

**Internal Academic Review 2004-2005
School of Physical and Health Education
Internal Academic Review Committee Report to Senate**

School of Physical and Health Education

The School of Physical and Health Education was noted as a program “on the rise” by review team members and external reviewers. Comprised of award winning teachers and scholars, the School’s faculty complement is recognized for its multi-disciplinary research endeavours and for its externally supported, faculty-wide research output. Faculty members participate in several well-recognized research initiatives both within their own discipline such as the Centre for Obesity Research and Education (CORE) and in multi-disciplinary initiatives such as the Human Mobility Research Centre. Equally well regarded by reviewers was the breadth of the School’s programs, which include a focus on humanities, behavioural and physical sciences as well as a new direction on the promotion of health and wellness. Students commented on faculty members’ passion for teaching and research.

A cohesive and collegial multi-dimensional unit, the members of the School of Physical and Health Education, are united in its vision and future direction. Reviewers’ concerns were few and the School has acted quickly to address identified issues such as systematically reviewing curriculum content, objectives and learning outcomes and the appropriate assessment tools for each program.

The Senate Internal Academic Review Committee (IARC) agrees with reviewers that the School has demonstrated excellent adaptability to refine and redefine its programs in response to the changing interests of students and the needs of society. In addition, the IARC praises the unit for its determination to delineate a framework of expectations and assessments for learning objectives and learning outcomes (including laboratory and “hands on” experiences) for each program.

The IARC recommends that the School of Physical and Health Education continue its proactive and self-reflective approach to ensuring excellence in all its academic pursuits.

**Outcomes of the Internal Academic Review
of the School of Physical and Health Education**

*Joint response submitted by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and
the Director of the School of Physical and Health Education*

The faculty, staff and students of the School of Physical and Health Education are very proud of the progress we have made over the past number of years. We have been well served by the strategic planning document we created in 2000. It has guided all our decisions of substance on curricular and staffing matters and continues to do so. The issues and recommendations articulated by the reviewers during the IAR process reflect, in large part, areas that we have been working on in an incremental manner since 2000.

A number of substantive initiatives have been undertaken to insure the School remains on its current trajectory. These initiatives include the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) approval of two new fields of study at the M.A., M.Sc., and Ph.D. levels and a new Ph.D. program. We are in the process of seeking approval for the establishment of two new undergraduate degree programs (pending university approval) and a change to the name of the School. The new programs and the re-branding of the School, will position our graduates to respond to changing professional and societal demands.

Follow-up on the review will take place in the annual budget and staffing strategy meetings between the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Vice-Principal (Academic)

*Internal Academic Review (IAR) Team Report,
School of Physical and Health Education (SPHE)*

Team Membership:

Mr. Alan Grant, Geological Sciences/Geological Engineering, Queen's University
Mrs. Catherine Goodman, Classics, Queen's University
Prof. Gary Kibbins, Film Studies, Queen's University
Dr. Donald H. Maurice, Pharmacology & Toxicology, Queen's University (**Chair**)
Mr. Christopher Langford, Economics, Queen's University
Dr. Sam Shortt, Community Health & Epidemiology, Queen's University,
Dr. Laureen Snider, Sociology, Queen's University

Preamble

During the period July, 2004 - February, 2005, the IAR Team reviewed information contained within,

- A *Self Study* prepared by the School of Physical and Health Education,
- An appraisal submitted by an External Review (ER) Team ER Team (appended).

This IAR Team Report, respectfully submitted, summarizes the results of this analysis, comments on certain strengths and potential weaknesses of the School of Physical and Health Education and attempts to provide guidance for future development of the School within the broader Queen's University community. For clarity and consistency of presentation, the format of our Report is based on the structure of the *Self Study* provided by the School of Physical and Health Education and the External Review Team appraisal.

