

Academic Unit Planning Report MUN – School of Human Kinetics and Recreation

Report of the Review Panel

Dr. Rhonda Joy, Associate Professor
Interim Associate Dean, Graduate Programs and Research
Faculty of Education, Memorial University

Dr. Elizabeth Ready, Professor
Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management, University of Manitoba

Dr. Aimée Surprenant, Professor (Chair)
Psychology Department, Memorial University

Dr. David Westwood, Professor
School of Health and Human Performance, Dalhousie University

April, 2016

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	3
1.1 Acknowledgements.....	3
1.2 Summary of the Review Process	3
1.2.1 Document Review	3
1.2.2 Written Submissions	3
1.2.3 Interviews	4
1.3 Context and Recurring Themes	4
2.0 Planning, Governance, and Leadership	5
2.1 Alignment with University Strategic Plans and Frameworks.....	5
2.2 Governance	6
2.3 Leadership.....	7
3.0 Undergraduate Programs	8
3.1 Programs	8
3.2 Course Offerings and Scheduling.....	0
3.3 Course Equivalencies and Course Instruction	11
3.4 Laboratory and Practical Experiences	12
3.5 Honours Program.....	12
3.6 Co-operative Education Programs	13
4.0 Graduate Program	14
4.1 MSc (Kinesiology).....	14
4.2 Masters of Physical Education (MPE) Program	17
5.0 Research and Scholarship	17
6.0 Faculty and Staff.....	20
6.1 Faculty	20
6.2 Staff.....	22
7.0 Community Service	22
8.0 University Citizenship	22
9.0 University Support	24
10.0 Plans, Goals, and Resource Allocation.....	24
11.0 Summary of Recommendations.....	25
Appendix A-Documents Provided to the Committee	31
Appendix B-Schedule of Panel Meetings.....	32

1.0 Introduction

The site visit for the Academic Unit Planning (AUP) review of the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation (HKR) took place March 17-19, 2016. The Appraisal Panel consisted of two external reviewers, Dr. Elizabeth Ready, Professor, Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management, University of Manitoba and Dr. David Westwood, Professor, School of Health and Human Performance, Dalhousie University and two internal reviewers from Memorial University, Dr. Rhonda Joy, Associate Professor, Interim Associate Dean, Graduate Programs and Research, Faculty of Education, and Dr. Aimée Surprenant, Professor, Psychology Department who chaired the committee.

1.1 Acknowledgements

The panel would like to express thanks to all of the individuals involved in the work of the Academic Unit Planning (AUP) process. We appreciate the tremendous time and effort that went into the preparation of the self-study report. We also sincerely appreciate the open and candid views shared in the written submissions and in the face-to-face meetings with faculty, staff, and students. We particularly wish to thank the graduate and undergraduate students for the enthusiasm with which they approached the exercise of improving the program. Finally, we are very appreciative of the work of Ms. Réanne Kinsella from the Centre for Institutional Analysis and Planning (CIAP) for her efficiency and effort in making sure that the process went smoothly.

1.2 Summary of the Review Process

The process consisted of reviewing a number of documents prepared by the Faculty, a meeting of the Review Committee members with Dr. Doreen Neville, Associate Vice-President (Academic), Dr. Faye Murrin, Dean of Graduate Studies *pro tempore*, and Ms. Réanne Kinsella, CIAP to discuss the process and expectations, and a two-day schedule of meetings with faculty, staff, and students in the unit. Additionally, the committee received a written submission from the graduate students. Preliminary findings and recommendations were shared with the Associate VP, Dr. Neville. Additional exit meetings were held with Dr. Heather Carnahan, Dean of the School of HKR and the faculty, staff, and students in the school. The panel then met for a half day to distribute writing duties and communicated further by email.

1.2.1 Document Review

Prior to the site visit, the members of the Appraisal Panel had the opportunity to review a number of documents; a listing can be found in Appendix A.

1.2.2 Written Submissions

During the interview process the panel received a written submission from the graduate students, and one email from an undergraduate student.

1.2.3 Interviews

The review committee met with many individuals who represented faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students. The schedule of interviews can be found in Appendix B.

1.3 Context and Recurring Themes

Like most units at Memorial, the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation (HKR) has gone through multiple changes in direction and purpose. Since its inception, it has transitioned from a service and teaching-based program to the present instantiation which, in keeping with the current MUN strategic frameworks, seeks to combine and balance teaching/learning with scholarly research and public engagement. The school offers large-enrolment service courses and was rewarded for this by the previous budget model that provided resources as a function of student enrolment. Even though that budget model has ceased to exist, the school continues to offer these courses. In addition, recent collective agreements have made it clear that faculty are expected to a) teach undergraduate and graduate courses, b) conduct and disseminate scholarly research, and c) engage in academic service, with the principal duties falling in teaching and research (Article 3.0.1 MUN/MUNFA Collective Agreement). In response to the greater expectation of scholarly research for the faculty, the normal teaching load was changed from six to five courses in 2012. In addition, faculty members receive a course equivalency of 1.0 course for each graduate student who convocates. However, there have been no increases in faculty complement to balance those changes and no decrease in student enrolment or the number of courses taught by the school. All of these factors put a serious strain on human resources.

Overall, feedback from faculty, staff, and students about each other was positive. There was a mutual respect expressed, and considerable excitement and passion for the School and its programs. There were many strengths and opportunities expressed, including; dedicated faculty who are engaged in work that is important with practical implications, strong students who report high satisfaction with and who are engaged in their programs, high student retention rates, the addition of junior faculty who are excited about their research, and faculty who are making positive connections with other faculties across the University and with the community. Finally, the School is well respected locally and nationally.

Recurring themes, however, included strained human resources, inadequate physical facilities, difficulties in communication, a lack of perceived transparency around policy and decision-making, a lack of balance between teaching and research, and a perceived reticence to change the *status quo*. The current situation is clearly not sustainable over the long term and changes must be made. Recommendations are provided below in relation to these areas.

This report presents the panel's findings, and provides recommendations based on what it heard during the on-campus visit, its readings and studies, knowledge of similar Schools in Canada, and subsequent deliberations. The report is organized by the following sections; planning, governance, and leadership, undergraduate programs, graduate programs, faculty research and scholarship, faculty and staff, community service, university citizenship, university support, and concludes with plans, goals, and research allocations. While we recognize overlap in these topics and repetition in some of the recommendations, we felt emphasizing particular points was important and are confident that the report as a whole covers the main issues facing the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation, as presented to the panel.

2.0 Planning, Governance, and Leadership

The leadership team in HKR consists of Dr. Heather Carnahan (Dean), Dr. Scott MacKinnon (Associate Dean, Graduate Studies and Research) and Dr. Linda Rohr (Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies). Dr. Carnahan has begun consultations regarding drafting a strategic plan for the School and there is currently a curriculum mapping exercise that is underway. Thus, the leadership has recognized the need for an overarching plan and is working toward that goal. However, progress toward that plan has been slow and the panel strongly recommends that the leadership team make this project a top priority. In particular, in the current budget situation, units will no longer automatically get permission to recruit new faculty just because there is a position that has become vacant due to retirement or relocation: All positions must be justified by showing how they fit within a comprehensive strategic plan that aligns with and supports the university's plan. Having a clear and detailed plan will also guide the staffing plan such that, when positions become open, priorities regarding the type of expertise needed will be clearly identified and the process of recruiting new faculty will be open and transparent.

