

University of Toronto - Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education
External Review Report
(Submitted: December 13, 2019)

John Bartholomew, University of Texas at Austin

Simon Coleman, University of Edinburgh

Janice Deakin, Western University

Preamble

The three-person external review committee visited the University of Toronto's Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education (KPE) on November 20-22 at the invitation of the Provost. In advance of our visit we were provided with terms of reference for the review, extensive self-study materials, the U of T 2030 planning document, URL's to 49 appendices to the planning document and a final report template which we have used to organize our report.

We engaged in two full days of interviews with senior administrators at the University and in the KPE, the Dean, staff and faculty members, and students both undergraduate and graduate. We appreciate the time and effort made by each of the Provost and Dean's office in arranging and organizing the detailed schedule and of course we thank all of the people we spoke with. They were all engaged and forthcoming in their observations and comments.

In each section of the report, we have addressed the specific questions outlined in the report template and have included a list of recommendations for each section. We hope that our recommendations will assist the Faculty in its ongoing pursuit of excellence.

Review Summary

The previous review occurred in 2011. At that time, there was a sense that the Faculty did not reflect the standard expected at the University of Toronto. In the subsequent eight years, that gap has closed considerably and KPE would be considered within the middle rank of the top Kinesiology faculties across Canada, the U.S. and the U.K. The ability to expand and renovate facilities and to attract and promote highly research productive faculty have been critical to this success. While there remain too few women and too little diversity at the Professor level, this is not the case with the junior faculty. Thus, with the proper support and formal mentoring, these faculty members should serve to significantly enhance the profile of the KPE faculty.

The development over the last 9 years began with a strategic planning process and name change. This signalled a new direction as a modern, Kinesiology faculty that would provide a broad representation of the field but with a core focus on health. Great strides have been made to achieve this goal. Specific examples include: their successful recruitment of a senior professor to a Canada Research Chair (CRC), the

building of the Goldring Centre, the Certificate in Global Kinesiology and Physical Education, establishing the Master of Professional Kinesiology (MPK) and the Mental Health and Physical Activity Research Centre. Each of these represents a key, innovative effort to re-envision the KPE. There is, of course, work that remains to be done. There is a sense that KPE is holding onto its previous identity as a Faculty of Physical Education. We recommend moving more strongly toward the modern Faculty of Kinesiology, including considering the removal of “Physical Education” from the faculty name, eliminating most if not all of the requirements for the Outdoor Projects, developing meaningful undergraduate areas of specialization and some form of culminating experience. Each of these would serve as a signal of the focus and strengths of the Faculty and guide future development.

Other challenges include the need for additional or renovated space as new hires do not have adequate research laboratories, and this undermines any effort to grow. There is also the sense that while the co-curricular program provides a benefit to KPE, it is not yet being fully leveraged for educational and research opportunities – particularly for undergraduate and professional masters students. It is not clear to us whether the benefits of the integration that accrue to the co-curricular side of the Faculty are commensurate with those that would be available through an integration with the student services portfolio of the University. The opportunities and challenges of either model would need to be evaluated through the lens of the University of Toronto. As such we make no recommendations related to the appropriateness of the current structure.

Bachelor of Kinesiology

Response to specific questions:

1. Objectives: *Consistency of the program with the University's mission and Faculty/unit's academic plans. Program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and align with the relevant undergraduate and/or graduate Degree Level Expectations.*

The BKin has extensive options for undergraduate student research and experiential learning. The courses utilize a range of learning outcomes and appear to be of high rigor. As such, their program is in alignment with the University's mission and the Faculty's academic plan.

Program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and align with the relevant undergraduate and/or graduate Degree Level Expectations.

KPE has completed extensive curricular mapping for the BKin degree. This reflects a range of learning outcomes that are equal to or surpasses those at comparable programs. This has also ensured that the program progresses nicely from foundational to more advanced skills. For example, in discussions with graduate students, one student serving as a TA mentioned that her focus was on shaping basic writing skills in first year courses but progressed to higher level with feedback on construction of arguments. This demonstrate a clear alignment and progression over time.

2. Admission requirements: *Appropriateness of admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program*

Admission requirements include advanced English, Science, and Math that are appropriate given the courses offered within the BKin.

3. Curriculum and program delivery

The curriculum is in alignment with the current state of the discipline and would be familiar to any Kinesiology faculty. The depth of study crosses each of the key areas within KPE and outcomes are as expected and appropriate for the program.

The curriculum is largely proscriptive in the first two years, with more choice and electives across a range of courses and disciplines in the third and fourth years. In interviews with students, they clearly enjoyed this breadth and the opportunity to explore.

While the breadth of options is appreciated by many students, there is a sense that others might benefit from more direction and a choice amongst focused structures. When compared to international peers, it is rare to see a single, broad kinesiology degree without some structure to provide depth within different academic options, e.g. certificate in global initiatives (existing); pre-health professions; pre-physical therapy/occupational therapy; sport and social justice; physical activity and public health; etc. Opportunities to develop a focus within the broad degree program exist at

other institutions and take many different forms, e.g. specialties, cognates, and certificates – each of which are used to guide students in course selection. They also allow for the development of student interest groups that build cohesion and reduce student advising. Moreover, these might provide a focus for minors that would be attractive to students outside of the Faculty.

These structures also serve to help define Kinesiology – and the BKin in particular - which is often an unfamiliar term and degree for many who continue to view it solely as a preparation program for physical educators.

Evidence of innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs

Areas of note:

1. While not innovative, per se, the emphasis on the broad range of areas within the discipline (i.e. physical cultural studies, biophysical and behavioural studies) is, unfortunately, rare amongst peer institutions.
2. The combined BKin and MT provides an innovative opportunity for advanced training in pedagogy.
3. The certificate in Global Kinesiology & Physical Education is also innovative. While most programs have a similar emphasis, a certificate program is relatively unique.

The first and second year has a high number of laboratory and tutorial experiences. The third and fourth year are more focused on lecture-based instruction and shift opportunities for experiential learning to a large number of in-field learning experiences available in the Faculty.

KPE identifies student uptake of international experiences as a primary, strategic goal. The lack of existing study abroad tied to KPE is not surprising. Kinesiology students tend to be “First in Family” and are often unlikely to travel. Moreover, there is less opportunity to leverage a specific location for education than exists for courses in other disciplines (e.g. art history or architecture in Italy or France). That said, the top international programs are making a similar emphasis and this effort by KPE is appropriate and their appointment of an experiential education coordinator for these efforts demonstrates their commitment to this approach.

Amongst peer institutions, there is often some requirement for a culminating experience that reflects the breadth and depth of the undergraduate education experience. While many programs require a research experience or individual capstone project, this would be difficult in KPE given the size of the faculty. Instead, students might be offered an option amongst research, in-field learning experience or study abroad as a culminating experience. In addition, faculty could be creative in assessing this project. For example, some peer institutions ask students to prepare posters describing their placement and learning outcomes within a large setting.

One area of concern is the outdoor projects sequence. These are required, non-credit bearing courses that required additional fees. The response from students is mixed, with many seeing these as a key distinguisher of the BKin at the University of Toronto and others viewing these as a burden that cause mental and financial stress. Our view is that these are more reflective of the history of physical education as a discipline than of the modern, health-focused field of kinesiology. The benefit of student cohesion is clear, but the three-year requirement seems especially burdensome. We would encourage KPE to eliminate the requirement in year 1, develop an on-campus alternative to build cohesion, and eliminate the 2nd and 3rd year programs.

KPE employs a high number of student workers in the co-curricular program. Faculty might consider converting some of these to paid internships to both increase student support and better leverage the co-curricular programs.