Curriculum

The External Report highlights, and the IAR Team concurs, that the School of Physical and Health Education offers a broad curriculum that has historically expanded its offering to best accommodate the changing interests of students. Most recently, this approach has led to the establishment in 2004 of a new BA Honours Health Studies program. It is anticipated that this program will increase student enrollment by approximately 100% over 4 years (i.e. from 400 to 800 students). While not explicitly stated in the ER Team report, the IAR Team wishes to comment that the strategy of the School of Physical and Health Education to continue to expand its offering is viewed as a positive sign of the School's "forward-looking" vision.

Based mostly on their interviews of students currently enrolled in degree programs in the School of Physical and Health Education, the ER Team makes six (6) specific recommendations for improvements to the School's curriculum. Based on the IAR Teams analysis of the ER Teams report, and our analysis of the *Self Study*, the IAR Team concurs with these recommendations. However, while agreeing with recommendation #2 of the ER Team Report which states "*The School should examine the CCUPEKA accreditation program for both physical education pre-teaching and kinesiology and determine whether they are germane for the Queen's population of students*" the IAR Team wishes to more formally request that the School **determine** how continued use of the CCUPEKA accreditation programs by other institutions might impact the competitiveness of Queen's Program into the future.

Equity

The ER Team appraisal does not formally assess specific issues concerning Equity questions within the School of Physical and Health Education but does, overall, state that the School has performed well in attempting to ensure that Equity issues are addressed. Based on its analysis of the *Self Study*, the IAR Team concurs with the views expressed by the ER Team and offers the following.

According to the Policy Analyst for the Office of the University Advisor on Equity, a comprehensive review of the equity section of the IAR involves three components:

- (A) How the department addresses the eight equity goals of the University (established in the 1994 Employment Equity Action Plan);
- (B) Relevant questions from USAT and the exit poll; and
- (C) Equity audit.

Based on our analysis of the School of Physical and Health Education the IAR Team feels that the School of Physical and Health Education compares favourably with other units at Queen's in each of these categories. Specifically, while the available documentation does not speak directly to the issue of increasing participation of Aboriginal people in faculty and staff positions, the School does recognize the need to extend postings of available positions beyond

traditional posting sites. In addition, while there is no external data for comparison purposes, the School of Physical and Health Education does exceed the national average for the proportion of female faculty members and, based on student responses (USAT & Exit Poll), instructors in the School of Physical and Health Education are deemed to be doing an excellent job in displaying “sensitivity to the needs and interests of students from diverse groups.”

Two important issues for which little information was available related to a) the proportion of faculty members that are visible minorities or persons with disabilities and b) steps which will be undertaken to improve access to the workplace to persons with disabilities. The IAR Team recommends that these issues be more formally addressed by the School of Physical and Health Education and that this could perhaps be accomplished within the move to their “new” space.

Resources

The ER Team identified that the School of Physical and Health Education has not been immune from the funding shortfalls that have significantly impacted all educational initiatives in Ontario Universities. However, the ER Team viewed the future of the School of Physical and Health Education with optimism based on recent events including Institutional support for strategic hirings as well as the very significant initiative to increase the space available to the School of Physical and Health Education. The ER Team made four (4) recommendations with respect to more effective use of available and securing further resources for the School of Physical and Health Education. While broadly speaking the recommendations were structural, the first recommendation which states in part that “*Resources be allocated to allow for more hands-on and laboratory experiences for the students, at least to the extent required for CCUPEKA accreditation in kinesiology*” builds on our earlier recommendation that the School of Physical and Health Education more formally assess the impact of this accreditation system on their future competitiveness. It is the IAR Team’s opinion that a more formal adoption of the training requirement for this accreditation could have a significant impact on resource allocation.

