

**SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY**  
**Senate Committee on University Priorities**  
**Memorandum**



**TO:** Senate

**FROM:** Bill Krane  
Acting Chair, SCUP  
Acting Vice-President, Academic

**RE:** School of Kinesiology

**DATE:** February 16, 2005

---

The Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP) has reviewed the External Review Report on the School of Kinesiology, together with the response from the School and the Dean of Applied Sciences.

Motion:

That Senate concur with the recommendations from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the School of Kinesiology on priority items resulting from the external review.

The report of the External Review Committee for the School of Kinesiology was submitted on April 16, 2004 following the review site visit which took place March 10-12, 2004. The response of the Director of the School was received on August 12, 2004 followed by that of the Dean of Applied Sciences on October 5, 2004.

SCUP notes that progress has already been made in adopting the advice of the External Reviewers and recommends to Senate that the School of Kinesiology and the Dean of Applied Sciences be advised to pursue the following as priority items:

**1 Graduate Studies**

- 1.1 The School should continue to revise the core curriculum to include interdisciplinary courses.
- 1.2 The newly formed Graduate Program Committee should continue to identify specific goals for development and improvement of the Graduate Program.

## **2 Faculty renewal**

- 2.1 The School should continue to develop the 5 year strategy to manage the replacement of retiring faculty and ensure that the succession of the Director is built into such a plan.

## **3 Faculty of Health Sciences**

- 3.1 The School should continue to work with the Dean of Health Sciences to determine, in concrete terms, the possible relationship that could exist between the School and the new Faculty.

## **4 Undergraduate Studies**

- 4.1 The School should continue to seek accreditation from the Canadian Council of University Physical Education and Kinesiology Administrators (CCUPEKA) and to continue to develop its program in order that students may seek accreditation from the Association of Canadian Ergonomists (ACE).
- 4.2 The School should continue to pursue the plans of locating a community health project at Harbour Centre.

## **5 Administration**

- 5.1 The School should continue to pursue ways of increasing communication among faculty members and graduate students, reevaluate the roles and terms of reference for their committees and ensure the transparency of funding allocation decisions.
- 5.2 The School should continue to implement the mentoring program to support junior faculty members.

c: B. Lewis  
J. Dickinson

EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

School of Kinesiology  
March 10 – 12, 2004

Dr. Jan Starkes (Chair of ERC)  
Department of Kinesiology  
McMaster University

Ph.D. Waterloo

Dr. Patricia A. McKinley  
Associate Professor  
School of Physical and Occupational Therapy  
McGill University

B.A., M.A., Ph.D. (U.C.L.A.)

Dr. Phil Gardiner  
Graduate Program Chair  
Faculty of Physical Education & Recreation Studies  
University of Manitoba

Ph.D. (Physical Education; exercise physiology) University of Alberta  
M.P.E. (Physical Education) University of Windsor  
B.P.H.E. (Physical Education) University of Windsor

Dr. Michael Smith  
Professor Emeritus  
Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry  
Simon Fraser University

B.Sc. in Biology, St. Mary's College of California  
Ph.D. in Zoology, University of British Columbia

## School of Kinesiology: External Review March 2004

We would like to thank both the School of Kinesiology and the senior administration of SFU for providing comprehensive documentation on both the School and the University and for facilitating our meetings with faculty members, staff, undergraduate and graduate students.

During our site visit we were able to meet with the Director of the School, the Undergraduate and Graduate committees, staff, each faculty member individually, 21 undergraduate students and 14 graduate students,

The School of Kinesiology is a well-respected program. It produces well-versed graduates from its undergraduate program, its graduate program produces skilled researchers and the faculty members are world-renowned for their innovative groundbreaking research. Having said this, the terms of the Review Committee are to recommend improvements that may enhance these areas and at the same time deal with certain internal issues that detract from the School's current and future operations.

The Review Committee has been asked to address several issues via the terms of reference provided and we will attempt to do so in turn.

### **1. Graduate Studies**

Faculty members have strong, varied, and well-supported research programs that provide graduate students with a very rich learning environment. Funding of the students does not appear to be a problem as students are funded by a combination of TA and RAships departmental and faculty scholarships, and provincial and federal scholarships. Thus the program does attract strong graduate students. The completion rate of the students is good and timely, reflecting both the quality of the students and the well-developed research programs of the faculty. However, the School expressed concern regarding the future of this program because of declining numbers of applicants. The school receives on average 12-15 applications a year. This is a very small number given the research reputation of the department.

#### *a. Declining numbers of students within the graduate program, particularly at the PhD level.*

While the reviewers agree that declining enrolment might not truly reflect the number of graduate students being supervised in the department, (due to enrolment in other programs), the decline in enrolment, particularly at the PhD level, is troublesome. When queried, most students were satisfied with their working arrangements within certain labs but few (6 of 14) of the current students indicated they would recommend the graduate program to others. The number of students enrolled at the graduate level reaches only 40% of the number found in the next smallest faculty. As well, the program does not seem to capture many students who completed undergraduate degrees in the school. Rather, other issues that may impact on this decline have been identified. Briefly they are as follows: lack of a specific graduate program structure that can be identified with Kinesiology; lack of transparency of information and policies within the school, as could be found in a departmental handbook; lack of sense of community among the graduate students with concomitant reluctance to recommend the program to other potential students;

entrenchment and lack of vision of the graduate committee. In order to avoid further deterioration of the program the following steps are strongly recommended.

***b. Development of a well-defined graduate curriculum.***

A well-defined graduate curriculum might include 3 to 4 core courses that are not specific to any one research area within the school, but rather are cross cutting and common to all areas. Examples of such core courses might include research methodology / research communication; applied instrumentation, modelling systems, advanced statistical methods, survey of departmental research in kinesiology, and a mandatory research seminar series. As well, students complained that it was difficult to plan or take courses within the school as they were often cancelled due to lack of sufficient enrolment. Thus a suggestion would be to regularly schedule elective courses (such as every other year, fall term) so that students could plan their studies in anticipation of taking a specific course in a particular semester or year. This advance scheduling may serve to increase enrolment in the courses so that they would not fall below the minimum enrolment. Other solutions to this issue of not consistently offering a course might be to decrease minimum enrolment, or encourage students from other schools or universities to enrol in the courses.