Opportunities for student research experience: There exist opportunities for formal student research within the BKin program, but these are not well prescribed. A number of barriers emerged in discussions with students and the student adviser:

1. The instruction in statistics and methods is not well ramped. Students describe a large jump in content and complexity from year 1 to year 2 that was challenging and seemed to undermine confidence in research.
2. Students are charged with establishing connection with faculty. This is problematic as it favours the most outgoing and well-connected students, which undermines equity. In addition, students seek out research with the most popular professors, which reduces capacity.
3. Opportunities for students to undertake a research experience beyond the directed and advanced courses should be highlighted and expanded.
4. Teaching stream faculty appear to be under-utilized for research experiences. KPE has a large number of highly skilled, well-trained teaching stream faculty who would be well-placed to help oversee undergraduate research and capstone experiences.
5. The co-curricular program appears to be under-utilized for research. While the co-curricular program is rarely a strong match for the kind of cutting-edge research required for promotion and tenure, it is ideal for developing research skills at the undergraduate (and MSc) level and could be better leveraged to this end.

4. Assessment of learning

As a result of the curriculum mapping exercise, the course sequence advances students across increasing depth of assessment. Concepts are first introduced, assessed at a deeper level and then assessed at an advanced level. This helps to ensure that their key outcomes are developed over time in the program. Considering their outcomes for Critically Reflective Practice, these concepts are assessed at an

introductory level through the 1st year, with deeper indicators used in the 2nd and 3rd years. By the 4th year, the assessments are all at an advanced level. This kind of scaffolding is excellent. In addition, these assessments cross numerous outcomes. While most are based on traditional exams and written assignments, there is a nice mix of group work, self-reflection, case studies, etc.

5. Quality indicators

Assessment of program against international comparators: The program is similar to international peers and would be well recognized by any faculty of kinesiology.

Quality of applicants and admitted students: KPE admits approximately 40% of all applicants to the BKin program. Of these, they yield about one third. These ratios are generally consistent for Canadian and International students. The number of students in BKin has steadily grown. This reflects both the purposeful efforts of KPE and the growing popularity of kinesiology internationally. The quality of these students has risen slightly since the last review, from an entering average of 83.5 to 86.4. We would consider these to be on the low-end of other peer institutions in the U.S. The number of self-reported Indigenous students is low. The self-study does not include data on the number of black students or any other racial / ethnic demographic.

Student completion rates and time to completion: The retention rate is well over 90% and would be considered quite good. It appears that 75-80% of students graduate after the 4th year as only 20-25% are retained for a 5th year. This, again, is quite good.

Quality of the educational experience, teaching and graduate supervision: The course of study is administered by 25 tenure stream, 7 teaching stream, 8 athletic instructors and 22 sessional instructors. This is relatively low number of tenure stream faculty given the size of the undergraduate program. This results in a large number of courses taught by those in a non-continuing status (approximately 35% of compulsory courses and 55% of non-compulsory courses).

Students clearly enjoy the educational experience. This was clear in our interviews with students and in their alumni survey where 79% would recommend the program to a prospective student and 85% were satisfied or very satisfied with their experience. Likewise, the NSSE data show BKin students to report mean data in line with the University of Toronto averages, although these are lower than would be expected for a university of University of Toronto's international status.

Implications of any data (where available) concerning post-graduation employability: The most recent data are from surveys in 2014 and 2016. In these surveys, 88.5% and 86.4% of KPE undergraduates were employed 6 months post-graduation. This compares to 90% of similar majors from other Ontario universities. However, these data do not reflect the extensive change in since adopting the BKin degree. It will be important to continue to track employment data to determine the impact of these changes.

Availability of student funding: There is some funding available for BKin students, with approximately 60-70 students receiving some type of award. This represents less than 10% of the present student enrollment.

Provision of student support through orientation, advising/mentoring, student services: The initial Outdoor Project provides a unique opportunity for student support and to build student rapport and cohesion. If this is to change, KPE should consider other means to build comradery early in the 1st year experience.

Much of the support is tied to University-wide support, e.g. Centre for International Experience, University of Toronto Health and Wellness Centre, etc. Most of this is general, but there is some support that is modified for KPE. For example, The Health Sciences Writing Centre provides specific support for academic reading and writing for BKin students as well as students from other health science divisions.

There is KPE-specific support through the KPE Registrar's Office, which includes accessibility, health and wellness, career education, learning strategies, and academic advising. These are well-utilized, with 643 appointments made for student advising, along with 69 students advised through group meetings. Thus, advisers reached over 70% of enrolled students in 2018. This is excellent.

Program outreach and promotion: KPE employs a recruitment coordinator who works with the communication office for promotion. This office oversees a range of outreach and promotion opportunities, from Summer programs (e.g. SOAR) to work with feeder schools that serve targeted minority students along with international recruitment initiatives to the U.S. In discussions with the recruitment coordinator these efforts have had an impact on applications and enrollment. It would be useful to include more specific evaluation of these efforts to track their impact.

Bachelor of Kinesiology Recommendations:

1. Consider the development of certificates/specialization to provide students with guidance and improved structure to Years 3 and 4, and to reflect and help others to recognize the range and specialization of the work being done. The Certificate in Global Kinesiology & Physical Education is an example. Similar programs could easily be created in Sport and Social Justice, Pre-Health Professions, etc.
2. Set specific goals for undergraduate research to increase reach along with strategic initiatives to meet these goals. These initiatives might include
 - eliminating the pre-requisite between 390Y and 490Y so that 4th year students can take a 4th year course.
 - consider improving the transition from the 1st year to the 2nd year statistics and research methods courses.
 - consider adding a formal, laboratory internship without independent project to build research skills. This could be available throughout the first 3 years to build skills and confidence in research.

- target teaching-stem faculty to support undergraduate research and capstone experiences in collaboration with the co-curricular program. This would increase the capacity to support these initiatives and better leverage the relationship with the co-curricular program.
3. Consider a culminating experience (e.g. research project, internship, international experience) with a required summative assessment (e.g. presentation or reflection).
 4. Make the 1st year of ODP optional with an on-campus option to build student comradery.
 5. Remove years 2 and 3 ODP completely. Consider embedding first-aid qualification within an existing, credit-bearing class.
 6. Seek greater advancement efforts to increase student financial support or converting existing student employment to paid internships.
 7. Track broad indicators of student diversity along with an on-going evaluation of recruitment efforts to guide future efforts. This may be occurring but not reported.

Masters in Professional Kinesiology

Response to specific questions:

1. Objectives: *Consistency of the program with the University's mission and Faculty/unit's academic plans. Program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and align with the relevant undergraduate and/or graduate Degree Level Expectations.*

The Masters in Professional Kinesiology (MPK) is part of the Faculty's developments in response to the 2011 External Review to expand opportunities arising from the recognition of Kinesiology as a regulated health profession by Ontario province. It is also consistent with the University's plan to increase graduate enrolment across the three campuses.

The learning outcomes for the MPK are clear and are of postgraduate level. There are both theoretical and applied learning outcomes, which is appropriate for a professional Masters. The LO's have been well-mapped onto each course and assessment.

2. Admission requirements: *Appropriateness of admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program*

Admission requirements are appropriate for a professional Masters, with both high academic performance and applied experience being important for entry. The latter is particularly significant for those who have already been in suitable employment post-graduation. The usual recruitment avenues are used for MPK, but other opportunities such as social media and meetings of faculty members with prospective students are also employed. The University website is an important tool for recruiting students to this program.

3. Curriculum and program delivery

The MPK is an innovative program, and the University of Toronto was the first provider of this qualification in Canada. Since then two other Canadian institutions have also started offering a similar qualification, but neither appear to match the University of Toronto in terms of depth or quality of study. KPE needs to ensure that its role of first and best provider of MPK is maintained by continual review of the program, and to combine this with work with Communication & Marketing and Admissions to hit the planned recruitment targets of increased quantity and quality of students.