2.1 Alignment with University Strategic Plans and Frameworks

The research conducted by the faculty in the School fits nicely into the University Research Strategy theme of Wellbeing, Health, and Biomedical Discovery Research. The review committee recommends that the School capitalize on that alignment and emphasize it in the strategic plan as a pathway for moving forward. This will naturally lead to plans for recruiting and retention of faculty as well as the desired program growth within a research-intensive university. In addition, this will help make a strong case for increases in and/or renovations to the physical space in which the research is conducted.

In terms of the Teaching and Learning Framework, the School of HKR is also very well positioned in regard to their outcome-oriented programs that prepare students for a variety of possible career paths. Finally, in terms of the Public Engagement Framework the School makes a positive difference in Memorial's community as well as the larger community encompassing the province, the country and the world. The faculty are heavily involved in public engagement (outlined below in the section on public engagement).

RECOMMENDATION 1: That the School establish a strategic planning committee with the mandate of developing a draft plan within six months. This should include a strategic hiring plan, staffing and three-year course plans. The unit may wish to consult external experts to assist with the development of such a plan. This plan should be *ambitious*, have clear *goals* and outcome *metrics*, and fit within the university's strategic plans and frameworks, in particular, the research intensity plan.

2.2 Governance

The School of HKR is a small academic unit and this creates some unique workload pressures due to the relatively high demand for administrative service. As a courtesy, faculty are invited to sit as delegates on academic councils for other schools, faculties, and units, as well as to send representatives to the University Senate (many of the faculty have served on and even chaired committees in the Senate). The panel was informed by more than one faculty member that, given the small number of faculty available, these service activities are an added burden and are sometimes not a productive use of their time. Although some of the links to other units are absolutely necessary and should be maintained or even strengthened (such as the one with the Faculty of Education), others might be more peripheral and thus the structure could be modified so that faculty time could be managed more efficiently.

The constitution and the by-laws for the School of HKR are extremely terse and no standing committees are identified therein. However, the panel was informed that the School has a one hour academic council meeting once per month, a one hour faculty only meeting once per month and undergraduate and graduate studies committee meetings monthly (chaired by the associate deans). In addition, there is a Search Committee (when necessary), a Promotion and Tenure Committee, an Occupational Health and Safety Committee, an Awards Committee, and an Ethics Committee. These committees meet on an as needed basis.

As a very minor point in the Constitution for the school it allows for "Delegates of other faculties, schools and divisions as determined by the Bylaws and Procedures of the Academic Council of the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation" to serve as members, however there are no procedures outlined in the Bylaws and Procedures for which other faculties or schools could send such delegates and how they might be solicited or appointed, nor does it specify which other units could be asked to participate.

RECOMMENDATION 2: That the School of HKR streamline its governance and committee structures to reduce the administrative workload on faculty members. One suggestion might be to determine if there are ways of partnering with other small schools (such as Social Work, Nursing, Pharmacy) to perhaps rotate delegates on more peripheral academic councils. Alternatively, the School should refrain from nominating faculty to sit on councils that are peripheral to the mission of the School.

2.3 Leadership

The Dean and Associate Deans of the School are clearly committed to promoting the strategic research and teaching goals of the university and supporting faculty in their pursuit of excellence. However, the panel was told that there are some communication and power issues—specifically in terms of dialogue among faculty members. Although the leadership team is supportive of new ideas and directions, some of the faculty seem to be less open to it. The panel was particularly concerned to hear that some faculty believed that opportunities for meaningful dialogue regarding the direction of the School were not available and that they felt inhibited about expressing their opinions in an open forum such as academic council meetings. Some faculty preferred not to voice their opinions out of concern for their future tenure and promotion decisions that would be made by their colleagues. To be clear, this was not an issue with respect to the Dean and the Associate Deans; rather, it was an issue with respect to fellow faculty.

In terms of communication issues between faculty and the leadership team, in the self-study document produced by the faculty in preparation for the AUP it says: “We are concerned about the lack of communication between the leadership committee and faculty related to issues such as space, equipment, staffing, teaching and learning, assessment, and administrative processes (p. 17).” The section goes on to imply that meeting minutes are not being supplied in a timely fashion and that important decisions are being made without adequate consultation.

In addition, some of the faculty expressed concerns about inequalities in the ways in which teaching loads are distributed and the distribution of service and administrative duties. This is made clear in the self-study document: “...we feel there are inefficiencies with administrative and operational procedures in HKR that are impacting faculty’s workload (p. 16)”, “...there is a need to explore ways to ensure that teaching loads are fairly and equitably distributed...”, “Our workload is exceptionally high due to ...teaching many 1.0 courses...(p. 20)”, and “We also have increased service and administration duties... (p. 20)” due to limited faculty numbers.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Possibly with the help of an external facilitator, it is suggested that the Leadership team in HKR call a special session of their Academic Council to discuss concerns about faculty feeling able to dissent or openly discuss issues without fear of negative repercussions, communication, transparency, and efficiency. The goal of such a meeting would be to identify areas where communication is lacking and develop procedures to increase transparency.

RECOMMENDATION 4: That the Leadership team develop clear guidelines for assigning teaching and administrative duties to encourage transparency and the faculty can see how and why they are distributed the way that they are.

RECOMMENDATION 5: That the Leadership team identify and address inefficiencies in administrative and operational procedures.

3.0 Undergraduate Programs

3.1 Programs

The School offers six undergraduate degree programs, a Bachelor of Kinesiology, a Bachelor of Recreation, and a Bachelor of Physical Education, each with a co-operative (co-op) option. Students in physical education may further specialize in a teaching or general option. Graduates from all three program areas fulfill important and necessary roles in the province. The kinesiology program is the most competitive, with more than twice as many students (169) as the other two programs. Enrolment in kinesiology is consistent, however student numbers have dropped considerably in physical education (currently 76 students) since its peak in 2012. Enrolment in recreation has steadily increased for the past several years, with 66 students in the program and annual admission of 25 to 30 students. The need for the BPE general option is unclear, as kinesiology programs across the country routinely prepare professionals to work in the areas of human movement, fitness and wellness.

The present complement of 16 Full-time equivalent (FTE) academic staff support the degree programs as follows (with some overlap): kinesiology - 10, physical education – 3, recreation - 3. As noted in the unit's Academic Staffing Plan, staffing is insufficient. Teaching loads are relatively high (5 courses per year), yet many courses must be taught by per course instructors. According to the Associate Dean Undergraduate Studies, one-third of courses are not taught by academic staff members. Courses are also routinely taught on overload by the academic staff. The School is at risk of losing accreditation of the Kinesiology and Physical Education Degree Programs by the Canadian Council of University Physical Education and Kinesiology Administrators (CCUPEKA), which requires 75% of core courses be taught by fulltime faculty members. CCUPEKA accreditation is recognized across Canada as the basic requirement for offering a quality undergraduate program, with requirements related to instruction, course offerings and laboratory experiences. Losing accreditation would reflect poorly on the University, who are encouraged to use the CCUPEKA requirements as standards to guide staffing and other resource decisions. There are also significant issues in the Recreation Degree Program, where a small number of faculty are preparing students in areas as diverse as community development, outdoor recreation and therapeutic recreation. As the School of HKR is "committed to excellence" in their undergraduate programs, resources must be increased and/or the extent and format of program and course offerings reconsidered.

RECOMMENDATION 6: That sufficient additional academic staff members be allocated to the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation to ensure CCUPEKA Accreditation standards are met in the Kinesiology and Physical Education Degree Programs (at least 75% of core courses taught by full time faculty), and that students in the Recreation Degree Program are provided with the courses necessary to graduate with the requisite knowledge and skills.