One important structure that was felt to be critical was the development of a seminar series that is multidisciplinary in nature, might be run by the graduate students, and has an attendance requirement. The purpose would be to develop shared experience and a sense of camaraderie within the graduate student population, as well as a respect for varying research disciplines. By fostering this sense of inclusion among the graduate students, it is hoped that the lack of understanding and collegiality within the faculty might be lessened.

***c. Development of a graduate handbook.***

The handbook would spell out the steps and requirements for attaining an MSc Thesis, MSc non-thesis and a PhD degree, including the process for awarding internal fellowships, guidelines for supervision, guidelines for comprehensive examinations, oral examinations and thesis defense; description of the core courses and elective courses as well as a general guide to when they would be offered. Setting down concrete guidelines would also aid the graduate director and committee in that administrative issues that currently bog down the committee would be easily handled by the secretary and director. As well, it would avoid contentious issues between students, or students and their supervisors. For example one issue of grave concern to the students was the nature and content of the comprehensive examinations. By spelling out the specifics of the comprehensive examination requirements, issues related to breadth and depth of the content, length of the reading list, and what constitutes a pass or fail on the examination would not only help the student formulate a framework for study, but help evaluators in grading the responses. Standardising these procedures would also lessen contentious issues (and disparaging remarks) related to the differences in research domains that typically exist in a school that is multidisciplinary, and where neither students nor professors have a clear grasp of their colleagues' domains.

It is felt that these two implementations in the graduate program would promote a sense of identity and structure to the program that is currently lacking, and would attract more students to the program, as they would have a better idea of what

would be expected of them as students as well as what the program could offer to them as stakeholders . With respect to course and thesis requirements this aspect is important, as the graduate studies handbook is particularly vague in these areas

“there are no university course requirements for the doctoral degree. However, a student’s supervisory committee, graduate program committee or the faculty graduate studies committee, may require a student to take specified courses or semester hours as part of the degree program” p13, 1.74).

Having specifics spelled out for the school will permit the prospective student to make a more informed decision with respect to graduate program selection and would enhance the identity of the school.

**d. *Yearly Goal-setting by the graduate director and committee.***

It appears that the committee spends an inordinate amount of time dealing with administrative issues. The administrative minutiae of running the graduate program needs to be addressed by the graduate secretary and the director, rather than in committee meetings. For important issues related to student progress and program implementation, the committee should be consulted, while day-to-day problems should merely be reported to the committee. The director and the committee need to identify specific goals for development and improvement of the graduate program and concentrate on these issues during the year. Development of the handbook policies and a well-defined graduate curriculum should be the top two priorities of the director and the committee. Not only should current policies be spelled out, they should be revisited.

There should be a concerted effort to renew the committee membership on a regular basis to avoid stagnation. As the graduate director serves for only a two year period, it may be necessary that the director serve on the committee for a year after stepping down from the position in order to ensure continuity, or that committee member rotation be staggered.

**e. *Potential for a non-thesis based Master’s program***

The opportunity to increase enrolment in the graduate program by offering a non-thesis based Master’s degree is a viable option for increasing graduate enrolment within the School. In particular, this option may be appealing to those health professionals with BSc degrees in physical and occupational therapy, who wish to be competitive with future entry-level Master’s graduates in these professions from the UBC programs. However, in order to make this option workable, the school needs to fully develop a graduate program, including a school graduate handbook with internal policies and procedures, core courses, and regularly taught electives, as well as a policy for directed practica, and/or projects, identification of elective courses outside the school and course work at the 400 level that could be applied to the degree.

The School should also be aware that a non-thesis distance education (web-based) Master’s degree in rehabilitation science will be offered next year through a joint venture by UBC and McMaster University, to target just such students.

## **2. An evaluation of the strategies and priorities for faculty renewal in light of upcoming retirements and the potential for redistributing teaching and research resources.**

The School will experience the retirement of 4 professors by 2008, with 3 of these scheduled for the same year (2008). The Dean of FAS indicated that these positions will remain in Kinesiology. At the time of the evaluation, the team did not have access to the recently-developed 3-yr plan of the school, and was thus not in a position to evaluate the school's posture on this issue. Discussions with faculty members and the Director indicated that plans for hiring of new faculty (areas of research), and the implications of retirements and new hires on important resources such as space, were not well-developed. If they were developed, the information was not transmitted to the faculty members that we interviewed. The issue of who will succeed Dr. Dickinson as Director when he retires in 2006, and how the priorities and the tack of the School may change as a result, is one of major significance for the School's future. The review team considered the following to constitute appropriate issues to address within the next 2 years, and in fact as soon as possible:

- 1) What should be the general profile of the next director of the School? This profile has in the past proven to have major impact on all aspects of the School, from program considerations to issues of collegiality and mutual respect. This should be discussed at the School level well in advance of the end of the current Director's mandate. It is important that the new Director have a clear mandate and approval of 75% of the faculty.
- 2) How will the hiring of new faculty from now to 2008 proceed with respect to current program needs vs. future program development vs. research areas of specialization? What is the general plan?
- 3) What are the projected space needs for these new hires, and how can these be interfaced with the space reallocations associated with the Dual Opportunity and TAS 2 initiatives currently under way in the FAS?
- 4) Should there be consideration within the hiring plan for eventual possible involvements in the future Olympic Oval research opportunities, and the Health Sciences Faculty?
- 5) How will the issue of teaching "buy-outs", which has raised some flags concerning the quality of interaction of junior undergraduate students with researchers, be considered as a part of the hiring policies, or will it?