The MPK program has a very good mix of academic, applied and professional content. The use of full professorial staff in teaching means that students are exposed to high-quality theoretical concepts and research. This is combined with delivery by applied practitioners to ensure students also understand the professional aspects of the program. This was appreciated by the single MPK student in the review graduate

student meeting. It is important to ensure that the program is supported both by appointments of Teaching Stream faculty and by the continued involvement of appropriate professors.

The three placements in the MPK are serialized, enabling students to build and apply their knowledge incrementally. They are designed as group exercises tackling a problem relevant to key practice areas and community needs rather than singly-supervised experiences. This means that students are well-prepared to work as a Kinesiologist as part of a wider team.

Placements are carried out in a variety of settings; high performance sport, chronic disease and mental health children and youth and musculoskeletal health and concussion. This wide range of settings gives students a good breadth of professional experience. There have also been four new clinics in which MPK students assist in exercise programming for various populations.

The use of a capstone project which asks students to develop a plan to improve kinesiological practice and then present this at a conference shows the integration of research, analytical, professional and presentation skills which are all important aspects of a registered Kinesiologist. There are also opportunities for students to become involved with faculty research projects, thus experiencing high-level study.

4. Assessment of learning

Assessments have been well-mapped onto the learning outcomes for the various courses in the program throughout the four different phases of the degree. There is a good balance of written, verbal and practical assessments.

5. Quality indicators

Assessment of program against international comparators: There are few international comparators as only Ontario has Kinesiology as a registered health profession. Other registered health-care professions such as physical or occupational therapy have similar postgraduate programs to qualify students. Comparison with other Masters programs in similar fields (e.g. Physical Activity for Health, Strength and Conditioning) show that the MPK is a high-quality postgraduate program, preparing students well to work with a wide range of clients

Quality of applicants and admitted students: The program has not met its projected intake numbers (40 students per cohort) with recruitment currently being approximately 20% below target. The KPE self-study report attributed this to lack of directed MPK focus at graduate fairs. Therefore, KPE needs to ensure that appropriate applicants are contacted to raise awareness of the MPK program. This is particularly important, as the long-term goal to enhance the quality of applicants is to increase the number of applicants to 150-200 (88-150% rise) for 44-46 entrants (approximately 40% rise).

Student completion rates and time to completion: The 16-month structure of the MPK ensures that a very high percentage (93-100%) complete their studies within two years. The program design means that there are two cohorts studying simultaneously for 4 months, but as the senior group will be carrying out their capstone projects this should not cause conflict for space, resources or staff.

Availability of student funding: MPK students pay full and ancillary fees and are not funded by KPE. Students may apply for an Ontario Graduate Scholarship but no students have applied for (nor received) external funding to date. There is clearly a need for students to commit considerable resources to fund their studies on this program.

6. Learning and Teaching Environment:

Specialized dedicated space for the MPK program has been provided in the Athletic Centre. The combination of adjacent teaching, laboratory and common areas aid learning and help students develop a sense of academic and professional identity. Future campus developments (e.g. Goldring building extension) should ensure that a very similar configuration of spaces is available to MPK students.

Masters in Professional Kinesiology Recommendations:

1. Ensure commitment to programme with continuing faculty appointments
2. Ensure continued involvement of appropriate tenure stream faculty members
3. Safeguard current MPK learning, teaching and common spaces, and in the new Goldring tower development ensure that there is similar or enhanced MPK space for this fully-cost recovered program.
4. Continue with Communications and Marketing programme to consolidate the first mover position and work to hit recruitment planned targets.

Exercise Sciences, MSc and PhD programs

Response to specific questions:

1. Objectives: *Consistency of the programs with the University's mission and Faculty's academic plans*

The MSc and PhD programs in the Department of Exercise Sciences (EXS) span the disciplinary areas of behavioral, biophysical and physical cultural study and represent the diversity expected of a graduate program in Kinesiology. The thesis-based programs require students to develop a deep understanding of their areas of study and the skill set to conduct independent research. The learning outcomes for both degrees are in alignment with Degree Level Expectations set out by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. Furthermore, the curriculum mapping exercise conducted by the Faculty in 2019 illustrates the extent to which the core competencies are covered, and by what means, for all graduate courses offered within the Faculty. These are consistent with best practice goals and expectations for the delivery of graduate education.

2. Admission Requirements: *Appropriateness of admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.*

The admission requirements for both degrees are consistent with what is required to successfully challenge the graduate degree expectations and to acquire the skills outlined in the learning objectives and outcomes.

3. Curriculum and Program Delivery

KPE has improved the alignment of program requirements and the curriculum with these two research focused programs. The reduction in mandatory course load to 2.0 and 1.5 credits for the MSc and PhD programs respectively and the revised comprehensive examination structure and content addressed the recommendations from the 2011 review and have been well received by the graduate students with whom we met. The recommended milestone timelines for each of the two programs are well defined and reasonable. Embedded requirements for research presentations, graduate student research/ journal/ laboratory meetings speak to a focus on critical analysis and assessment, the opportunity to participate in research activities and the sharing of ideas across disciplinary boundaries.

The structure, content and methods of instruction and learning outcomes for both the MSc and PhD are well articulated, available and communicated appropriately to the students. Students appreciate the collaborative and integrative nature of their programs and the extent to which faculty members create both formal and informal opportunities for students within the three disciplinary areas to interact. The three research centres within KPE (Centre for Sport Policy Studies, Centre for Motor Control

and the Mental Health and Physical Activity Research Centre MPARC) each contribute to a vibrant set of opportunities for graduate students that includes graduate research conferences, speaker series, project driven work and most recently synergies with the co-curricular side through involvement in leading exercise intervention work through MPARC. Thought should be given to how the opportunities provided through these research centres can be leveraged in graduate student recruitment and as a further enhancement to their graduate experience through cross-faculty and inter-Faculty engagement.

Students stated their appreciation for the flexibility to take courses outside EXS as part of their degree program. However, they expressed frustration at how difficult it is to actually enroll in outside courses and the manual nature of the approval process. Perhaps efficiencies could be explored with the graduate programs that see the highest proportion of EXS students enrolled.

Details provided on the curriculum mapping exercise highlight the extent to which the 16 core competencies are assessed by informal, formal and practice enacted assessment and feedback. The curriculum map makes clear the degree to which the successful completion of the thesis serves as evidence of mastery of the learning outcomes and degree level expectations.

4. Assessment of Learning

Students are assessed through their EXS course work and on their research work in the forms of thesis proposals and defense at the MSc level and with the addition of comprehensive examinations at the PhD level. These assessment techniques are standard in research degree programs across the globe. Timely feedback is a requirement in all levels of assessment. Graduates students with whom we met were satisfied with the level of feedback that they received from both their course instructors and thesis supervisors.

5. Quality Indicators and Quality Enhancements

Program Reputation: The University of Toronto is the most highly ranked University in Canada and is a leading research-intensive university in the world. Following the 2011 review, KPE developed a plan to join the top ranked kinesiology programs in Canada and beyond. KPE has made great progress in addressing the barriers outlined in the 2011 review with respect to graduate program structure, laboratory and graduate research space as well as faculty complement and productivity. As a result, the reputation of the graduate programs have improved and they compare well with comparable programs in the U15. It should be noted that the majority of students have family in the GTA. Students attribute this to the lack of funding and the expense of living in Toronto. While this is addressed below, it is important to emphasize that a narrow focus on local students serves to undermine the long-term reputation of the program.

Applicants and Admitted Students: Applications to the MSc program have nearly doubled since 2011 from 43 to 82 with a concomitant increase in offers from 19 to 32 and new registrants from 7 to 27. The offer and acceptance rate for the program remain slightly higher at 39% and 84% respectively than for the Division of Life Science at 36% and 64%, and the University of Toronto composite rates of 27% and 61%. Over the same period PhD applications increased from 20 to 32, with offers increasing slightly from 10 to 13 in 2017-18. The offer and acceptance rates of 39% and 77% are also higher than that of the Division of Life Science at 36% and 69% and the University of Toronto composite 22% and 66% respectively.