RECOMMENDATION 7: In view of relatively low enrolment, lack of course offerings, and the small number of faculty members with expertise in recreation, that additional options be considered for the delivery of the Recreation Degree Program, such as an articulated program with the College of the North Atlantic (Community Recreation Leadership program) (e.g., two years at each institution).

RECOMMENDATION 8: In view of overlap with kinesiology and given the need to consolidate resources, that the BPE Degree Program general option be discontinued, and that the BPE Degree Program focus on preparation for teaching, and that a conjoint degree be pursued with the Faculty of Education.

3.2 Course Offerings and Scheduling

The number of HKR courses offered has doubled in the past 20 years, with 84 undergraduate courses now listed in the Calendar. Fifteen of these courses are “inactive”, most notably eight upper level (4000) recreation courses. The School offers four service courses (HKR 1000, HKR 1001, HKR 2001, HKR 2311) to external students (not for credit towards kinesiology or physical education degrees). Several courses are offered on-line, and many are available to both HKR and other students. In some cases, more than one section of these elective courses is offered. Service course offerings were increased when the budget model rewarded high course enrolment, however there is no longer any financial benefit to the School for offering these courses, which have become a significant drain on human resources.

Maintaining six degree programs with insufficient academic staff has necessitated some creative course offerings. Several “slash” courses are offered (e.g., HKR 3340 Adapted Physical Activity and HKR 3685 Assessment and Documentation in Therapeutic Recreation), where two courses with the same content, but different names, course numbers and evaluation criteria/assignments are offered together. These slash courses primarily enable students to meet the Certified Therapeutic Recreation Specialist requirements via their core courses. Although these courses are touted as “not adding additional faculty resources”, having two sets of assignments and evaluation criteria is additional work. While some courses have been offered in alternate years (“or” courses), this has not proven effective to date, primarily due to lack of long range scheduling and promotion of the courses to students. Alternating core courses also adds additional courses to the portfolio of courses each faculty member will be expected to teach, with implications for workload. Lack of core course availability has also resulted in faculty members offering more directed studies to students who need them for graduation. Students and faculty both expressed concern that students in the Recreation Degree Program are not provided with courses related to core knowledge and technical skills such as facility planning, design and management, promotion and marketing, and budgeting.

Courses are sometimes offered in small sections to meet the needs of students who wish to graduate (these are often transfer students or students who entered the program in year 2 or 3 having already taken many electives). Meeting the needs of students in the co-op

programs is an additional scheduling issue that will be addressed below. Finally, the issue of students from two or three degree programs taking courses together must be considered (“doubles and triples”). This has sometimes posed problems when students enter with different backgrounds and academic standings, for example biomechanics and physiology courses shared by physical education and kinesiology students. However, it has also been suggested that there could be some benefits to more shared courses between recreation and the other programs, in the broader areas of active living and wellness. The potential also exists to partner with other units on campus to offer common courses (e.g., research methods, physiology).

Students depend on academic advising support to plan their programs in a complex unit (six undergraduate degree programs offering shared courses and with varying schedules). One advisor is responsible for advising over 300 undergraduate students and close to 125 graduate students. It was clear from student feedback that there is a need for additional advising support, including regular meetings with all students and a proactive approach to support students having difficulties.

RECOMMENDATION 9: That service courses be discontinued unless remuneration is provided to the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation to support course instruction.

RECOMMENDATION 10: That only one section of elective courses be offered per year, and that space be prioritized for students in the HKR degree programs.

RECOMMENDATION 11: That the curriculum mapping exercise:

- review “slash” courses to ensure they are pedagogically effective and not adding to workload (two separate courses may be preferable in some cases);
- determine which courses could be offered in alternating years (“or” courses), and develop a long range plan for these courses. The alternating course schedule should be listed in the Calendar from three to four years ahead to aid student planning;
- evaluate courses offered as “doubles” or “triples” to ensure course content meets the needs of all students, and to identify courses that would be better offered independently;
- review desired outcomes in the three degree programs, and determine where there are gaps (e.g., inactive recreation courses) and overlaps;
- explore opportunities for shared courses between units in HKR as well as with other units on campus;
- review course scheduling to eliminate “extra” small course sections and directed studies offered for students who wish to graduate (not all students can be accommodated, however advanced course planning and increased promotion of the schedule in the Calendar should assist).

RECOMMENDATION 12: That the school consider adding an additional academic advisor, or having the current advisor work solely with undergraduate students.

RECOMMENDATION 13: That the Associate Dean Undergraduate Studies conduct a comprehensive review of academic advising procedures, and meet regularly with the academic advisor to ensure optimal student support via clear processes and communication.

3.3 Course Equivalencies and Course Instruction

Faculty members and administration both raised concerns that course equivalencies are not equitable, and expressed a preference for a system that specifies “a course is a course is a course”. Class sizes differ considerably, activity courses are assigned double contact hours and course equivalency (despite smaller numbers), and some courses are delivered on-line or have laboratory components. Many faculty members teach overload, usually for additional payment, limiting their ability to do research. The former practice of “banking” course credits, as well as teaching releases for more senior faculty members in administrative roles, has resulted in heavy teaching loads for junior untenured faculty (who often agree to teach additional courses above load). In addition, due to an inadequate number of teaching staff to cover a large program, very few new courses have been developed. New faculty members have had limited opportunity to create and teach courses in their areas of expertise, further detracting from their ability to focus on their research areas.

Many courses are taught by per course instructors, some of whom are graduate students. Although they are provided with a course instructor manual, concerns were identified by some faculty members that the sessional instructors receive insufficient orientation, resulting in inconsistent course delivery (e.g., expectations, assessment). Masters students are hired to instruct some of the on-line undergraduate courses.

RECOMMENDATION 14: That a task force be created to review course equivalencies, with the goal of finding a more equitable balance between smaller activity courses (with more contact hours), and larger lecture classes (see also Recommendation 4).

RECOMMENDATION 15: That untenured faculty members not be requested to teach courses on overload.

RECOMMENDATION 16: That a formal orientation process be developed for per course instructors to ensure they are knowledgeable about school policies and procedures and to ensure consistency of course delivery.

RECOMMENDATION 17: That all per course instructors have at least a minimal qualification of a completed Masters degree in a relevant area.

3.4 Laboratory and Practical Experiences

The laboratory facilities in the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation are inadequate. Five laboratories are located in the basement of the building, and one upstairs. There are no dedicated instructional laboratories, and teaching and research laboratory space is shared. The laboratories are also used for graduate student research and for undergraduate honours research projects. Laboratories are generally small, and several are sectioned by curtains (which raises privacy issues). Researchers do not have dedicated laboratory space, and access to their equipment depends on class use. Expensive and sophisticated equipment is covered in plastic, however some damage is unavoidable given the large numbers of untrained undergraduate students who access the labs. There is insufficient equipment for all students to have hands-on laboratory experiences, especially in exercise physiology.

Entry is controlled to the laboratories, and the Level 2 Containment Lab, which contains blood samples, is not used by undergraduate students. However, there are potential safety issues, including cramped spaces, limited exits, airflow quality and possible presence of PCBs.

While students in physical education benefit from a school placement in their curriculum course. Kinesiology students expressed some concerns that they do not get sufficient exposure to practical skills. For example, despite its importance, exposure to resistance training and exercise analysis and prescription is lacking. A lack of formal training in scientific writing was also mentioned as an issue.

RECOMMENDATION 18: That a safety audit be conducted in all laboratories to ensure students, faculty members and staff are not being placed at risk.

RECOMMENDATION 19: That a dedicated undergraduate exercise physiology/biomechanics teaching laboratory be established, with several stations (4-6) and sufficient equipment to accommodate active participation by students.