## **3. Strategies for the School to engage in cooperative research and teaching programs with the new Faculty of Health Sciences**

Our attempt to address this issue involved some fact-gathering and discussions with members of the School as well as with the individual spear-heading the new faculty, Dr. David Maclean. Among the faculty members of the School of Kinesiology who were interviewed, there was a rather wide range of opinion on this question. Most were of the opinion that development of the HSF would provide significant opportunities for the School, with one member stating that Kinesiology ought to be the first Department of the new Faculty. Most were also of the opinion that the details concerning the implementation and eventual functioning of the new

faculty are not yet apparent, and have therefore decided to reserve judgement – “wait and see”. Some have already decided that they do not want to be involved personally, and do not think that the School should be involved, nor will it benefit from being involved. The concerns of the faculty members in the School can be summarized as falling into one or several of the following;

- 1) “The principal area of concentration, initially, will be in Population and Public Health, which is an area of expertise currently not found in the School of Kinesiology. Therefore, we will be left out – but this does not concern us anyway”. The sentiment of exclusion of the School from the HSF is supported to some extent in the document “Appendix 5: Proposal for a Faculty of Health Sciences – School of Kinesiology”. In that document, kinesiology is not mentioned as a possible partner in the initial phase of the HSF – Population and Public Health – in spite of a planned emphasis on “the causes of disease and the determinants of health” during that phase. Kinesiology is mentioned, on the other hand, as possible contributors in areas of emphasis to come later, such as Biomolecular Interactions, Aging and Chronic Illness, and Brain Function and Development.
- 2) “I am happy in Applied Sciences – why move to another Faculty?” Some faculty have issues related to resources – what will the move mean to me and to the School with respect to reallocation of space, other resources? Although there is not necessarily a plan put forward to move the entire School from one faculty to another, this possibility is seen as a threat by some.
- 3) “The ergonomics and biomedical engineering components of kinesiology fit better in the FAS than in the new FHS”.
- 4) “Much will depend on the Dean appointed to run this new faculty”, and “Nothing happened with the IHRE, and so nothing will happen with the HSF, especially under the same Director/Dean”.

It would appear that many of these issues could easily be addressed with more information regarding the concrete plans for the new Faculty. The fact that details are not available, and have not been forthcoming from the individual spear-heading this initiative, is a source of frustration for everyone involved, from Central Administration to members of the School. Our meeting with Dave Maclean did little to clarify these issues, other than revealing that Dr. Maclean had concerns about the lack of universal enthusiasm in the School for this initiative.

The committee would like to recommend that Dr. Maclean meet with members of the School of Kinesiology to outline in more concrete terms than is currently available, the role, implications, and format, for the eventual involvement of members of the School, and/or of the School itself as a unit, in the HSF. A further recommendation would be to present this plan as a time-line, with emphasis on the implementation of the initial phase(s). The committee was convinced that the absence of attempts at some form of communication along these lines would severely impede the development of any fruitful interactions between Kinesiology and HSF.



#### 4. An evaluation of the potential of the undergraduate program to obtain accreditation by CCUPEKA and by ACE.

---

##### *a. CCUPEKA Accreditation*

CCUPEKA accredits programs in Kinesiology for a period of seven years. The standards are viewed as minimal requirements and programs are encouraged to offer additional areas of concentration for their students. There are 4 potential areas that present problems for accreditation at SFU but we believe these could be resolved by the School. At the moment the Active Health and Ergonomics streams present the best potential for accreditation. The first issue is that the School would have to guarantee that all graduates from these programs have 96 hours of labs associated with a minimum of 4 core areas. This means that labs would currently need to be added in two areas. Second, accreditation requires a minimum of two, one term courses in Research methods / Statistics. Currently one course is required and one is optional, these would both need to be required. Thirdly, CCUPEKA mandates two courses in Social Sciences / or Humanities. Their thinking is that graduates of Kinesiology programs are often employed in service occupations that deal with patients or clients. Indeed, the School's own undergraduate brochure indicates that Kinesiologists are most often employed as OT or PT assistants, in Health and Fitness, in Teaching, or go on to Medicine or Chiropractic. CCUPEKA feels that all Kinesiology grads should be exposed to psycho-social aspects of movement because their careers typically involve motivating people and issues of adherence / compliance. The Active Health and Ergonomics streams provide these types of courses as optional but these (or two other courses) would need to be mandatory. The fourth area of concern is that 75% of Kinesiology courses for a degree (60 units of 120 units to graduate) must be taught by fulltime appointments. The faculty count may include lecturers, contractually limited appointments, or tenure stream appointments, but not part-time sessionals.

Given that both UBC and Fraser Valley have indicated that they will likely seek accreditation in future, one can foresee a time when competition for students will be even greater for SFU if accreditation is not pursued. Fourteen kinesiology degree programs across the country are already accredited or currently under review.

##### *b. ACE accreditation.*

The half-time lecturer in ergonomomy feels strongly that with new course development ACE accreditation should not be difficult to acquire, as co-op program internships could be used to meet requirements of field work for accreditation, and the course work currently offered will meet the course requirements of this degree. However, others in the co-op program expressed the opinion that to meet the requirements for accreditation with ACE would still take work. ACE accredits individuals based on specific course work taken and not programs per se. Thus, it would seem that not only does there need to be consultation with the new ergonomomy lecturer, but a student advisor who is well informed with respect to ACE requirements for certification. Meeting the standards to certify students will require additional space and human resources. Some of these resources have already been committed in the form of a half-time lecturer appointment, equipment purchases, and space provided at Harbour Centre for a potential cohort of students. If the resource requirements can be met this would appear to be a good program to provide students. The undergraduate students perceive ergonomics as a very desirable certification and the Co-op coordinator assures us that several ergonomics placements currently go unfilled

because of a lack of qualified students. One strong reason for pursuing the accreditation with ACE is that it might bring in a variety of heretofore untapped students such as physical medicine occupational therapists wishing to expand their knowledge and accreditation in ergonomics.