The entering MSc class of 2017-18 increased to 27 students from 7 reported in 2011. A similar level of growth has not yet been achieved at the PhD level where there were 10 new registrants in 2017-18 as compared with 7 in 2011. A review of the recent history of external student awards (Tri-council, OGS) illustrates an increase in the number of PhD students holding these awards from 6 in 2015-16 to 14 in 2019-20. MSc external award winners has remained between 5 and 7. This increase in externally funded PhD students – who can hold their award at any Canadian University, speaks to the desire of well qualified and highly competitive students to complete their doctorate in this program.

KPE recognizes that they have a significant challenge in the recruitment of students from outside of the University of Toronto and the GTA. An advisory committee was struck to look at recruitment issues and best practice strategies for the PhD program. Thought should be given to the extent to which the 'Exercise Science' branding of the program and the concomitant offering of an MSc only (no MA) may limit students studying at other institutions interested in the fields of cultural studies or sport policy from applying to the graduate programs in Kinesiology at the University of Toronto.

Times to Completion: The mean time to completion rate (MSc program) of 2.3 years aligns with that of the Division of Life Science and is higher than the University of Toronto composite mean of 1.7 years. Mean time to completion for the PhD program is 5 years which is less than both internal comparators. Time to completion rates for each of the MSc and PhD fall outside the funding eligible period for provincial funding. Students suggested to us that program barriers to on-time completion include time required for preparation of comprehensive examinations, ethics approvals, the recruitment of study participants, the time required to arrange committee and supervisory committee meetings. Students identified funding as the most critical obstacle to on-time completion, particularly for MSc students who indicated the need to take on other employment with concomitant time commitments no longer available to devote to their graduate work.

Availability of Student Funding: The Department of Exercise Science offers full-time MSc students minimum funding packages in the amount of \$8500 plus tuition and fees for their funding eligible period of two years. The minimum funding package for PhD students is \$17,750 plus tuition and fees for the funding eligible period of four years. Funding packages for both degrees usually include a stipend, teaching assistantship

hours (TA) and in some cases research assistantship hours. These packages are funded by the KPE operating budget and there is no requirement for faculty members to contribute funding. They may however, top-up the funding package with no claw-back of operating funds.

When students are successful in securing external funding (i.e., OGS, Tri council) the external funding replaces their internal funding package and students receive a further top-up from the Faculty as an incentive to secure external funding.

Additionally, any teaching assistantships or research assistantships secured by students who are externally funded are paid as additional funds on top of their funding package. For smaller external awards (< \$10,000) there is no adjustment to the internal funding package and the external award is received in full as a top-up.

Teaching assistantships are a component of the minimum funding guarantee package for students who do not hold external funding. Students in EXS observed that when there is a requirement for TA work within the package, many of them have to seek additional employment opportunities either on or off campus. As a result, they have less time to devote to their program of study and timelines for completion of their degrees must be extended beyond the funding eligible period.

Although faculty members expressed appreciation of the current graduate student funding model within KPE, it is clear that the sole use of operating funds to meet the minimum guarantee severely limits the size of the packages that can be offered. The ability to attract and enroll excellent graduate students is tightly tied to the funding packages that are offered and the details pertaining to whether for example: teaching assistantships are supernumerary to the minimum funding package or not, the provisions around claw-backs if the student comes with an external award, and the extent to which a research assistantship is a component of the funding package. The issue of funding is particularly acute for the recruitment of students who do not reside in the GTA. Given the Faculty's desire to increase overall quality of students who apply with a GPA greater than 4.0 to over 35% from the current 16%, they will have to closely evaluate funding packages offered in terms of competitiveness on dollar value and make up.

6. Learning & Teaching Environment:

The graduate students we met with were generally very positive about their experience in the programs. Some cited access to a vast area of clinical opportunities and cross appointed faculty members as being a differentiator for them in their program choice. Support in terms of supervisor availability and responsiveness, timeliness of feedback, mentorship and support for scholarly activities such as conference travel and presentation preparation were stated to be good but also faculty member dependent.

The addition of the Goldring Centre and the repurposing of space in the Benson Building have resulted in the creation of new and enhanced laboratory and teaching

space for KPE. The creation of new shared research laboratory space is consistent with best practice in design and increases the efficiency of space use. This model of space planning supports a culture of collaboration between faculty members and their students. The laboratory spaces that we toured were equipped with state-of-the-art equipment by disciplinary standards. In some cases, graduate students are housed within the laboratory space of their supervisor, others have access to graduate student shared office space, and hoteling space is available (in the Goldring Centre and the Benson Building) to accommodate student mobility between buildings. Despite the acquisition of the Goldring Centre and the renovations across the other buildings the quality of graduate space is highly variable and constrained with respect to any further expansion of student intake or program offerings. Students and faculty members noted the extent to which the creation of community and comradery must be explicit given the distributed nature of graduate student work. Further students noted the absence of a graduate student lounge or similar area to gather informally.

Exercise Science MSc & PhD Program Recommendations:

1. Reconsider funding packages in light of the component parts and minimum funding levels to insure they are competitive and have parity with internal comparators.
2. Consider a mandatory faculty contribution to funding packages for post tenure members.
3. Consider offering an MA program to attract socio-cultural and policy applicants.
4. Consider offering a direct entry PhD program.
5. Consider finding space for a graduate student gathering area in one of the KPE buildings.

Faculty and Research:

Response to specific questions:

1. Scope, Quality and relevance of faculty research activities

The Dean and the faculty should be congratulated for the way in which the faculty and research recommendations of the 2011 review have been successfully addressed. The faculty complement has increased and now includes an externally recruited Canada Research Chair. An onboarding workload policy now exists for pre-tenure hires whereby they receive a 0.5 course reduction in their first year and again in the year of their interim review. Investments continue to be made in the development of new laboratory space and equipment. As well, the Faculty separated the responsibilities for graduate studies and research with the addition of an associate dean research position. The position was filled by a research active internal appointment. A seed funding program for grant preparation was instituted and participation rates in tri-council granting competitions has increased to 50%. Each of these initiatives serves to support faculty members in their remit to carry out research and training of highly qualified personnel.

KPE updated the Research Cluster Exercise to identify converging areas and opportunities to build synergies within KPE and for alignment with the University of Toronto 2030 vision document. Four main research clusters were identified: Improving Physical Activity Standards in Healthcare; Training Global Citizens in Sport and Exercise; Making Sport and Exercise Safe and Healthy; and Optimizing Performance. The three Research Centres (EDU-D) in KPE each facilitate and enable innovative connections across the Faculty and university to increase research collaborations and engage faculty and graduate students in cross disciplinary research. Formal collaborations with other Ontario universities in southwestern Ontario, UHN and the Faculty of Medicine at University of Toronto in each of the Centre for Motor Control, and MPARC provide unique interdisciplinary research and conference opportunities for faculty member and their graduate students. The Centre for Sport Policy is a project-driven centre that has employed over 120 graduate students over the last 20 years on collaborations with scholars from around the world. The Research Cluster Themes and the research centres reflect the breadth of the Kinesiology.

Faculty members expressed appreciation for the level of support they now receive for the research enterprise from KPE. There was universal support of the internal seed funds for the preparation of Tri-council and other major grants. While they also appreciate the extent to which KPE supports the funding of graduate students, they understand that this model – as currently configured, limits other ways in which KPE can support research initiatives. Our discussions with faculty members revealed that they had a far greater affinity for the work of the research centres and the encouragement of organic collaborations between faculty members than for the identification of official research clusters.

Faculty members were generally supportive of the development of shared disciplinary laboratory space particularly given that new faculty have been “waitlisted” for research space, thereby holding up early progress on the development of their research program. Faculty feel that the graduate student experience is highly constrained due to lack of space. They cited a quality issue for graduate students who do not reside within a research laboratory and noted that there is no space for community-based researchers to do their work when they are on campus. More generally, faculty observed that there is a lack of space for intergroup meetings that would foster collaboration between and across disciplinary boundaries. It is clear that research space is highly constrained and is a limitation to the vitality of all programs (faculty, graduate and undergraduate). This will not be resolved until additional space is secured and configured for the Faculty.