RECOMMENDATION 20: That efforts be made to find additional laboratory space across campus to house some faculty researchers, so that space may become available in the HKR building for teaching laboratories.

3.5 Honours Program

Many students (e.g., 58% of kinesiology students) elect to do the Honours research project (HKR 4610). As currently constituted, the Honours research project places considerable demands on laboratory resources and faculty members' time as students are supervised in small groups by a faculty member. According to the MUN General Calendar 6.12.3, "honours degrees may be classified or not classified in compliance with such regulations as may be required by the academic unit offering the program". Therefore, the unit could choose to a) limit the hands on research requirement or b) limit

the number of students who are accepted into the program by instituting a competitive entry process in which students apply for a limited number of honours spaces.

RECOMMENDATION 21: That the School of HKR review the requirements for an honours degree with the intent of reducing the strain on faculty and laboratory resources.

3.6 Co-operative Education Programs

Co-operative degree programs have been a feature of the School of HKR for almost 25 years. These programs offer students work experience in related fields as part of their undergraduate studies. Practical experiences augment in class learning. The Bachelor of Kinesiology (co-op) program is accredited by the Canadian Association for Co-operative Education. The co-op program, which has been at times centralized and decentralized over the past 10 years, is currently decentralized and staffed by 1.5 academic staff members and 1 support staff member within the School of HKR. A move to merge with the Faculties of Arts and Science co-op program in 2014 was placed on hold, however it remains a time of change, transition, and uncertainty for the program. Student numbers have declined recently, with the most noticeable decline in physical education.

Although the pedagogical strengths of the co-op approach were routinely acknowledged by faculty members, there are several concerns. First and foremost, course scheduling for the entire unit is driven by the needs of co-op students, who require courses in all three terms and at specific times for graduation. Some concern was expressed by students as to the quality of placements, especially for kinesiology and physical education students. The necessity of payment generally precludes placements in desired health care and education settings. It is claimed that the co-op work experience better prepares students for the workforce, however there are no data to support this claim. Finally, the need for the co-op program in physical education is unclear, as students have a school-based internship as part of their degree program (and co-op placements are often not in the schools).

RECOMMENDATION 22: That data be gathered to evaluate whether the co-op program (Kinesiology, Recreation, Physical Education) is more effective in preparing students for the workforce than the other degree programs, and to assess the quality of work experience in the program.

RECOMMENDATION 23: That the need for the co-op programs in physical education, kinesiology and recreation be reviewed based on the data gathered.

RECOMMENDATION 24: That the effect of co-op student requirements on course scheduling be reviewed, with a view to limiting the impact of a few students on the whole.

4.0 Graduate Programs

Graduate programs are fundamental to the scholarly and research ambitions of academic units and have been identified as a clear priority for growth at this institution: Memorial University aims to double graduate student enrolment and institutional research productivity, although specific targets for each unit are unclear.

RECOMMENDATION 25: That the School seek guidance from the institution on setting specific graduate enrolment targets, and determine what incentives, resources, and supports are available to meet those targets.

The School of HKR offers two graduate programs, a traditional thesis-based MSc in Kinesiology (initiated in 2005) and an on-line MPE program (initiated in 2007/2008) which targets PE teachers looking to upgrade their credentials. Both programs are overseen by the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies and Research). There is no additional administrative support attached to the graduate programs at present.

Enrolment in the MSc program has increased dramatically over the past 10 years, whereas enrolment in the MPE program reached a peak in 2012 and has been in decline in recent years due to saturation of provincial market demand and the challenges of marketing the program nationally and internationally.

The School has engaged in preliminary planning discussions for an MA in Recreation and a PhD program but these appear to have stalled due to concerns about faculty workloads and the capacity to offer sufficient courses. While the Review Panel recognizes the potential value of such new programs to the overall research mission of the School, the University and therefore the province, it does not seem prudent to proceed in this direction until significant issues (discussed throughout this document) related to faculty complement, faculty workload, student funding, and space are addressed.

RECOMMENDATION 26: The School is advised to focus energy and resources on the existing graduate programs until significant gains can be realized in terms of faculty complement.

4.1 MSc (Kinesiology)

The MSc program identifies four areas of concentration (Exercise and Work Physiology, Biomechanics/Ergonomics, Sport Psychology, and Sociocultural Studies of Physical Activity and Health) and provides clear support for the research activities of some Kinesiology faculty members, particularly those working in Exercise Physiology and Neurophysiology. However, the MSc program does not appear to be serving the research needs of Kinesiology faculty members working in the Social Sciences or the Recreation and Physical Education faculty members. In addition, students in some of the concentrations actually take no courses in their area of specialization due to insufficient numbers of relevant graduate-level courses. There does not appear to be a graduate

seminar series offered in which students can regularly attend and participate in knowledge dissemination. There are opportunities to collaborate or partner with other academic units at Memorial University (e.g., Medicine, Psychology) to enrich the breadth of courses that are available to graduate students, and to enhance the exposure of graduate students to research dissemination.

RECOMMENDATION 27: Supported by the Associate Dean (Graduate and Research), a plan is required to offer with regularity a slate of graduate courses that meets the needs of the students and faculty members working in each of the designated areas of concentration. Such a plan could benefit from consultation with other academic units that overlap in interest and expertise, such as Medicine, Psychology, and Engineering.

Supervisors receive a one-course (three credit hour) equivalency for each MSc student who graduates, which can be used to reduce teaching load or to receive financial compensation as per the Collective Agreement. The Review Panel noted that this is an abnormally high equivalency when compared to similar academic programs in Canada, which can create serious future financial liabilities for the unit if enrolments are not carefully managed.

RECOMMENDATION 28: An enrolment management plan can help the School set clear targets for enrolment that balance the potential financial liabilities associated with current course equivalencies for graduate student supervision. Course equivalencies for supervision should be reviewed, using appropriate comparator groups.

Graduate students seemed pleased with the quality of the teaching and supervision provided by faculty members, and expressed appreciation for the support received from the research co-ordinator position. However, students expressed several significant concerns about the courses offered in the program and funding mechanisms.

Few courses listed in the graduate calendar are offered on a regular basis, and many students from different areas of concentration end up taking the same courses due to lack of choice. While the lack of courses is most pronounced in the sociocultural concentration, it was also noted as a concern for neurophysiology, biomechanics, and ergonomics. Concerns were raised about the appropriateness of the HKR 6330 Introduction to Technologies course for many students' needs, and it was suggested that a modular delivery might be more appropriate so that students could take advantage of the modules that are most relevant to their research needs.

RECOMMENDATION 29: A review of the HKR 6330 course structure is recommended, considering the possibility of offering modules to those students with specific needs.

Graduate students voiced serious concerns about the transparency and perceived fairness of graduate funding decisions at the time of admission, in addition to issues around

receiving timely and consistent payment of those funds. The Review Panel noted that funding levels for MSc students are low both within the institution and in relation to other Kinesiology programs in Canada, with some students receiving no funding. The funding model used by the unit attempts to achieve equality rather than rewarding student excellence, and the supervisors have considerable latitude in deciding how to allocate internal funding to their own students which can contribute to student concerns around perceived fairness and transparency.

RECOMMENDATION 30: Led by the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies and Research) and supported by the School of Graduate Studies, a comprehensive review of graduate student funding procedures is necessary to ensure transparency and consistency, and that procedures are consistent with the strategic priorities of the School with regard to enrolment targets and research aspirations.

Teaching Assistant positions are available to MSc students, in addition to opportunities as per-course instructors in some cases. Graduate students indicated that some TA positions carry a much higher workload than others despite similar remuneration. Relatively few MSc students in the School win external scholarships such as NSERC, CIHR, or SSHRC.