#### **5. Staffing**

The addition of a half-time undergraduate advisor to the staff is a welcome adjunct to the undergraduate program, as the administrative assistant is overloaded at the present time. Indeed, the undergraduates, while supportive of the efforts of the administrative assistant, highlighted the need for a person dedicated to this task. Perhaps the school should consider requesting funding for support of a full time position in this area.

The library and computer resources are excellent, and there were no major problems identified by faculty or support staff with respect to workload of the secretarial staff. However, the secretarial staff did express a desire to have yearly evaluations of their performance so that they would have a better idea of the areas in which they are doing well, and those areas in which they could improve.

One area of concern is the staffing for the environmental physiology area. Currently the research engineer is supported for 50% of his time through the cost-recovery program and a large percentage of time is devoted to revenue generation. It appears that this aspect is a source of concern for both the engineer and the technician. They would both like to see a re-invigorated program with more faculty and students, to fully exploit the potential of the environmental laboratories.

#### **6. An evaluation of the programmatic and research opportunities to Kinesiology in relation to the 2010 Olympics and the Olympic Oval at SFU.**

Acquisition of a speedskating oval on campus is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for research, and should be heartily pursued by SFU. Currently the School does not have a faculty member in the area of high performance and would need to consider whether such an addition would fit within the School's long-term academic plan. One of the issues with faculty involved in high performance research is that to engage in a viable research program it's also necessary to maintain connections and a presence as a consultant with national teams, in part for subjects and continued access to funding. This can be rewarding but necessarily time-consuming. In addition, sustaining research funding in sport related research is difficult, so there would need to be funds available for both equipment acquisition but more importantly equipment maintenance and upgrades. Having said that, this is a situation in which the opportunities are endless. As a case in point, Calgary's Olympic Oval is the only one of the Calgary Olympic venues with significant revenue generation beyond operating costs. A portion of this revenue (about \$100,000 annually) has been earmarked to support small research projects and provide contracts for research with high performance applications. Revenue has also allowed them to support faculty appointments in part. At Calgary there is an enormous "buy-in" to research associated with the Oval by both Kinesiology and Engineering. The research has resulted in new patents for speedskating crash pads, a more aerodynamic competition suit, a better designed klap-skate, and materials research that has patented an ice crystal that melts at higher than usual temperatures. This last invention will actually save on operating costs for the Oval. We recommend that the university strike and support a small

advisory committee composed of faculty members from Kinesiology and elsewhere to determine how research at SFU could benefit from the Oval. From the School, Robínovitch, Milner, Goodman, Lear, and Parkhouse would be good potential members of this committee. This committee should be provided a small operating budget (a portion of which might be accessible for travel to sites like Calgary, the US Olympic training center at Colorado Springs, or elsewhere) and a mandate to provide guidelines for access, and potential avenues of research.

#### **7. The issue of modified contracts and the undergraduate program.**

Faculty members in the School have been extremely successful in attaining research funding, as reflected by both the overall research funding per year and faculty per capita amounts. The associated release buyouts are necessary for faculty to engage in research. However, the reduction in workload available for teaching means the School is a victim of its own research success. Most faculty we met with enjoy teaching and miss the student contact associated with it. The result of these various buyouts is that the School has evolved into one cohort of tenure-stream faculty who pursue research, teaching and service; and a cohort of lecturers / senior lecturers, who are on contractual appointments and are devoted to teaching and service.

We were able to meet with 21 undergraduate students from a variety of years. Meeting this group was one of the highlights of our visit. Students from the School were a bright, articulate group, eager to share their views and "constructive suggestions" for the School. When we first met with undergraduate students we anticipated that students would be concerned that their interaction with skilled researchers in the department often does not occur until their senior years. By and large students were very supportive of the School, the degree structure, and the faculty. They like having lecturers and senior lecturers teaching most of the core as they felt these individuals were devoted to teaching, and were more accessible to students than research faculty were likely to be.

One advantage of teaching buyouts is that sessional salaries are usually somewhat less than the actual buyout amounts and the additional soft monies may provide a net gain in teaching resources. The School appears to have taken advantage of this to provide additional teaching support. One disadvantage of not having senior faculty do more undergraduate teaching is that students never really come to know the various research directions in the department, or which faculty member they might choose to work with, were they to continue on to graduate work. Even though research faculty may teach less we feel it would be a good idea to rotate all faculty so they teach in the core. Elsewhere some departments have created internal guidelines that no faculty member may totally buyout of undergraduate teaching and that everyone must maintain some presence (usually one course) in undergraduate teaching. The School should consider whether such an approach would be of benefit.

Co-op programming at SFU is extremely successful and a model for other programs across the country. Students appreciate having access to it and unlike some other co-op programs across the country the positions offered appear to be consistently challenging and educational. We were impressed with the quality of positions being offered and the fact that students access positions virtually across North America. Students however, were concerned about availability of courses, particularly for co-op students. They like the idea of streams of concentration, but feel

that there should be a review of which courses are appropriate for distance education. They felt that courses in anatomy or those involving skills such as skin-fold assessments should not be offered in distance education, because they require more hands-on instruction and feedback. Finally, they appreciate access to courses offered jointly with programs such as Emily Carr.

#### **8. Harbour Centre as a satellite teaching / research center.**

Through documentation and our meetings we learned of the proposal to offer a menu of courses for single terms, to a cohort of 25 students, at Harbour Centre. Harbour Centre is a beautiful facility but at the moment the existing space on the second floor is insufficient to offer both teaching labs, administrative offices, and a research lab for Dr. Scott Lear. If appropriate space can be found this would be a very positive venture. The School still needs to consider part-time technical support to deal with equipment issues, and if students and faculty are to spend full terms there they will need some administrative and academic advising support, preferably on-site. If the Faculty decides to go the way of ACE accreditation, some consideration will also have to be given to ACE accreditation being related to the individual rather than the program, since having an advisor for those students in ergonomics who wish to become certified would be crucial to the success of the program. Student surveys indicated that the cohort initiative would be most appealing if they had guaranteed access to a suite of courses, all offered in one term, and if the academic offerings could be compressed into a shorter week. From the students' perspective access and parking are also issues that would need to be addressed.