Disciplinary differences within Kinesiology notwithstanding, research productivity is variable across the members of the faculty as is graduate supervision. KPE has a significant number of highly productive senior and midcareer scholars as well as a number of highly qualified new members. Participation rates in tri-council funding applications while improved to 50% of those eligible remains below the Division of Life Science rate of 72% and the University of Toronto composite average of 63%. The self-study reports an impressive increase in overall research funding since 2011 from just under \$500,000 to just under \$2M in 2018. The Faculty’s success in tri-council funding has increased from \$140,000 to \$630,000, reflecting an increase in the number of grants from 11 to 30. The number of KPE faculty holding tri-council funding has grown from 3 to 10 over this timeframe. The success rate for SSHRC Insight Grants in 2016 and 2017 were 100% and 66% respectively and reflect the success of some of KPE mid- career faculty. It will remain important that appropriate mentorship and feedback mechanisms are in place to ensure that the current mid- career and junior members develop and maintain a career trajectory to successfully challenge these granting council awards, tenure and promotion decisions as well as the promotion to full professor in an appropriate time frame.

2. Appropriateness of the level of activity relative to national and international comparators

There are a number of members of the Faculty whose reputation for research and mentorship of HQP are amongst the leaders in the field. Others are forging strong reputations for their own work and are beginning to take on larger numbers of graduate students. There are others for whom there is room to grow in terms of reputation and influence in the field. The Faculty complement has grown considerably since 2011 and many of the recent hires are well on their way to establishing themselves in their respective fields of expertise. In terms of research output, the data provided by the Faculty reflects a level of scope and productivity that is consistent with peer institutions within North America and the UK.

3. Appropriateness of research activities for the undergraduate and graduate students in the Faculty

The opportunities for graduate student research are consistent with what would be expected of MSc and PhD candidates in comparable Kinesiology programs around the world. The potential for research work through KPE's EDU's and with the University Hospital Network (UHN) are outstanding. The increasing level of inter and cross disciplinary collaborations seen across faculty members in KPE creates enhanced opportunities for graduate students with whom they work. Consideration should be given to formalizing a role for the Associate Dean Research with respect to graduate education. The complete separation of these sets of responsibilities between the two associate dean portfolios may be a barrier to the identification of further opportunities for graduate student participation in interdisciplinary research.

While the BKIN program has been discussed more formally in another section of this document it would be fair to say that we believe that there are barriers to the participation of undergraduate students to take part in a research project in KPE. Students reported a lack of sophisticated hands-on experiences in the first two years of their program, the difficulty of the second-year statistics course and the fact that specialization does not begin to occur until third year as barriers to taking 390Y in third year. It was reported that the majority of students in 390Y were in fact fourth year students, meaning that the small proportion of students who did undertake a research-based course did not do so until their fourth year. Opportunities for a guided research experience earlier in the program that would help develop interest, skills and confidence could be explored. Undergraduate students are not exposed to sophisticated laboratory space in the context of their laboratory experiences. The space used for this course related work is limited in both quality and quantity. Students need an experience early in their program that promotes their interest in research. Expansion of laboratory space for undergraduates is essential and laboratory experiences should be enhanced in the first two years of the program.

4. Faculty complement plan

The KPE faculty complement has increased since 2011 from 36 to a current complement of 42 including 25 tenure-stream faculty, 9 teaching stream faculty, and 8 athletic instructors. There are two tenure stream searches currently ongoing and plans for three additional contractually limited faculty appointments in the 2019-20 cycle. Over this same time period the total undergraduate student enrolment has increased from 744 to 1045 and graduate enrolment from 62 to 183, a major component of which are enrolments in the new MPK program.

While the gender balance of the faculty complement is very close to 50% (21 women of 43 listed members of KPE), a closer examination of the tenure stream faculty reveals some imbalance. At the rank of professor only 2 are women, with one being the recent external CRC hire. A better gender balance exists at both the associate and

assistant rank, but it appears that the males at the associate rank are, in general, better positioned for promotion to full than the females in that cohort. Robust mentorship strategies should be developed to ensure that junior faculty members are well prepared and supported to move through the ranks in KPE. A goal for KPE should be to increase the diversity of the full professor rank with promotion of the existing members of the Faculty.

KPE has invested in teaching stream faculty who take on a higher teaching workload in both the BKIN and MPK programs and in some cases, supervise MSc students. There is gender balance at both the associate and assistant ranks in this cohort with most of these faculty at the associate rank.

5. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit's use of existing human resources

KPE makes appropriate, effective and efficient use of their complement in the delivery of four academic programs and full-time coaching leadership in the co-curricular program by their athletic instructors. KPE's decision to invest in teaching stream faculty allowed them to handle the increase in undergraduate student enrolments since 2011 and to develop and sustain the innovative MPK program. Teaching load for this group at 3.0 FCE is standard for this category of appointment and provides teaching capacity beyond that available with tenure stream faculty.

KPE's standard workload for research intensive members is 1.5 FCE with a reduction of 0.5 in the first year of appointment. This policy supports junior faculty members in establishing their research programs at the outset of their academic career. The standard workload of 1.5 FCE's is appropriate for research active faculty members. A pilot project exists, with the approval of the dean, for a reduction in teaching load by 0.5 when a faculty member is the principal investigator on a major research project. The dean should also consider a redistribution of workload when a faculty member no longer meets the expectations and standards of being research active.

There is no capacity in the current complement of KPE to increase the number of graduate courses offered internally, enhance the laboratory experiences in years 1 and 2 of the BKIN program, or to create and support additional Masters level professional programs. Future program growth and current program enhancements will require additional investments in faculty. Determination of what should determine the type (tenure or teaching stream) and area of appointment (research-driven or program-driven) will be critical matters for discussion within KPE.

Faculty and Research Recommendations:

1. Continue with Dean's seed funding in support of tri-council grant (or equivalent) preparations.
2. Continue with Associate Dean Research position and consider a formal association with Vice Dean Academic to enhance UG and G research opportunities.
3. Continue to increase Tri-council participation rates to University of Toronto average
4. Formalize mentorship to ensure pre-tenure faculty feedback and support.
5. Consider a funding model for graduate support that requires post-tenure members to provide a designated amount for trainees.
6. Continue with minimum funding package for graduate students for pre-tenure hires.
7. Consider increase teaching load assignment for tenure-stream faculty members who do not have a bona fide research program.
8. Consider cluster hires to address diversity issues and to build innovative research programs with other faculties (i.e. joint appointments)
9. Continue to transition to shared lab space from individual lab model where appropriate.
10. Identify and provide laboratory space to new tenure-stream hires at the time of their appointment.

Relationships

Response to specific questions:

1. Strength of the morale of faculty, students and staff.

Morale of the faculty, students and staff was high in the meetings with the review team. All recognised the high academic status of University of Toronto and were proud of studying and working there. They also reported positive learning, teaching and working experiences and relationships. This was borne out by the Speaking Up! survey of faculty and staff, although these data are now 5 years old. However, the same survey also noted that a majority of faculty members was dissatisfied with their workload, and this was supported by several comments in review meetings about uneven teaching and marking loads for various courses. Student survey results (NSSE and CGPSS) were rather mixed, with low scores and a rather low ranking compared to other Canadian universities. When questioned, faculty members and students did not see this as a major problem, but it is important that KPE monitor these scores carefully to ensure they do not affect student recruitment. Similar scores in UK student surveys would see significant pressure from university senior management to introduce initiatives to enhance the student experience and improve survey scores.