RECOMMENDATION 31: Led by the Associate Dean (Undergraduate) and in consultation with the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies and Research), workloads should be assessed for TA positions to ensure consistency and fairness.

RECOMMENDATION 32: A formal mentoring program for graduate students could help increase success rates in external funding competitions. Continuing funding for graduate students could be made conditional upon students applying for external sources of funding.

A tour of the graduate student office space reinforced student concerns about a lack of privacy and secure storage, in addition to a poor overall atmosphere with cramped space and the prospect of considerable noise due to the volume of users. Access to some laboratory equipment for graduate student research is problematic due to the sharing of equipment and spaces with undergraduate teaching. There is little redundancy in some pieces of equipment, which could pose challenges for graduate student progress in the event of damage or equipment failure.

RECOMMENDATION 33: Suitable graduate student space should be included as part of all on-going space planning activities.

RECOMMENDATION 34: Equipment that is used for graduate student research should be carefully managed to minimize the risk of damage from other uses such as undergraduate teaching. A capital equipment plan would be prudent to increase redundancy in key areas.

The Review Panel noted the absence of a designated administrator to support graduate students in dealing with routine day-to-day procedures such as academic advising and course selection, sorting out financial arrangements, and completing required paperwork.

RECOMMENDATION 35: Administrative support for the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies and Research) is necessary to serve as a point of contact for the day-to-day needs of graduate students (see Recommendation 12).

4.2 Masters of Physical Education (MPE) program

The award-winning and innovative on-line MPE program is primarily a course-based professional program although students have the option to pursue a thesis or an action research report. However, it does not appear that this program supports the research or scholarly ambitions of the School in a significant way. The program was initiated without the commitment of stable resources from the institution, which creates considerable pressure on faculty workload due to the high volume of courses that must be taught to sustain the program. The MPE program has a rich history and has done much to serve the needs of PE practitioners in the province, but the local market is dwindling and the program faces declining enrolment and significant challenges to recruitment of new students nationally and internationally.

RECOMMENDATION 36: The School of HKR should conduct a review to determine if the MPE should be a core part of the School's mission.

RECOMMENDATION 37: The School should develop a plan to handle the significant resource costs of running the MPE program, either by negotiating stable, increased resource support from the institution, or by increasing the efficiency of the program perhaps by offering courses in alternate years and admitting new students to the program only every second year.

5.0 RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Considering Memorial's goal to double research at the institution by 2020, the HKR unit is exquisitely positioned to contribute within the health/wellness priority that is emphasized in Memorial's Research Intensity Plan.

The faculty should be commended for their collaborative work both with other colleagues in the School and with other faculties across the university. For example, the faculty in the social science cluster are sharing resources and working together to create a small centre of excellence in that area. The neuromuscular group is very cohesive and has cross-appointed individuals (CRC in Medicine, Chiropractic Research Chair) and this has the potential of enhancing research capacity through partnerships around space, equipment, and student training. The Dean's cross appointments to the Psychology Department and the Marine Institute (MI) and her work with two post-doctoral fellows at the MI also provides enormous potential for research. While it is not clear whether the

HKR unit has contemplated crafting a CFI application, this might a fruitful avenue to pursue that would have clear benefits to improving research infrastructure in the School.

There was wide variation in terms of the amount of research being conducted among the HKR faculty. It is important to recognize and respect that HKR is transitioning from a mainly teaching to a teaching and research unit and as a result there is a need to ensure that there is a balance between research, teaching, and service. However, the School needs to recognize that this balance can be achieved across the overall unit while allowing considerable variation for each individual.

Even though there are clear signs of research productivity and interdisciplinary research activities among the faculty, the faculty as a whole are heavily engaged with teaching and appear to put less emphasis on research and scholarly activity. This lack of focus on research was obvious in the unit's 31-page self-study in which less than a single page of prose was devoted to research. This is particularly concerning because, whether justified or not, we heard very loudly and clearly that the junior faculty do not feel that their research efforts are valued as a contribution to the school. In addition, some types of research seem to be considered to be more valuable than other types of research. The result of this is that, in order to show that they are good departmental citizens and are contributing to the unit, some of the junior faculty feel pressured to take on large numbers of honours student projects and to take remuneration for graduate student supervision rather than using the credit to reduce their course load to concentrate more on research. This leads to feelings of frustration and inequity as their heavy teaching loads negatively impact their research productivity. These young researchers feel that they are no longer competitive for national funding and, even more concerning, feel as if they are no longer able to be competitive for other academic positions across Canada. This is particularly unfortunate as they expressed their passion for research and their desire to devote more time to research. This atmosphere will make it increasingly difficult to recruit new, research-active faculty.

The panel heard more than once that, although it was great that they had been successful in recruiting a CRC chair, it did not solve their issues with teaching load as the CRC will have a reduced teaching load. This exactly emphasizes the points made in the previous paragraph that research is viewed as less important than teaching. The senior faculty, in particular, must take the lead in acknowledging that the university has determined that research activities are valued equally to teaching activities (and that has been codified in the Collective Agreement). If the School wants to keep recruiting and retaining research active faculty, the research culture must change.

As discussed earlier, space is an area of great concern. Unlike many places where lab spaces are assigned to individual faculty, the spaces in HKR are often shared. The Dean has been creative in carving out new space for new faculty and the faculty seem willing and happy to share these resources. The faculty are clearly doing their part to be maximally efficient in their use of the space and the equipment. But, it is an overcrowded unit with almost all of the research spaces being shared with teaching space and the faculty from other units. This impacts research productivity.

In summary, while the unit has much diversity in its scholarship, it would be prudent to consider developing a strategic research plan that aligns with institutional priorities that focus on areas of strength for CFI/CRC positioning. This plan would also help to support the unit in prioritizing and requesting additional resources such as research space.

RECOMMENDATION 38: The Dean and Associate Dean (Graduate and Research) should take leadership roles in supporting faculty in their research efforts and work toward creating an atmosphere in which research is valued as a contribution to the School equally to teaching contributions (see Recommendation 3).

RECOMMENDATION 39: The position of the CRC Chair should be used strategically as a nucleus of research for the unit and the Chair should be expected to act as a champion for all research across the unit.

RECOMMENDATION 40: Faculty, particularly junior faculty, should be encouraged to take their course equivalencies as teaching release and plan and take sabbaticals in order to advance their research agendas (see Recommendation 15).

RECOMMENDATION 41: A seminar/research series /colloquium could be initiated whereby HKR students and faculty from HKR and across the campus present and invite visiting speakers to present. Alternatively, individual research groups could become part of already-existing seminar series in other departments or schools.

RECOMMENDATION 42: The unit's profile and opportunity for research could be increased through regional partnerships, exchanges and possible internships (e.g., with Dalhousie, UNB).

RECOMMENDATION 43: The unit may wish to consider meeting with the VP Research to have him visit the facilities and discuss their research with the goal of gaining support for implementing the plan. One topic of discussion could be the possibility of applying for CFI funding to make urgent renovations to research infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATION 44: Further workload reduction, particularly for new faculty would help to support the development of their research agenda.

RECOMMENDATION 45: While there is only one course release required through Memorial's collective agreement (Clause 3.25) the unit may wish to use this release strategically to enhance research productivity and reward individual faculty's research efforts.

RECOMMENDATION 46: Explore the possibility of sharing a research support and/or grant facilitator position with another unit or units on campus.