The review team was struck by the potential of the Centre to host community-based health research, because of its location. The location may also present opportunities for research with social scientists in other programs at Harbour Centre. Dr. Scott Lear's research is ideally located in this area, with access to both participants and hospitals. The downside for Dr. Lear is that he is physically removed from the rest of the School and must travel to attend committees, seminars, etc. Nevertheless, the potential for the Centre as a host for urban health research is tremendous. This could present an opportunity to increase faculty in the psychosocial domain as it would not only form a bridge between the school and Dr. Lear's work but would serve to support a CCUPEKA accreditation application and increase breadth in the ergonomics domain.

Within the School there are currently two faculty members (Lear, Goodman) whose research has a community focus. However, community-focused research allows access to substantial funding available through SSHRC, CAHR, and CIHR. Presently this avenue is largely untapped by faculty within the School.

#### **9. Ways to increase collegiality, cohesiveness and mutual respect in the context of a multidisciplinary School.**

As happens often in Schools in which interests are as varied as is the case in the School of Kinesiology, differences of opinion often occur which are related to issues including curriculum development, tenure and promotion of professors, graduate student supervision, and research space, to name but a few. Problems relating to the issue of collegiality and mutual respect were flagged during the previous evaluation, and several faculty members interviewed have declared that, although the situation has improved significantly since that time (owing in part to the

development of a constitution for the School), some problems remain. There are several suggestions that the review committee can put forward to help this situation:

- 1) The committee was of the opinion that at least part of this problem stems from the lack of communication among faculty members and graduate students at formalized common forums, such as School research seminars, core courses in the graduate program, and other common activities involving faculty and graduate students from all labs. This relates back to a basic issue of defining the elements of commonality among the research labs – what are we as a group trying to do in the School, with our collective body of graduate students? It may be that this element requires a champion – a person who brings together the faculty and graduate students into common activities. This person might indeed be the Director of the School. A good start might be initiation of a School graduate seminar (as outlined earlier), involving faculty and graduate student informal presentations, perhaps with a social component attached (refreshments) with some involvement of speakers invited from outside the School.
- 2) The evaluation committee noted that several departmental committee meetings with mandates significant to School development appear to be conducted in a manner not entirely conducive to moving the School along. The committee interviewed a committee Chair, for example, who declared dissatisfaction with the way that the meetings that he/she chaired, were conducted! The School might wish to re-evaluate the committees of the School, to ensure that each committee has a clear mandate and terms of reference, a mission statement for the tenure of the current Chair, and preferably beyond that, if possible, and a procedural structure that is productive and efficient. A suggestion might be to consider adding the Director or his designate as an ad hoc member of some committees, to ensure continuity, to act as a resource person for the chair in committee meeting procedures, and to help maintain focus consistent with the School's strategic plan. The reviewers felt it was also important that the school move forward of its own accord without the continued influence of retired faculty.
- 3) Somewhat related to 2) immediately above, and perhaps as a result of the issues raised therein, there seems to be a general tendency for faculty to consider committee membership as undesirable, and therefore something to avoid. This obviously has a tendency to limit flexibility concerning committee membership (committee members are nominated), and tends to diminish the importance of committee activities in the eyes of all faculty members, and particularly in the eyes of the younger faculty members. It may be that the Director could consider convincing specific faculty members to contribute to committees in which he feels that their impact and experience might be of particular value – “twisting their arms”. In addition, the current Director has practiced a policy of “protecting” young faculty from committee duties to a certain extent. While the notion is laudable, the reality may be that young faculty, who will ultimately be impacted the most by committee decisions, might be interested in taking part in more committee activities. Involving young faculty on more committees that are efficiently conducted, with clear goals and procedures, will also constitute a valuable learning experience, and

prepare them for their larger roles in the future of the School – they will “buy in” more into the School – what it is doing and where it is going - than is currently the case.

- 4) One concern expressed by a faculty member was an apparent lack of transparency in the allocation of resources by the Director’s office, as a possible source of some discord among faculty members. The example given was the ultimate fate of funds recovered from teaching buy-outs from research grants and awards. While complete transparency is not always entirely appropriate or desirable, the Director should at least be aware of the possible divisive effects surrounding this issue.
- 5) It was apparent to the evaluation team that several of the junior faculty members would benefit significantly from a mentoring program, in which advice concerning research grantsmanship, publishing, teaching, time and stress management, and even issues of a personal nature, could be made available on either an informal or more formalized basis with the School. It was felt that this might go a long way in reducing some of the frustration and isolation that junior faculty often experience during their first highly vulnerable years as faculty members.

**Recommendations in order of priority**

1. Develop a graduate “program” with a required core, mandatory interdisciplinary seminar and well-developed handbook on policies.
2. Develop a 5 year plan for hiring, space, succession of the director, staffing and research. Once a plan is developed it should be well-circulated and transparent. It was only after our visit that we learned that the School currently has a 3 year plan. The lack of inclusion of the plan was either an oversight or a reflection of the weight placed on it within the School.
3. With regard to the Undergraduate program – provide space, equipment and human resources to facilitate the cohort program offered through Harbour Centre and facilitate accreditation by CCUPEKA and ACE.
4. Establish a clearer understanding of what role individual faculty members or departments will play in the new Faculty of Health Science and resolve the relationship with the new Faculty .
5. Investigate further potential of the Olympic Oval and develop a plan for hiring and how research can be integrated with the School and other faculty areas.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Phillip Gardiner  
Dr. Patricia McKinley  
Dr. Janet Starkes

RESPONSE  
TO THE  
EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT  
OF  
MARCH 2004

SCHOOL OF KINESIOLOGY  
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

August 12<sup>th</sup>, 2004

## **PREAMBLE**

The School of Kinesiology would like to thank the External Review Committee for its report and to commend the committee for its thoughtful comments on the program at Simon Fraser University.