2. Scope and nature of relationships with cognate Faculties, academic departments and units.

The review panel met the Deans of three other faculties (OISE, Public Health and Music) who gave very positive reflections on interactions with KPE faculty members and students.

OISE is involved with BKin/MT combined program, which allows students accelerated entry to the MT. However, only approximately 5 students per year pursue this route, possibly due to the requirement to apply in Year 2 of the BKin. There is also a necessity for a high GPA on application, and students reported that in Years 1 and 2 very good applicants might achieve one or two low grades due to the breadth of the program, thus affecting their entry potential. The Dean of OISE indicated that his Faculty would not be averse to considering changing the admission to the combined BKin/MT. to the third year of the BKin. program.

The Dean of Public Health reported that there was a significant amount of common research and study with KPE, such as the Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research and Council of Health Sciences. Health promotion is an important shared area between the two faculties with outreach examples such as exercise programs in mosques and life skills and exercise work in public schools. The Dean also reported that KPE graduate students were of a very high standard and brought much to the interactions between faculties. As Public Health does not have any undergraduate programs there are opportunities for combined degrees between Public Health and KPE.

The Dean of Music interacts with the Dean of KPE through regular meetings and conversations between the Deans of Single-Department Faculties, a group created by the Deans to address SDF issues specifically. The group-appointed chair of the DSDF has been invited to participate in forums where consultation about the University's budget allocations are conducted by the Provost and the President. He reported that the Dean of KPE is generous with his time and knowledge and was proactive towards interdisciplinary work when he was Chair. The Faculty of Music also has research links with KPE faculty (particularly those in sport psychology, sports injuries and exercise physiology) through projects on high performance and music. These interactions are very positive, and similar opportunities are expected to grow in the future (for example joint MSc/PhD supervision and a Music and Health Centre).

The cognate Deans believed inter- and multi-disciplinary research and study were the way forward, but they also realized that this might cause some budgetary sharing issues. There are many good ideas, but it is sometimes difficult to take advantage of all the multidisciplinary work that is possible due to time and resource constraints. Although the three Deans are all based on the St George Campus, they also realized that inter-campus collaboration, whilst opening interesting possibilities, might be constrained by practicalities such as travel and expertise.

3. Extent to which the division/unit has developed or sustained fruitful partnerships with other universities and organizations in order to foster research, creative professional activities and to deliver teaching programs.

There are student exchanges available with other universities. Although faculty and administrative staff promote these through activities such as information sessions and individual meetings, some students are unaware that these opportunities exist or misunderstand some aspects (e.g. fees). There are scholarships available (e.g. MITACS for graduate students), but it is unclear if many students know about these. If the University of Toronto is to achieve its target of 33% of students having an international experience, partnerships with other universities and external international bodies are crucial and students need to be made aware of these and the support available through all dissemination methods (e.g. social media, website, meetings with faculty and administrative staff). It may be possible to incentivize students to take part in international experience by such methods as providing financial travel support to high achieving students and/or those from disadvantaged backgrounds.

There are many examples of successful research relationships with other universities. The three existing research centres (Motor Control, Centre for Sport Policy Studies and MPARC) all liaise with faculty members at other institutions to apply for grant funding and carry out research. The research centres also perform other activities with partner institutions such as co-ordinating symposia, arranging visiting professors and delivering physical activity and health programs.

4. Scope and nature of the division/unit's relationship with external government, academic and professional organizations.

KPE has formal links with various public, non-governmental organizations through Canada. The self-study document gave details over one hundred partners with whom single KPE, omnibus or affiliation agreements are currently active, including eleven that have already been established for the 2019-2020 academic year. This is a significant number of partner organizations, and KPE should be applauded for the wide range and depth of these agreements. Relationships with clinical organizations, such as hospital and research institutes are particularly fruitful, and several faculty members reported that they carried out their research work in collaboration with medical facilities. There are also links to sports organizations and clubs both in sport science support and placement experiences.

5. Social impact of the division/unit in terms of outreach and impact locally and nationally.

There are several very good examples of outreach programs such as S.M.I.L.E. and MoveU HappyU. In these programs, faculty and students work with community partners and schools to deliver physical activity and health interactions. These should be continued and expanded where appropriate, and similar programs should be initiated where possible. The KPE public symposia have been a very successful way of sharing with the public the knowledge of faculty members and invited guests and are now annual events and should be continued. The KPE Registrar's office targets under-represented groups (e.g. Black and Indigenous high-school students) and this will need to be expanded in the context of the increased recruitment targets for undergraduate and graduate programs.

Relationship Recommendations

1. Monitor metrics for faculty, staff and student satisfaction. Particular focus should be on faculty and staff workloads and work-life balance, and on student interactions with faculty. If future surveys (Speaking Up!, NSSE, CGPSS) show similar patterns then short-life working groups might be set up to consider ways to ameliorate faculty, staff and student experiences.
2. Consider a shift in timing of applications for combined BKin/MT. to year 3 of BKin.
3. Consider collaboration with Public Health to develop a joint undergraduate degree program.
4. Continue to expand research networks with other faculties such as Music.
5. Expand student exchanges with international partner institutions and consider ways to incentivize students to take international exchanges.
6. Continue and expand outreach programmes such as SMILE.
7. Work with KPE Registrar's office to increase targeting of under-represented groups (e.g. Black and Indigenous high-school students), particularly in the context of KPE expanded. recruitment targets.

Organization and Financial Structure

Responses to specific questions:

1. The appropriateness and effectiveness of the division/unit's organizational and financial structure, and its use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering its program(s).

There has been significant financial growth in KPE since 2011. The self-study document reports an overall uplift of 55% for the faculty budget from \$28m to \$43m, with 92% and 44% increases in curricular and co-curricular headings respectively. Much of this increase has been achieved by a growth of over 50% in total student numbers. Of particular note is the rise in international undergraduate student entries from six in 2011 to 38 in 2019 which, combined with changes in fees, has resulted in a tenfold increase in budget contribution from this stream. The rise in student numbers across the university has also benefitted the co-curricular budget, as much of this heading comes from student ancillary fees. Finally, research grant income has also increased by 42% in the period 2011-2019 from just over \$5m to \$8.5m, although this has decreased as a percentage of the faculty revenue due to the larger growth in tuition income. The KPE senior management group should be congratulated for the expansion of the operating budget, particularly against a background of constraints in the domestic and worldwide education market.

KPE has now reached a point where any further growth in student numbers is constrained by resources – particularly in teaching space. Discussions with the Dean combined with the Long-Range Challenges section of the self-study report indicated that after this period of significant growth, KPE is proposing to enter a period of enhancing the quality of students. This will be carried out by increasing the totals of applicants by up to 100%, whilst maintaining or only slightly raising entrant numbers. However, the planned growth of approximately 33% in international students within these stable cohorts should continue to produce budgetary enhancements.

The University of Toronto's devolved financial model has enabled the Dean and senior management to utilize this financial growth creatively to enhance faculty appointments, infrastructure developments and staff administrative support. The curricular and co-curricular budgets are kept separate, but there are advantages of having both areas contributing to the income of KPE. For example, administrative staff salaries are mainly paid from co-curricular income, but these staff work also support the academic part of the faculty. This benefits the curricular areas in a more direct way than might occur if KPE was part of another Faculty, such as Arts and Sciences. However, there is a slight anomaly as the Chief Administrative Officer reports directly only to the Dean and not to the Executive Director, Co-curricular Athletics and Physical Activity programs. In the meetings with the review panel, it was not clear how the latter had input into administrative staff appraisals and accountability even though

these salaries are paid from co-curricular income and the staff support both academic and co-curricular areas.