6.0 Faculty and Staff

During the site visit it was clear to the Review Panel that the School of HKR has passionate and dedicated faculty and staff members who take pride in the strong history of the unit and who share the desire to see the School continue to play an important role at the University and in the province. There is a mutual respect, and also a strong student-centered focus with many examples of positive and meaningful relationships. The Panel noted many instances of faculty and staff going out of their way to accommodate student needs and circumstances, and also individuals who were willing to shoulder a heavy workload in order to ensure that the quality of the program remains high in the face of adverse circumstances.

6.1 Faculty

It was obvious that faculty are experiencing considerable stress and strain related to high workload and an uncertain future in the face of pending budget constraints and changing patterns of undergraduate and graduate student enrolment. As mentioned above, expectations for productivity and its priority are not clear to those in the junior ranks and that creates additional stress and anxiety. Some members of faculty and staff are desperate for change and innovation whereas others demonstrate a fierce desire to maintain the *status quo*. Whereas the faculty share a passion for the School and its work, it is clear that there are diverging perspectives on the strategic directions the School should pursue moving forward particularly in the likely event that further budget constraints emerge. There are several strong leaders and voices in the faculty ranks, but it is of significant concern that many members do not feel comfortable expressing their opinions and concerns in open meetings and that the strong voices at times seem to be the only ones that are heard. The Review Panel was concerned that there appeared to be a general lack of strong, positive mentoring of junior faculty members by those with greater seniority.

RECOMMENDATION 47: See Recommendation 3.

RECOMMENDATION 48: That the School of HKR develop a formal mentoring process for new faculty members that matches them with senior scholars in related fields of study for the purpose of developing both teaching and research priorities and successes.

Based on comparisons to academic units in Canada with a comparable mixture of undergraduate and graduate program offerings and similar research aspirations, the Review Panel estimates that the FTE faculty complement in the School of HKR should be between 20 and 22 (it currently sits at 16). The current shortfall in FTE complement poses significant challenges for the School moving forward given the pressures that are creating high teaching workloads and stifling research productivity and program

innovation. Whereas the simple solution is to negotiate with the institution to secure additional appointments on the strength of strong undergraduate enrolments and value to the mission of the University, the current and pending budget climate dictates that other contingency plans must be considered since the *status quo* is not sustainable. The School has already noted that it is in a poor position to maintain quality program delivery in the face of personnel challenges such as parental leave, sick leave, sabbatical leave, turnover, or other staff shortages.

RECOMMENDATION 49: That the School prepare a resource request proposal that outlines the areas of greatest need for FTE faculty complement, drawing from quantitative comparisons of similar units across Canada.

RECOMMENDATION 50: That the School carefully revisit academic programs with an eye toward reducing the number of courses that need to be taught in order to deliver programs with predictable quality that are robust against unanticipated staffing pressures (see recommendations 7-11, 27, 28, 37).

Interestingly, the Review Panel noticed that many faculty members expressed a concern that teaching workloads need to be reduced in order to allow research productivity, yet many of these members were also engaging in paid overload teaching or were choosing to forego teaching release in favour of financial remuneration. From this perspective, it is clear that there are many factors contributing to the expressed concern about heavy workload. As noted elsewhere in this report, there are lingering concerns about equity in workload allocation due to historical factors that have enabled some members to accumulate a bank of teaching equivalencies that is not available to more recent hires, and a concern that equivalencies are not the same for different types of courses (i.e., a “course” is not necessarily a “course”).

RECOMMENDATION 51: That the School of HKR engage in a facilitated workshop addressing concerns and policies around workload allocation (see Recommendations 4, 14).

As mentioned earlier, the Review Panel is concerned that the School of HKR is struggling with progress in the area of academic program innovation. As one specific example, several junior faculty members expressed a concern that it was not possible to develop any new courses in their area of expertise due to the need to teach existing required courses or service courses. During the site visit, discussions about making changes to academic programs were frequently disrupted by stories about historical context and previous efforts at change that had been unsuccessful. The general impression was that change is not easy. On a positive note, however, it appears that recent efforts in the area of curriculum mapping are beginning to identify opportunities for change that might increase the efficiency of program delivery. In a similar vein, it is clear that there is a strong appetite for change and innovation amongst many members of Faculty and Staff, and several ideas were suggested but must continue to be encouraged.

6.2 Staff

Unfortunately, due to weather concerns, the panel's meetings with the staff were shortened and scattered. However, we did hear from multiple sources that the Research Coordinator was very much valued and that he routinely excels in his devotion to the position. Likewise the Lab Instructor is very dedicated to helping students and has ambitious plans for making the lab experience of the highest quality for the students. Both of these individuals are creative in their use of very limited resources.

The School has recently hired a Communications Officer who is working to develop more ties with alumni and the community with a goal toward creating more scholarship and other funding sources.

The co-op program has recently transitioned from 2 to 1.5 Academic Staff Members in Co-operative Education. The panel did not get a sense of how that impacts workload for the secretary to the co-op and whether that frees up any of her time. It would be useful to determine if there was the possibility of finding efficiencies and synergies so that some administrative duties that are lacking (like administrative help for the Associate Dean Graduate and Research, Recommendations 12 and 35) could be taken on as part of those duties.

As mentioned above, the academic advisor could also use some more help for both undergraduate and graduate advising.

RECOMMENDATION 52: Conduct a review of how staff supports the current administrative structure in order to adapt to shifting responsibilities. Request more resources in areas identified as priorities.

7.0 Community Service

The research, training, and scholarship in the discipline lends itself to community involvement and the faculty contribute a tremendous amount of time fulfilling that potential. Some of the faculty have captured the media's attention they promote healthy living and exploration throughout the world. Less visible, but equally valuable are the freely offered contributions of time and expertise that most of the rest of the faculty are engaged in, ranging from media appearances, presentations to local sports and recreational organizations, educational service such as workshops given to individuals enrolled in the Shad Valley program, and much more. The unit is more than fulfilling its obligations in this area.

8.0 University Citizenship

The School of Human Kinetics and Recreation is one of several professional schools and faculties at Memorial University. With programs in kinesiology, recreation and physical education, they have some shared interests with others in the university community, including medicine and the health professions, education, social services, science and the

social sciences. Many opportunities exist for partnerships and collaboration, both in teaching and research. With its origins in physical education and athletics, the School of HKR traditionally focused more on teaching than research, however this has changed with the greater University-wide emphasis on research. The importance of knowledge related to human movement, physical activity and leisure is also increasingly recognized, and these areas are now well-established scholarly academic disciplines. As the School of HKR becomes more research intensive, it could take on new roles within the University.

The School provides a major service to the University by teaching on-line and classroom based service courses. Four of these courses are available only to external non-HKR students, and several others are available to both HKR and other students. These courses assist other faculties, however they are a burden on the under resourced School of HKR as they do not generate any funds. A better solution would be to explore a more collaborative or reciprocal approach to offering such courses among units (e.g., with the Faculty of Education whose students take HKR 2001, or with units whose students take HKR 2311). Many graduates of the Kinesiology Degree Program enter Medicine and other health professions, another way the School supports the broader university in the teaching realm.

The School of HKR is a participant in the Centre for Collaborative Health Professional Education (CCHPE), whose mission is to provide leadership in interprofessional education (IPE) and research. This is an excellent opportunity to enhance both student experiences and faculty development. Faculty members can also benefit by collaborating with colleagues across campus in IPE scholarship. IPE initiatives have traditionally included the health and social services professions, however some faculty members in physical education suggested that physical education is also a good fit, and that they would benefit from involvement with the CCHPE. MUN is considering introducing programs in occupational and physical therapy, which would provide additional partnership opportunities in health education and scholarship. There are many advantages to such relationships, and the School of HKR should actively seek opportunities to be an integral part of the CCHPE and related initiatives.