The School provided focus questions for the committee to comment on and for the most part the report concentrates on those focus questions. Apart from a single paragraph, the committee does not comment on the successes or achievements of the School and in this regard the School was somewhat disappointed that a true evaluation of the School's merits did not occur and it therefore refers the Senate Committee to the School's internal review (Self-Study Report).

## **GRADUATE STUDIES**

A significant proportion of the External Review Report was concerned with the status of graduate studies in the School of Kinesiology. Four specific recommendations were made. As a result of this report, the School devoted two Graduate Program Mini Retreats in the months of May and June, 2004, to a discussion of the Graduate Program and a significant proportion of two regularly scheduled School Meetings. As a result of these meetings, many of the concerns expressed in the report have been addressed.

A. The curriculum of the Graduate Program has been revised with the addition of two required courses at the Masters level, a seminar course and a course in Statistics. In addition, the total minimum number of credits for completion of the M.Sc. degree has been increased from 12 to 18. The School has also identified a core of 8 courses from which M.Sc. students must select at least two. Through these means, it is anticipated that greater interaction will occur among the Graduate students, particularly in the survey seminar course, and that students will be assured of increased breadth and depth in their program. These revisions were given final approval at the School meeting of 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2004.



B. At the Mini Retreats the School also discussed the possibility of the development of an M.Sc. by coursework for the School. This has now been approved and details of the curriculum have been developed. In summary, the Seminar and Statistics courses recommended for the M.Sc. Thesis option will also be required of the M.Sc. coursework students and in addition, three courses from the eight identified core courses will be required. Students will then take additional coursework to a total of 27 credits from electives within the School. The final three credits for the 30-credit coursework Masters degree will be taken in the form of a Directed Studies in which a project will be completed. The format conforms with the other coursework Masters degrees offered at Simon Fraser University.

The introduction of the Coursework Masters is anticipated in 2005-3 provided that approval is forthcoming from the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies and the Senate. The proposal has approval from the FAS Graduate Committee in principle. It is anticipated that the establishment of a cohort of between 10 and 20 M.Sc. Coursework students will have a number of valuable ramifications for the program in general. Principally, it will ensure sufficient enrollment in all graduate courses that confirmed planning for course offerings can occur with no risk that courses will be cancelled for reasons of low enrollment. The proposition for a Coursework Masters has been the subject of a survey of former Kinesiology students and the School is convinced that it will attract candidates. In addition, there are a number of professional organizations who may seek the advance training such an M.Sc. program can provide. Preliminary negotiations have taken place with a chiropractic group.

The External Review committee also recommended the development of a Graduate Handbook. As a first step to this process, the handbooks for Graduate Programs have been solicited from other institutions and from other programs in FAS. The School accepts the necessity and value of such a handbook and it will be produced in time for delivery to students

applying for the 2005-3 semester. A senior graduate student has been recruited to assist in the process and contracted to produce a first draft by the end of September 2004.

The External Review also suggested that the Graduate Chair and Committee should set annual goals and the committee membership should be renewed on a regular basis. This has occurred. The Director is currently acting as the Graduate Program Chair and a new committee has been formed retaining two of the previous members to ensure continuity. This committee has been instrumental in setting the goals for the committee over the next year.

#### **FACULTY RENEWAL**

The External Review noted that four professors will retire by 2008. One of these positions is that of the current Director. The Review recommended early initiation of a search for the replacement of the Director. A recommendation has been made informally by the Director of the School to the Dean, FAS, that an external search be made for the new Director. Since all other appointments occur four years from now, it is submitted that there is adequate time for significant discussion to occur concerning the areas in which the appointments will be made. A half-day retreat will be held in 2004-3 to develop a 3 year hiring strategy.

Of more immediate concern to the School, is the appointment of “fallout” positions in the School of Kinesiology. Dr. Glen Tibbits has been awarded a CRC Tier I Chair and authorization for the fallout position has been received. Dr. Stephen Robinovitch has been recommended for a CRC Tier II and it is anticipated that an additional fallout position will be recommended. There is currently one position vacant within the School of Kinesiology and an appointment has been concluded for this position with an individual beginning in January 2005.

The appointment of the two fallout positions is not straightforward. The significant complicating factor is the fact that currently the School of Kinesiology has no space to offer for laboratories to appointments to the fallout positions. However, this is a temporary situation which will be alleviated and resolved by the completion of the TASC II building and the

associated moves of other units within the University. Currently, the School of Kinesiology has been allocated space within TASC II which will be sufficient to meet its needs both in terms of the fallout positions and in terms of the pressure which currently exists for both office space and laboratory space. This space will be on line in 2006.

Temporary solutions are under discussion with the School, with recommendations from its newly appointed Space Committee and with FAS. Following the resolution of the space issues, advertising for the fallout positions will be initiated.

The three faculty members scheduled to retire in the year 2008 have existing laboratory space which should be adequate for the needs of their replacements. Hence, it does not at this time seem necessary or reasonable to consider the replacements in the allocation of space to the new building.

#### **THE INTERACTION WITH THE FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES**

The Faculty of Health Sciences' existence has been approved by Senate and the Dean of the Faculty has been ratified. The External Review Committee identified that a majority within the School have decided to adopt a "wait and see" attitude with respect to the new Faculty and its relationships to the School of Kinesiology. While the mandate of the School of Kinesiology is to provide health-related education and research and this forms a part of its Mission Statement, nevertheless the proposals for the Faculty of Health Sciences, both in terms of its Masters level program and the plans for hiring, do not indicate that there is significant overlap with the current operations of the School.

Since a significant proportion of faculty members are also members of the Institute for Health Research and Education, and there is representation from the School on the Steering Committee for IHRE, developments in the Faculty of Health Sciences may be monitored closely and in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty appropriate interactions may be developed. A Kinesiology faculty member is a member of the Search Committee for FHS faculty. It is

foreseen that some faculty appointed to the new Faculty of Health Sciences may have cross-appointments with Kinesiology. In addition, it is assumed that once programming has been approved, there will be cross-listing of courses at the graduate level in the two units.

