b> To better utilize the existing staff complement it is recommended that the School undertake a review of support functions currently being performed by faculty that are either displacing teaching and research or for which faculty are being otherwise compensated but may be better suited to staff.				This recommendation has already been met.
<b>Recommendation #17c:</b> To increase coordination and alignment across professional and research programs, it is recommended that the current program	Associate Deans of Business	n/a	Spring 2024	The specific recommendation to change the structure is

<p>director structure be changed (e.g., one program director for research programs, and one or two for professional programs).</p>				<p>not prioritized, only the consideration of possible structural changes.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #18:</b> To better allocate resources between graduate, undergraduate and external facing staff, and facilitate a greater understanding of the support that administrative staff can and do provide, it is recommended that the School document and communicate (possibly through an internal portal) a summary of functions (and associated contact details) completed by various staffing positions and areas to both staff and faculty on a regular basis (e.g., who to contact for X, Y, Z).</p>	<p>Associate Deans of Business; Senior Administrator Officer</p>	<p>Senior Administrator Officer</p>	<p>Fall 2022</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation #19:</b> To enhance cooperation between the graduate and undergraduate it is recommended that the School encourage movement between faculty teaching in various programs and encourage newer tenure track faculty to teach in the undergraduate. In particular, until faculty preferences and strengths are fully identified or developed it is recommended that the School establish a requirement for all faculty to have some teaching responsibilities in the undergraduate program.</p>				<p>This recommendation has not been prioritized.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation #20:</b> In order to direct resources and attention to ensure the continued development of the School’s research culture, it is recommended that a School level research strategy be developed.</p>	<p>Dean’s office; Business department administrators; faculty at large</p>	<p>Dean</p>	<p>Plan will be developed by Winter 2023</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation #21:</b> To maintain faculty morale, it is recommended that the School leadership team identify and implement a set of practices which recognize, reinforce and celebrate the importance of teaching excellence and innovation, commitment to immersive activities, student responsiveness, and external engagement (e.g., with alumni, professional bodies).</p>	<p>Associate Deans of Business</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Fall 2023</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation #22a:</b> To ensure that the School continues to anticipate the changing landscape of demand, it is recommended that closer ties with the central admission be developed with regular debriefs of the annual entry and application data.</p>				<p>This recommendation is not applicable as it is already our practice.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #22b:</b> To ensure that the students are kept aware of various opportunities that may not have been kept at top of mind, it is recommended that these be emphasized not only with advising but in second and third year in order to allow students to more effectively plan and consider ways to tailor their degrees and</p>				<p>This recommendation is not applicable as it is already our practice.</p>

<p>pursue options that are more closely aligned with their personal interests.</p>				
<p><b>Recommendation #22c:</b> The School is doing an excellent job of connecting with alumni and surveying its undergraduates. It is recommended that output from these surveys be used to refine future surveys and that this information be shared more broadly with new students through events and materials such as orientation as validation for having selected a high quality school and to increase school spirit.</p>				<p>This recommendation has not been prioritized.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #23:</b> To better serve students in general it is recommended that the School take a longer-term view of remote education. Rather than consider this as a temporary stopgap it can be viewed and supported as more of a strategic delivery option that is integral to the programs.</p>				<p>This recommendation cannot be implemented until faculty collective agreements change.</p>