The KPE faculty is sited in a variety of buildings of different ages around the St George campus. Comments from the Dean, faculty members, staff and students reinforced the statements made in the self-study document concerning the shortage of usable space for academic and co-curricular activities, given the size of the University of Toronto. There has been much ingenuity of re-development and re-purposing of existing buildings, and some excellent spaces have been created. However, the Athletic Centre is at least 40 years old and only so much extra space can be created within its large concrete structure. The Goldring Centre has shown the advantages of a modern facility for research, teaching and sports activities, although even here there have been some adjustments (for example the creation of shared laboratories) to better utilize space. If KPE is to continue to grow, there will need to be a significant increase in teaching and research space. The proposed development of the new academic tower on the north end of the Goldring Centre for HPS may provide additional physical resources, but the allocation to KPE will depend on the Faculty's budget contribution.

2. The appropriateness with which resource allocation, including space and infrastructure support, has been managed.

The Dean and senior management have worked well together to balance the curricular and co-curricular users of shared spaces, and much of the success of this collaboration has been due to the excellent relationships between the faculty senior management team. The sharing of administrative staff between the two parts of KPE also works well, although there are times where competing demands of academic and co-curricular on staff time means that some areas have to be prioritized to the detriment of other tasks. In the allocation of space, precedence is usually given to academics and this does sometimes cause issues with rooms for administrative or casual staff.

3. Opportunities for new revenue generation.

KPE plans to stabilize its undergraduate numbers and achieve modest increases in postgraduate professional and research degrees. Therefore, this income stream will show only moderate growth unless the increase in international students is continued. The planned 33% increase in undergraduate international students will provide further revenue. Although this will not match the tenfold increase shown between 2011 and 2019, it will provide income for further appointments and infrastructure development. It is less likely that large numbers of international students will be attracted to the MPK as this is closely linked to professions that do not have direct comparators outside Canada. The KPE future plans do not state the target for international entrants for MSc/PhD programs.

Another income stream could be through the establishment of shared undergraduate programs, either with other faculties or other campuses. There are already strong links with the Dalla Lana School of Public Health in postgraduate supervision and faculty research, and there are clear opportunities to develop a shared undergraduate program in this area. Of course, market research should be carried out prior to any development to ensure that any newly designed, shared program will not be competing for the same applicants as the current BKin degree. There are also opportunities to establish programs on the two other campuses, particularly as there are existing excellent sports facilities and co-curricular programs. For example, it may be worth considering a program in Sports Policy/Management delivered mainly by Teaching Stream faculty at one of the other campuses. At the University of Edinburgh both the BSc Sport and Recreation Management and MSc in Sport Policy, Management and International Development recruit well, the latter in particular attracting a very high percentage of international students who wish to learn in English. This pattern is similar to most programs in the U.S.A.

The MPK has been an interesting development and it may be worth KPE considering other professional programs once the MPK has been established and has reached its target numbers. These professional programs could also be shared with other faculties or campuses.

Advancement is also an area where there could be significant growth. Apart from a major donation for the construction of the Goldring Building, most benefactors and sponsors donate to co-curricular programs. There has been an increase of over 250% in revenue from endowments since 2011, but this is clearly an area that could deliver significant income to KPE.

There are also opportunities for growth in hire of the sports facilities to outside agencies. The high-quality stadia and arenas should be attractive to external users and the University needs to ensure that any enterprise model is operated in an effective way so that facility rental income is maximized with a proportion returned to KPE. However, external hire of the facilities should not be to the detriment of the academic and athletic programs.

Organization and Financial Structure Recommendations

1. Review reporting structure for CAO's portfolio to ensure appropriate levels of service and accountability to both academic and co-curricular leadership.
2. Consider collaborations with other faculties or campuses if growth in student numbers is desired.
3. Consider development of additional professional programs upon consolidation of the MPK
4. Continue to recruit international students at all levels (particularly undergraduate)

Long-Range Planning Challenges

Response to specific questions:

1. Consistency with the University's Academic Plan.

After the last review there was a sense that KPE was not in alignment with UT's academic plan. Addressing this has been a primary focus of KPE Faculty since that report. They have done much to bring themselves in alignment with the University's Academic Plan. In fact, the growth of KPE as a research unit is one of the most notable achievements of the last 8 years. As a result, the long-term plan does not require extensive change. Instead, the focus is on smaller adjustments to continue their upward trajectory.

2. Appropriateness of:

- *Complement plan, including balance of tenure-stream and non-tenure stream faculty:* Balance of 25 tenure stream to 9 teaching-stream is appropriate. It is clear that the number of faculty has not kept pace with the increase in undergraduate enrollment. Specifically, where the undergraduate student population has increased 44%, the faculty has increased just over 16%. As a result, KPE has one of the highest student to faculty ratios at UT (39.4:1). This results in a large number (often 225+) of students in required courses. These make up the bulk of the 1st and 2nd year offerings, along with a few in the 3rd and 4th year. While upper division elective courses are smaller, they remain large by the University of Toronto standards (40+ students). This has a number of impacts:
- The student-faculty ratio makes it difficult to accommodate undergraduate, mentored research experiences.
- Large format classes require a large number of TA positions, committing funds that might be used in other ways to support graduate students.
- Large format classes impact space usage and there are discussions of converting a gymnasium to a large-format, tiered classroom.
- These concerns are off-set by the degree of TA support for large classes that reduces the impact on faculty productivity. In addition, most TA positions are limited to 5-6 hours / week. Additional relief might come from increasing this to 10 hours/week as an optional assignment for students. Some relief will also come in the form of planned searches that will take the department to 27 tenure stream faculty.
- In addition, there appear to be a number of tenure stream faculty who are no longer research productive. Given the expected 40-40-20 workload, it would seem that these faculty are not meeting their 40% allocation to research. In response, we suggest that these faculty be provided additional support to improve their research. Failing this within some time frame (e.g. two years), their work allocations should be examined for the possibility of increasing time allocated to teaching to assure a full effort allocation.

- Despite these efforts, there is likely to remain a disproportionate student to faculty ratio. Additional hires should be considered. Initial efforts should be relative to other strategic initiatives of the KPE Faculty and the University of Toronto. This might include cluster hires to increase diversity and to support meaningful research themes and collaborations or cross-appointments across other faculties (e.g. in public health, health and music, etc.). This, in turn, will require renovation of space to house these faculty. At present, hires within the last two years have not yet received sufficient laboratory space.
- There is some sense from faculty discussions that they seek hires focused on teaching responsibilities. This thinking challenges all faculties, especially when the focus of the undergraduate education is of a different focus than the kind of cutting-edge research conducted by the tenure stream faculty. We would re-affirm the commitment to hire faculty based on research potential first, with gaps in teaching filled by teaching stream faculty.

Enrolment strategy: There is a clear recognition that the present level of recruitment is insufficient. This is largely expressed as an admit rate for KPE that exceeds the norms for UT, e.g. 50% admit for undergraduate applicants. There are specific goals that would bring KPE in line with this norm. In addition, they have hired a student recruitment coordinator that is charged with both a general increase in recruitment along with specific recruitment of black and indigenous students. This demonstrates a strong commitment to enrollment management. The goals would be improved if the present numbers of black students were specified within their racially identified students and goals for increasing those numbers were articulated.

Student financial aid: Student financial aid has been budgeted, with an emphasis on indigenous students. This is an appropriate focus, but the level of student funding is low. Increasing these levels should be a focus of advancement work to raise funds for student scholarships.

Development/fundraising Initiatives: The fundraising record to date has been excellent, with great success in raising funds for new construction. The faculty are presently pressed for space and would be in a critical position without these efforts. As such, KPE should be commended for this effort.

There is a clear need for an expansion of space. In the near term, this should center on advancement to support the proposed acquisition of two floors in the academic tower to be constructed on the north end of the Goldring Centre for HPS. Long-term, aspirational goals might include development to support a direct replacement for the Benson Building. More immediate (and attainable) goals should center on student support across all levels of the program.