Appropriate coursework may be regarded as elective courses in both units.

The Faculty of Health Sciences is also actively considering undergraduate level programming. Preliminary discussion among the Dean FAS, Dean FHS and the Director of Kinesiology has resulted in agreement to cooperation and representation from Kinesiology on the FHS Curriculum Planning Committee.

#### **ACCREDITATION WITH CCUPEKA AND ACE**

The External Review Committee recommended that the School pursue accreditation of the Kinesiology Program with CCUPEKA. Significant discussions have taken place between the School and the Chair of the Accreditation Committee of CCUPEKA. It is apparent from these discussions that concentrations or streams within the School may be eligible for accreditation. The Chair of the Undergraduate Program Committee in the School of Kinesiology has taken responsibility for the preparation of the documentation necessary to undergo the accreditation process and this information has already been sent to the Accreditation Committee of CCUPEKA. It is anticipated that accreditation will occur within the next year.

ACE accreditation is somewhat more complicated by the fact that the ACE does not accredit programs but accredits individuals. Appropriate coursework and practical experience as well as laboratory training are provided currently in Kinesiology. The Co-op Education Program is aware of the requirements of the ACE for accreditation. The External Review Committee pointed out that since students must select an appropriate set of courses to ensure accreditation that the Undergraduate Advisor must be aware of both the goals of the students and the requirements of ACE. The School has been authorized to appoint a half-time Undergraduate

Advisor and a search is currently underway. It will be a requirement for this Advisor to be familiar with the accreditation requirements of ACE.

#### **STAFFING**

The External Review Committee noted the prospect of a new half-time Undergraduate Advisor. They recommended that the position be full-time. This has been requested by the Director but initial appointment at a half-time level is anticipated. The Committee reported that secretarial staff had requested annual reviews of their performance. The staff have explained that they did not request a formal review, but that ongoing reviews of work allocation and responsibility occur. The Director and Departmental Assistant agree that a regular informal review of this nature will take place.

The Committee also identified that staff would like to see increased activity in the environmental physiology area. Since a faculty member was appointed in that area in January 2003 whose laboratory is now expanding, with increased enrollment of graduate students in the field it is anticipated that a greater level of activity will make use of those facilities.

#### **KINESIOLOGY AND THE OLYMPIC OVAL AT SFU**

The location of the Olympic Oval at Simon Fraser University is still under discussion and a matter of significant political, as well as financial, debate. The recommendations for the involvement of Kinesiology in the planning of the Oval made by the External Review Committee are taken under advisement and the School has ensured that it has representation on relevant University committees with respect to decisions regarding the Oval. Significant effort in terms of planning for the Oval, when neither the nature of the structure nor its support or even its existence at SFU is certain, would not seem an appropriate use of resources at the moment.

## **MODIFIED CONTRACTS AND TEACHING IN THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM**

The School has a number of faculty who are relieved of teaching to a greater or lesser extent due to research granting agency sponsored teaching relief and/or administrative responsibilities. This creates a problem in ensuring that all teaching requirements are met. However, the School has been successful in establishing a cohort of Sessional Instructors of high quality. The External Review Committee suggested that the School should consider not allowing School members to buy out of undergraduate teaching totally. This is already the case and all faculty members receiving research agency sponsored relief teach at least one undergraduate course per year. With the granting of Access Funds last year, the School has appointed an additional full-time Lecturer and a half-time Limited Term Lecturer which has reduced the extent of dependence on Sessional Instructors.

Those faculty who are on 100% administrative relief from teaching, namely Dr. Ron Marteniuk, Dr. David MacLean and Dr. Diane Finegood, have full-time employment in their respective administrative positions. Although undergraduate students would benefit from their expertise in the classroom, this will not be possible for the duration of their administrative contracts.

Under this heading the External Review Committee also noted that the quality of the Co-operative Education Program in Kinesiology at SFU is very high. It also suggested that some students feel that there should be a review of courses that are appropriate for Distance Education. This review has been undertaken and some modifications to the program have been made. It should be noted that starting in 2004-3 a new web-based Nutrition Certificate using only Distance Education techniques will be offered.

## **HARBOUR CENTRE AS A SATELLITE TEACHING RESEARCH CENTRE**

The External Review Committee was supportive of further development at Harbour Centre. In light of the recommendations of this committee, and in accordance with resolutions

made by the School of Kinesiology, a Cohort Program at the Harbour Centre campus will be initiated in 2004-3. Applications have been made to expand the space available to Kinesiology both for research and teaching purposes as well as office accommodation at Harbour Centre. Agreement has been reached for a significant expansion for Kinesiology with the administration at Harbour Centre and the School is optimistic that a vital research and teaching function will be expanded in that location. Preliminary enrolment figures show that the scheduled courses for the first offering of the Cohort Program are more than 75% full.

Dr. Scott Lear's research is based at Harbour Centre. He has recently received approval of a CFI application which will be used to provide research equipment and infrastructure at Harbour Centre. The School has also purchased equipment necessary for this fall and set aside adequate funding for other teaching equipment necessary in that location.

#### **COLLEGIALITY, COHESIVENESS AND MUTUAL RESPECT**

Using only objective measure the School of Kinesiology is a highly successful School. In terms of the teaching evaluations, the quality of the students produced, the quality of the research, the support for research, the contribution of faculty in the administration of the University and the contribution of faculty to academe at large, there is ample evidence of a School deserving of its high international reputation. Nevertheless, it remains true that frequently there is acrimony within the School. This results from the combination of individuals with divergent opinions about the nature of the discipline, the relationship between the discipline and the profession, as well as the importance of the contributing sub-disciplines.