Members of the School actively partner with cross-appointed individuals in the Faculty of Medicine (CRC in Medicine, Chiropractic Research Chair) to increase research capacity by sharing laboratory space and equipment, working on joint projects, and co-advising graduate students. Cross-appointed faculty members also provide guest lectures. The School has recruited a CRC in population health who will be well situated to create additional synergies through similar partnerships. The Dean is cross-appointed to the Marine Institute, and works with two post doctoral fellows funded by the Offshore Safety and Survival Centre Research Unit. Like other units on campus, the School of HKR is becoming more research intensive. These scholarly partnerships illustrate the School's potential to assist the University in its goal of doubling research by 2020.

9.0 University Support

The overwhelming sense from faculty, staff and students was that the HKR facilities and resources were not adequate. Concerns were expressed about space shortages, old equipment, library resources, lack of computers and the limited laboratory space. The need for more staff to support programming was also noted. The faculty are certainly contributing by finding the most efficient use of teaching and laboratory space. However, it is clear they lack required resources.

Recommendation 53. Urgent attention should be paid to space, equipment, laboratory, and staffing.

10.0 Plans, Goals, and Resource Allocation

The objectives of the unit, while still in development, align well with the mission of the university. The unit requested this review so that they could be better informed as they developed their strategic plans and goals. The unit offers many programs and has grown exponentially in the past number of years. Growth has occurred so quickly that the capacity to support the present student enrollments, program offerings and research agendas is a concern. The faculty is trying to do too much with their limited resources. In order for faculty to achieve a balance between offering a high quality program and realize its objectives in terms of research, decisions may need to be made to redistribute resources. After careful consideration of the information gathered the panel feels strongly that this unit is challenged by workload, facility and resource issues. The current situation is not sustainable and the program cannot continue to operate at its present capacity without these supports.

11.0 Summary of Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 1: That the School establish a strategic planning committee with the mandate of developing a draft plan within six months. This should include a strategic hiring plan, staffing and three-year course plans. The unit may wish to consult external experts to assist with the development of such a plan. This plan should be *ambitious*, have clear *goals* and outcome *metrics*, and fit within the university's strategic plans and frameworks, in particular, the research intensity plan.

RECOMMENDATION 2: That the School of HKR streamline its governance and committee structures to reduce the administrative workload on faculty members. One suggestion might be to determine if there are ways of partnering with other small schools (such as Social Work, Nursing, Pharmacy) to perhaps rotate delegates on more peripheral academic councils. Alternatively, the School should refrain from nominating faculty to sit on councils that are peripheral to the mission of the School.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Possibly with the help of an external facilitator, it is suggested that the Leadership team in HKR call a special session of their Academic Council to discuss concerns about faculty feeling able to dissent or openly discuss issues without fear of negative repercussions, communication, transparency, and efficiency. The goal of such a meeting would be to identify areas where communication is lacking and develop procedures to increase transparency.

RECOMMENDATION 4: That the Leadership team develop clear guidelines for assigning teaching and administrative duties to encourage transparency and the faculty can see how and why they are distributed the way that they are.

RECOMMENDATION 5: That the Leadership team identify and address inefficiencies in administrative and operational procedures.

RECOMMENDATION 6: That sufficient additional academic staff members be allocated to the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation to ensure CCUPEKA Accreditation standards are met in the Kinesiology and Physical Education Degree Programs (at least 75% of core courses taught by full time faculty), and that students in the Recreation Degree Program are provided with the courses necessary to graduate with the requisite knowledge and skills.

RECOMMENDATION 7: In view of relatively low enrolment, lack of course offerings, and the small number of faculty members with expertise in recreation, that additional options be considered for the delivery of the Recreation Degree Program, such as an articulated program with the College of the North Atlantic (Community Recreation Leadership program) (e.g., two years at each institution).

RECOMMENDATION 8: In view of overlap with kinesiology and given the need to consolidate resources, that the BPE Degree Program general option be discontinued, and that the BPE Degree Program focus on preparation for teaching, and that a conjoint degree be pursued with the Faculty of Education.

RECOMMENDATION 9: That service courses be discontinued unless remuneration is provided to the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation to support course instruction.

RECOMMENDATION 10: That only one section of elective courses be offered per year, and that space be prioritized for students in the HKR degree programs.

RECOMMENDATION 11: That the curriculum mapping exercise:

- review “slash” courses to ensure they are pedagogically effective and not adding to workload (two separate courses may be preferable in some cases);
- determine which courses could be offered in alternating years (“or” courses), and develop a long range plan for these courses. The alternating course schedule should be listed in the Calendar from three to four years ahead to aid student planning;

- evaluate courses offered as “doubles” or “triples” to ensure course content meets the needs of all students, and to identify courses that would be better offered independently;
- review desired outcomes in the three degree programs, and determine where there are gaps (e.g., inactive recreation courses) and overlaps;
- explore opportunities for shared courses between units in HKR as well as with other units on campus;
- review course scheduling to eliminate “extra” small course sections and directed studies offered for students who wish to graduate (not all students can be accommodated, however advanced course planning and increased promotion of the schedule in the Calendar should assist).

RECOMMENDATION 12: That the school consider adding an additional academic advisor, or having the current advisor work solely with undergraduate students.

RECOMMENDATION 13: That the Associate Dean Undergraduate Studies conduct a comprehensive review of academic advising procedures, and meet regularly with the academic advisor to ensure optimal student support via clear processes and communication.

RECOMMENDATION 14: That a task force be created to review course equivalencies, with the goal of finding a more equitable balance between smaller activity courses (with more contact hours), and larger lecture classes (see also Recommendation 4).

RECOMMENDATION 15: That untenured faculty members not be requested to teach courses on overload.

RECOMMENDATION 16: That a formal orientation process be developed for per course instructors to ensure they are knowledgeable about school policies and procedures and to ensure consistency of course delivery.

RECOMMENDATION 17: That all per course instructors have at least a minimal qualification of a completed Masters degree in a relevant area.

RECOMMENDATION 18: That a safety audit be conducted in all laboratories to ensure students, faculty members and staff are not being placed at risk.

RECOMMENDATION 19: That a dedicated undergraduate exercise physiology/biomechanics teaching laboratory be established, with several stations (4-6) and sufficient equipment to accommodate active participation by students.

RECOMMENDATION 20: That efforts be made to find additional laboratory space across campus to house some faculty researchers, so that space may become available in the HKR building for teaching laboratories.

RECOMMENDATION 21: That the School of HKR review the requirements for an honours degree with the intent of reducing the strain on faculty and laboratory resources.

RECOMMENDATION 22: That data be gathered to evaluate whether the co-op program (Kinesiology, Recreation, Physical Education) is more effective in preparing students for the workforce than the other degree programs, and to assess the quality of work experience in the program.

RECOMMENDATION 23: That the need for the co-op programs in physical education, kinesiology and recreation be reviewed based on the data gathered.

RECOMMENDATION 24: That the effect of co-op student requirements on course scheduling be reviewed, with a view to limiting the impact of a few students on the whole.

RECOMMENDATION 25: That the School seek guidance from the institution on setting specific graduate enrolment targets, and determine what incentives, resources, and supports are available to meet those targets.

RECOMMENDATION 26: The School is advised to focus energy and resources on the existing graduate programs until significant gains can be realized in terms of faculty complement.