Faculty

The ER Team highlighted what they referred to as “sign-posts” that they stated were indicative of the high quality of the faculty. These included:

- ✓ The involvement of all professors in the department in research endeavours
- ✓ The attainment of teaching awards by a number of the faculty
- ✓ The awarding of Queen’s National Scholarships to two recent hires
- ✓ The awarding of additional faculty positions to the School despite hiring freezes
- ✓ The appreciation of both teaching and research cross-disciplinary efforts by many individuals within the department

✓ The recognition that the School is a program “on the rise”
Based on our analysis of the materials provided by the School of Physical and Health Education and our reading of the ER Team’s report, we agree that the School’s Faculty complement is indeed one of its strengths. As was the case with the ER Team, the IAR Team was also impressed with the involvement of School of Physical and Health Education Faculty in research (see below). In addition, we concur with the ER Team that the breadth of the Faculty is a significant strength. The ER Team offered one (1) structural recommendation based on their conversations with adjunct members of the unit. It is impossible for the IAR Team to comment further on this recommendation, as we did not meet with members of the unit individually.

Students

Undergraduate: The ER Team report focused extensively on the opinion of the students on the qualities/limitation of the School of Physical and Health Education and not so much on the quality/aptitude of the student body itself. Based on our analysis of the ER Team’s report it is clear that the undergraduates are pleased with their choice to come to Queen’s University and are overall content with the quality of their instruction. Based on our analysis of the information contained within the *Self Study*, it is clear that high demand for admission continues to ensure high quality undergraduate students for the School of Physical and Health Education. Indeed, based on data for the admission period (2002-2004), approximately 1 in 12 applicants was admitted with admitted students securing 2.5% of entrance scholarships, a figure consistent with their representative numbers.

Graduate: As was the case with their analysis of the undergraduate student body, the ER Team focused their attention on the opinion of the students on their choice of Queen’s University, rather than on more objective criteria which could have allowed comparison with graduate students in other units, or in similar units at other Universities. Overall, the ER Team finds that the graduate students are pleased with their training in the School of Physical and Health Education at Queen’s. One problem that is recognized was related to the number of courses available within the unit. The IAR Team concurs that the information provided is consistent with the graduate student body being pleased with their training in the School of Physical and Health Education at Queen’s University and respectfully recommends that further course options be made available to students. Based on the *Self Study*, it is clear that the quality of the entering students is very high. Approximately 20-62% of MA/MSc applicants are admitted while 40-62% of PhD applicants are offered positions. Regrettably, the manner in which the data were presented (in dollar amounts) made it difficult to determine the number of graduate students who were awarded external scholarships such as SSHRC, OGS and NSERC.

Teaching

The ER Team commends the School of Physical and Health Education for broadening its teaching mission away from the traditional “Phys. Ed” teacher to one in which a more holistic and multidisciplinary approach is used. The IAR Team concurs with this analysis. While the ER Team recognized that the lack of laboratory experience was problematic in terms of accreditation in Kinesiology, they indicate that the fact that the student “seemed fairly pleased with the present state of affairs” and “advocate not necessarily more laboratory experiences”, we, the IAR Team, for the reasons listed in previous sections of this report, hope that this issue will be more formally considered. We concur with the ER Team when they conclude that teaching evaluations are good and that the teaching load per faculty member is in keeping with the size of the School of Physical and Health Education. Of course, this “workload” will change when the new programs come on line and we, the IAR Team, recommend that the impact of these changes should be considered by both the School of Physical and Health Education as well as both Faculties affected (Arts & Science and Health Sciences).

Research

The ER Team appraisal highlights that the quality and quantity of scholarship/research of the faculty in the School of Physical and Health Education are excellent. In addition, the ER Team points out that each and every faculty member is actively involved in research/scholarship. The IAR Team concurs with this appraisal and wishes to comment that the quality of the teaching/training in this unit commented on above likely flows from this level of scholarship. The ER Team proposed one structural recommendation.

Concluding Comments

Within the Queen’s University community, the IAR Team concludes that the School of Physical and Health Education is a strong academic unit with very high performance in each of teaching, administration and scholarship/research. Within a broader National and International perspective, the IAR Team, in agreement with the ER Team’s appraisal, concludes that the Queen’s University School of Physical and Health Education is well viewed and respected. In scholarship/research the unit is clearly performing very well.