In many respects, this vibrant, controversial atmosphere is stimulating and is evidence of the seriousness with which individual faculty take their responsibility to their School. On the other hand, it can also lead to lasting antipathies between faculty members when disagreements become entrenched and personal. The recommendations proposed by the External Review Committee to reduce occasional lapses in collegiality have, to a greater or lesser extent, been

tried in the past within the School. Stress will continue to be placed on the professional conduct of faculty members towards each other and towards students. Additional attempts to promote collegiality and cohesion will be made, including the suggestions of the committee with respect to extending social activities and development of a more formalized seminar series. It is also probable that changes in personnel expected in the near future will serve to reduce existing interpersonal tensions. Faculty renewal and expansion as well as reallocation of responsibilities will change the social dynamics of the School.

Under this heading, the Committee also recognized that the Director has sought to “protect young faculty from committee work.” It suggests that this may not be an optimum strategy. However, it is probable that the Committee misunderstood. In fact, junior faculty members participate in all committees. The onerous tasks of Graduate Program Chair and Undergraduate Program Chair tend to be reserved for tenured/continuing faculty.

Under Item IV, the Committee noted that the Director should be more transparent with his handling of the School budget. An annual budget is presented in which income and proposed expenses are discussed. Some funds are maintained in a contingency form which has been used for such unbudgeted expenses as emergency equipment repair, support or honoraria for visitors to the School, travel expenses for the Director and other School representatives to meetings, emergency support for graduate students, and contributions to student conference travel.



M E M O R A N D U M  
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCES

---

DATE: October 4, 2004  
TO: Bill Krane, Associate Vice-President Academic  
FROM: Brian Lewis, Dean, Faculty of Applied Sciences  
RE: External Review – School of Kinesiology

---

1. The reviewers recommend the development of a core curriculum, core interdisciplinary seminar, and standardization of procedures and expectations in the Graduate Program. They suggest that given the implementation of these practices, and an appropriate analysis of demand in the face of competing programs, a non-thesis based degree would be a viable way to grow the Program. These comments have been very useful. The School has worked vigorously to address curricular and procedural concerns expressed in the document, and a proposed coursework-based degree is going forward for approval.
2. The reviewers were somehow not supplied with the 3-year plan of the School in advance, and took this as an indication of a lack of interest in facilities, succession and curriculum planning. Significant planning is occurring in each of the areas—the allocation of fallout positions and retirement positions matched to an assessment of program needs, and the allocation of space falling out from this plan. The reviewers did not suggest particular areas of concentration, but this is in active discussion within the School.
3. The reviewers noted certain aspects of the program which would have to be enhanced to receive CCUPEKA and ACE accreditation, and suggested that such accreditation may be important to continue to attract students. They applauded the expansion of Harbour Centre offerings and its potential to support community-based health research. A CCUPEKA accreditation team has been invited, and the concerns are being discussed with the team.
4. The reviewers noted a diversity of opinion within the School around possible engagements with the Faculty of Health Sciences. The School has adopted a “wait and see attitude” while the new Faculty takes shape. Without recommending any one scenario, the reviewers do note that synergy will depend on better communication across the Faculties/Schools. It has been established that Kinesiology will be represented on the FHS Curriculum Planning Committee.
5. As the reviewers noted, senior and junior Kinesiology faculty have been very successful in winning large research grants which include modified contracts and course release. Further, three senior faculty are on 100% administrative leave. Kinesiology has been successful in recruiting highly qualified lecturers to take up some of the teaching, but it is suggested by the reviewers that all faculty assume some teaching assignments within the core curriculum on a rotating basis. With the exception of the three faculty on administrative leave, all faculty are now required to teach a minimum of one course.

6. The reviewers were asked to comment on a perceived lack of collegiality within the School. They noted continuing professional and personal differences among groups and individuals, and suggested several approaches to overcome these issues: the development of a Kinesiology identity—a core curriculum and common activities; clearer mandates and rules of procedure for some committees; expectations for service participation by all faculty; a transparent budget allocation process; mentoring junior faculty. These suggestions have merit—some are common practice. The atmosphere in the School has improved substantially over the last year. The Director of the School has worked hard to create a supportive and disciplined academic environment. Kinesiology is undergoing substantial faculty renewal, which will change the chemistry of the School.

Overall, the reviewers did a credible job in the analysis of possible areas of improvement, without providing great specificity. Their focused recommendations vis-à-vis the graduate program were especially useful, and have been embraced fully. Discussions around the recommendations of the External Review have led to productive changes, and seem to have led to a feeling of moving forward in a more collegial atmosphere.

*Brian Lewis*

---

Brian Lewis  
Dean  
Faculty of Applied Sciences

BL/lc

cc: J. Dickinson, Director, School of Kinesiology

SCUP-FHS.Kinesiology

From dean@cs.sfu.ca Thu Feb 10 19:22:54 2005  
Date: Mon, 7 Feb 2005 09:16:37 -0800 (PST)  
From: Charmaine Dean <dean@cs.sfu.ca>  
To: bslewis@sfu.ca, john\_dickinson@sfu.ca  
Cc: krane@sfu.ca, jhw@sfu.ca, FHS David MacLean <dmaclean@sfu.ca>, FHS Colin Jones <colin\_jones@sfu.ca>  
Subject: SCUP - FHS & Kinesiology

Dear John,

The SCUP meeting papers for the meeting on February 9, 2005 includes a recommendation that the School of Kinesiology work with FHS to determine possible relationships that could exist between the School and FHS.

This is a memo in response to that recommendation to indicate interest and support for pursuing this development.

In particular, I see possibilities for FHS Associate Members in Kinesiology serving on supervisory committees, or as supervisor, for graduate students in our new program as suits the interest of the student, students in our program taking elective courses in Kinesiology and gaining exposure to faculty research there, if that works for Kinesiology, the hosting of joint seminars or workshops or other avenues for intellectual networking. Kinesiology may have other ideas.

I would be happy to meet to pursue this.

Regards,

Charmaine

C.B. Dean  
Associate Director, Institute for Health Research and Education

Statistics and Actuarial Science  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6 Canada  
<http://www.stat.sfu.ca/~dean/>

Direct Line: 604-291-4919  
Messages: 604-291-3803  
Main Office FAX: 604-291-4368  
<http://ihre.sfu.ca/>

---