Management and leadership: The growth in the Faculty and its programs from time of the last review is impressive as is the general morale and collegiality across the faculty. The leadership should be commended for this despite the challenges of space and a complicated structure with the co-curricular unit. The re-organization and the appointment of the current Dean has had a positive impact on the academic and

research priorities within the Faculty. In interviews with the Athletic Director, there is a concern that she does not have sufficient input in hiring and in oversight of the administrative staff who are shared across the curricular and co-curricular groups. This leaves the perception that the staff are less responsive to the needs of the co-curricular units. It might be useful to re-consider the reporting structure or formalize the input from the Athletic Director in staff review. That said, there has recently been a change in the CAO that expected to improve this relationship.

Long Term Planning Recommendations

1. Consider an effort to more fully re-brand the Faculty. This would include dropping “Physical Education” from the Faculty name and better communicating the specific areas of research and educational excellence.
2. The co-curricular structure presents unique challenges to the leadership of the KPE Faculty. Careful consideration of the required skills will be critical to the appointment of the incoming Dean.
3. Fund-raising should focus on student awards, capital funding of Goldring Tower development and, as a long-term aspirational goal, the replacement of the Benson Building.
4. Seek internal solutions to teaching needs to increased demands of undergraduate program
 - After a period of support for research development, shift low research productive faculty to increased teaching assignments.
 - Offer the option for increased TA appointments to 10 hours.
 - Seek Provost investment for dual-appointed scholars across other faculties (e.g. Public Health, Music, Nutrition) that would allow the development of interdisciplinary research centres and unique educational offerings.
5. Following internal efforts, re-evaluate the student experience vis-à-vis the faculty-student ratio to support additional investment in faculty.
6. Before seeking new faculty, space issues must be addressed as the most recent hires have inadequate research space.
7. We stress the need to hire faculty based on research potential first, with gaps in teaching filled by teaching stream faculty.

International Comparators

Response to specific questions:

1. Assessment of the division/unit and the program(s) under review relative to the best in Canada/North America and internationally, including areas of strength and opportunities

The self-report is largely based on international rankings. These are, however, fundamentally flawed as they aggregate data across units on a single topic or over-emphasize reputational rankings that are more reflective of the larger university than a specific academic unit. This is clear in the QS World Rankings in the self-report that include Harvard and Stanford Universities as top 10 programs, despite no formal sports science or kinesiology programs. This is not a criticism of the KPE self-study - the QS World Rankings are one of the few available for inclusion. It is simply a problem with the existing quantitative data. In response, we will provide more qualitative evaluation of how the KPE Faculty align with international peers.

At the time of the last review, it was clear that the KPE faculty lagged their Canadian and international peers. Since that review, KPE has instituted numerous efforts to close this gap. Specific strategies centred on a move from a PE and sport studies focus to a modern, research-focused Kinesiology Faculty with health at its core. This has allowed UT to close the gap on the top internationally recognized peer institutions.

Appropriate peer institutions include:

- Canada: Waterloo University, Queens University, McMaster University, University of British Columbia, and the University of Alberta
- United States: University of Michigan, University of Texas at Austin, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, and Penn State University
- United Kingdom: University of Loughborough, University of Birmingham, University of Bath, University of Exeter and University of Edinburgh.

On the basis of this review, KPE would be considered in the middle rank of these peer departments. This is largely due to the existing, critical mass of faculty who would compete well with faculty across this group - most notably their Assistant Professor, recently promoted Associate Professors, and a select group of the Professors (including a Canadian Research Chair). In sum, KPE are on a very positive trajectory and our review provides great confidence in their ability to hire and support very strong faculty in the field.

Long Term Planning Recommendations

1. Continue the present trajectory of building faculty through support for research.
2. Expand efforts to recruit the highest quality students at all-levels – with a particular emphasis on improving funding to attract these students.

3. Seek out collaborative efforts with other faculties at the University of Toronto to create unique, research and educational programs.
4. Develop a specific plan to better leverage the co-curricular programs to support education and research, particularly at the undergraduate and the professional masters levels.

Co-curricular Program

Response to Specific Questions:

1. **Consistency of the co-curricular sports and physical activity recreational programs, with the University's mission and Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education academic plans.**

The co-curricular programs are clearly aligned with the University's mission and contribute to the Faculty's academic plans and operational capabilities.

The 1998 mandate to amalgamate the former School of PE, the Department of Athletics and Recreation and the graduate programs in Exercise Science was based on a vision to create a *teaching and learning centre*, in which research, teaching and practice are closely linked to the benefit of both students in the Faculty's degree programs, and other University of Toronto students" (KPE Self-Study pp. 9). The merger resulted in a highly integrated and complex Faculty with variability in the extent to which synergies between the academic and co-curricular programs exist and are mutually beneficial.

We heard that faculty and graduate students benefit from synergies of the combined programs in participant recruitment for exercise-based intervention studies. The MPK program was highlighted as a great example of how 4 new sports clinics were designed by researchers in KPE in exercise programming that served as placement and practicum sites for MPK students. As well, MPARC was described as a research program that created synergies with the Fitness and Performance platform in sport and recreation and provided graduate student experience and support. There was acknowledgement that the more could be done to better leverage the co-curricular program for developing research skills for BKIN students. We heard that the benefit of the combined structure for the co-curricular side is access to faculty who work in physical activity and wellness and in fitness and performance – people are connected to those who do cutting edge research. Further, programs developed in mental training, visualization, nutrition, rest and wellness are now available to the student body – including but not limited to varsity athletes. On balance there is consensus that mutual benefits do exist, albeit relatively limited in scope in both directions.

Our discussions on space availability, facilities management and administrative support highlighted a general view that the academic side derived far more benefit from the integration than did the co-curricular side. Space is at a premium for KPE and while there was general acceptance of the priority of *space use* for the academic side, concern was expressed over the ongoing repurposing of sport and recreation space to academic space despite the needs of the former. Similarly, we heard that the administrative and facilities needs of the academic side of the Faculty take priority over the needs of the co-curricular operations. It is not surprising to see tension on these matters between these two components of the Faculty. At an operational level the enterprise needs of the academic unit contrast with the more entrepreneurial and customer-service demands of the co-curricular unit. The extent to which the Faculty

currently enjoys success and harmony relates to the mutual respect, strong skill sets and communication that exists between the Dean and the Executive Director of Sport and Recreation Services.

We are not in a position to recommend whether the integrated model should remain the model of choice or not, for the University of Toronto and KPE in the long term. It is fair to say that the high level of physical integration is in and of itself a barrier to separation. If the proposed new academic tower on the north end of the Goldring Centre for HPS goes forward and if the Benson building were to be renovated or raised and replaced, the timing would be right for serious consideration of whether the units should remain integrated. A dedicated academic building for Kinesiology is becoming more prevalent in many research-intensive universities where proximities can be purpose built and new shared research laboratories and 21st century teaching spaces can be created.

Much was made of the benefits of having a Dean rather than a Vice-Provost of student services advocate on behalf of sport and recreation. While we see merit in that given the primacy of the academic mission of our universities, this organizational structure, paradoxically buries a university-wide enterprise within a single faculty. This structure inhibits the extent to which a division of sport and recreational services – is seen to be a resource to campus education and programming in the areas of exercise related personal health and wellness. There are many examples in Canada and beyond, of units that have separated with each component becoming demonstrably stronger. We see the recruitment of the right Dean, one whose mandate is to drive research and academic program excellence is made more difficult when overseeing a large and multidimensional co-curricular program is part of the role. Similarly, recruitment to the role of an Executive Director of Sport and Recreation which has only a subset of the responsibility, tools and oversight of what would be expected in comparable positions will also be difficult.

Recommendations on Co-curricular Programs

1. Maximize the relationship between academic undergraduate and professional Master's programs with the co-curricular units through internships, demonstrations laboratories, research and support for performance enhancement.
2. Reconsider the reporting structure of Chief Administrative Officer and the staff support units with respect to the role of the Executive Director of Sport and Recreation.
3. The Provost should determine the utility and viability of the integrated model in the University of Toronto system prior to the change in decanal leadership.