RECOMMENDATION 27: Supported by the Associate Dean (Graduate and Research), a plan is required to offer with regularity a slate of graduate courses that meets the needs of the students and faculty members working in each of the designated areas of concentration. Such a plan could benefit from consultation with other academic units that overlap in interest and expertise, such as Medicine, Psychology, and Engineering.

RECOMMENDATION 28: An enrolment management plan can help the School set clear targets for enrolment that balance the potential financial liabilities associated with current course equivalencies for graduate student supervision. Course equivalencies for supervision should be reviewed, using appropriate comparator groups.

RECOMMENDATION 29: A review of the HKR 6330 course structure is recommended, considering the possibility of offering modules to those students with specific needs.

RECOMMENDATION 30: Led by the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies and Research) and supported by the School of Graduate Studies, a comprehensive review of graduate student funding procedures is necessary to ensure transparency and consistency, and that procedures are consistent with the strategic priorities of the School with regard to enrolment targets and research aspirations.

RECOMMENDATION 31: Led by the Associate Dean (Undergraduate) and in consultation with the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies and Research), workloads should be assessed for TA positions to ensure consistency and fairness.

RECOMMENDATION 32: A formal mentoring program for graduate students could help increase success rates in external funding competitions. Continuing funding for graduate students could be made conditional upon students applying for external sources of funding.

RECOMMENDATION 33: Suitable graduate student space should be included as part of all on-going space planning activities.

RECOMMENDATION 34: Equipment that is used for graduate student research should be carefully managed to minimize the risk of damage from other uses such as undergraduate teaching. A capital equipment plan would be prudent to increase redundancy in key areas.

RECOMMENDATION 35: Administrative support for the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies and Research) is necessary to serve as a point of contact for the day-to-day needs of graduate students (see Recommendation 12).

RECOMMENDATION 36: The School of HKR should conduct a review to determine if the MPE should be a core part of the School's mission.

RECOMMENDATION 37: The School should develop a plan to handle the significant resource costs of running the MPE program, either by negotiating stable, increased resource support from the institution, or by increasing the efficiency of the program perhaps by offering courses in alternate years and admitting new students to the program only every second year.

RECOMMENDATION 38: The Dean and Associate Dean (Graduate and Research) should take leadership roles in supporting faculty in their research efforts and work toward creating an atmosphere in which research is valued as a contribution to the School equally to teaching contributions (see Recommendations 4, 14).

RECOMMENDATION 39: The position of the CRC Chair should be used strategically as a nucleus of research for the unit and the Chair should be expected to act as a champion for all research across the unit.

RECOMMENDATION 40: Faculty, particularly junior faculty, should be encouraged to take their course equivalencies as teaching release and plan and take sabbaticals in order to advance their research agendas (see Recommendation 15).

RECOMMENDATION 41: A seminar/research series /colloquium could be initiated whereby HKR students and faculty from HKR and across the campus present and invite visiting speakers to present. Alternatively, individual research groups could become part of already-existing seminar series in other departments or schools.

RECOMMENDATION 42: The unit's profile and opportunity for research could be increased through regional partnerships, exchanges and possible internships (e.g., with Dalhousie, UNB).

RECOMMENDATION 43: The unit may wish to consider meeting with the VP Research to have him visit the facilities and discuss their research with the goal of gaining support for implementing the plan. One topic of discussion could be the possibility of applying for CFI funding to make urgent renovations to research infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATION 44: Further workload reduction, particularly for new faculty would help to support the development of their research agenda.

RECOMMENDATION 45: While there is only one course release required through Memorial's collective agreement (Clause 3.25) the unit may wish to use this release strategically to enhance research productivity and reward individual faculty's research efforts.

RECOMMENDATION 46: Explore the possibility of sharing a research support and/or grant facilitator position with another unit or units on campus.

RECOMMENDATION 47: Recommendation 3.

RECOMMENDATION 48: That the School of HKR develop a formal mentoring process for new faculty members that matches them with senior scholars in related fields of study for the purpose of developing both teaching and research priorities and successes.

RECOMMENDATION 49: That the School prepare a resource request proposal that outlines the areas of greatest need for FTE faculty complement, drawing from quantitative comparisons of similar units across Canada.

RECOMMENDATION 50: That the School carefully revisit academic programs with an eye toward reducing the number of courses that need to be taught in order to deliver programs with predictable quality that are robust against unanticipated staffing pressures (see recommendations 7-11, 27, 28, 37).

RECOMMENDATION 51: That the School of HKR engage in a facilitated workshop addressing concerns and policies around workload allocation (see Recommendations 4, 14).

RECOMMENDATION 52: Conduct a review of how staff supports the current administrative structure in order to adapt to shifting responsibilities. Request more resources in areas identified as priorities.

RECOMMENDATION 53. Urgent attention should be paid to space, equipment, laboratory, and staffing.

Appendix A

Documents reviewed

1. Self-study report
2. Faculty CVs
3. Athletics Report (2013)
4. Co-op Handbook
5. New Faculty Checklist
6. Graduate Student Handbook
7. HKR Per Course Instructor Handbook
8. Current Staff Inventory
9. 2015-2016 Staffing plan
10. 2015 Budget Forecast
11. Executive summary
12. Teaching Equivalencies
13. HKR Constitution and By-Laws and Procedures

Appendix B

Schedule of Meetings

School of Human Kinetics and Recreation
Site Visit Itinerary – March 17-19, 2016



Academic Unit Planning

Thursday, Mar 17		Friday, Mar 18		Saturday Mar 19	
9:00 AM	Welcome Breakfast – Panel members meet with Associate VP(Academic), Dean of Grad Studies, AUP Coordinator IIC 2012-K	9:00 AM	Organizational Meeting: Panel & AUP Coordinator PE 3000	Panel: Draft Report Room: PE 3000	
9:30 AM		9:30 AM	Assistant Professors PE 2028		
10:00 AM	Organizational Meeting: Panel & AUP Coordinator PE 3000				
10:30 AM	Dean Tour of Facilities	10:30 AM	Associate and Full Professors PE 2028		
11:15 AM	Assoc. Dean Undergrad Studies PE 2026	11:30 AM	Athletics PE 3000		
12:00 PM	Panel Lunch with Dean and Two Invited Guests The Pantry	12:00 PM	Panel Working Lunch PE 3000		
		1:30 PM	Teaching Staff PE 3000		
2:00 PM	Graduate Students PE 3000	2:30 PM	Cross-Appointments, PDFs PE 3000		
2:45 PM	Undergraduate Student Representatives PE 3000	3:00 PM	Panel confers for exit meetings PE 3000		
3:15 PM	Co-op Staff PE 3000	3:30 PM	Exit Meeting with Associate VP (Academic) (Panel shares preliminary findings) PE 3000		
4:00 PM	Assoc. Dean Graduate Studies and Research PE 3000	4:00 PM	Exit Meeting with Dean (Panel shares preliminary findings) PE 3000		
4:45 PM	Dean Wrap Up of Day PE 3000	4:30 PM	Exit Meeting with Dean, Faculty, Students, Staff (Panel shares preliminary findings) PE 3001 – Lecture Theatre		
5:00 PM	Suggested time for panel to confer PE 3000	5:00 PM	Suggested time for panel to confer PE 3000		
7:00 PM	Working dinner for panel to discuss meetings and report writing	7:00 PM	Working dinner for panel to discuss meetings and report writing		
Review Panel Members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Aimée Surprenant, Department of Psychology, Memorial University (PANEL CHAIR) • Dr. Rhonda Joy, Faculty of Education, Memorial University • Dr. David Westwood, School of Health and Human Performance, Dalhousie University • Dr. Elizabeth Ready, Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management, University of Manitoba 					