

Internal Academic Review 2006-2007
School of Rehabilitation Therapy
Internal Academic Review Committee Report to Senate

The Internal Academic Review (IAR) of the School of Rehabilitation Therapy is now complete. The Internal Academic Review Committee (IARC) has taken into consideration all of the submissions related to the IAR of the School of Rehabilitation Therapy and respectfully submits the following report. The IARC Report to Senate is intended to supplement the findings of the attached Review Team Report and to provide a mechanism for the Director of the School and the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences to jointly report on the progress in addressing the Review Team recommendations (please see the “Outcomes” section of this report).

Summary of the Internal Academic Review of the School of Rehabilitation Therapy

The School of Rehabilitation Therapy is a highly respected program at Queen’s University and across Canada, and is to be congratulated for its ability to attract exceptional students and maintain a commitment to excellence in teaching and research during a period of significant transition.

The IARC acknowledges the work that has commenced to develop a strategic plan for the School and agrees with the Review Team’s recommendation to complete the strategic planning process, within the context of the Queen’s Strategic Plan. The IARC further recommends, as part of the planning process, that the Faculty of Health Sciences and the School of Rehabilitation Therapy review their administrative relationship and related financial arrangements.

Since the School has recently introduced an entry-level graduate program model and is under the leadership of a newly appointed Director, the IARC anticipates a future of productive academic innovation and strong leadership. Furthermore, the IARC supports the IAR Team’s recommendation to continue to evaluate and manage the core faculty complement to meet the current academic program requirements and maximize teaching efficiencies in the future.

It is recognized that a fundamental challenge for the School is maintaining and growing the essential clinical field placements for students. The IARC encourages the School to

work in collaboration with the Faculty of Health Sciences to identify methods to support this critical piece of the program mandated by accreditation requirements. The IARC commends the School for its efforts and flexibility to build professional relationships in the field resulting in an increase of clinical field placement opportunities, and the School's ability to leverage funding opportunities in support of this initiative.

The IARC compliments the School and all participants for a thoughtful and constructive Internal Academic Review and supports the School in its future success in implementation of the recommendations put forth in the Internal Academic Review Team report.

Outcomes of the Internal Academic Review of the School of Rehabilitation Therapy

*Joint response submitted by the
Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences and the
Director of the School of Rehabilitation Therapy*

The Internal Academic Review Team highlighted a number of strengths in the School of Rehabilitation Therapy including, highly dedicated faculty committed to excellence in teaching and research; quality of entry-level graduate programs and ability to attract excellent students; well established areas of research strength in Motor Performance and Disability in the Community, which mirror research strengths of faculty; quality of MSc and PhD research graduate programs, which have grown in excess of expectations; demonstrated strength in interdisciplinary research; international recognition of research contributions and potential for future development of the School, both in terms of teaching and research.

The School of Rehabilitation Therapy has taken steps to address many of the recommendations of the Internal Academic Review Team. As suggested in recommendation one, the School is in the process of developing a five-year strategic plan to inform future direction of the School, including priorities for resource allocation.

The faculty recognize the need for ongoing curriculum review and have made changes to streamline curricula in all graduate programs. Course offerings in the Rehabilitation Science programs were reviewed over the past year, resulting in amalgamation of content and an overall reduction in course offerings in the Motor Performance field. The review is continuing and policy being developed regarding enrolments and course offerings. Curricula of both professional programs have undergone continuous review since their inception in 2004, based on feedback from accreditation bodies, faculty, students and the clinical community. The most significant change was the amalgamation of critical

enquiry courses into one course spanning the two-year program. The School of Rehabilitation Therapy will continue to strive for efficiencies in program delivery of the professional programs, while maintaining professional accreditation standards and program excellence.

Steps have been taken to help address the space issues within the School of Rehabilitation Therapy. The application for Renovation and Alteration funding to renovate teaching and student space in the south end of the basement of the Louise D. Acton Building was approved. Renovations are expected to start in May 2008. This will free up space in the north end of the basement for much needed research space. Funding has been requested for the north end renovations.

We concur with the recommendation to immediately implement mechanisms to increase the number of clinical/fieldwork placements for students in the professional programs. Securing a sufficient number of quality fieldwork experiences is a longstanding issue for Rehabilitation Science Programs in Ontario. Funding was received from the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities in 2006/07 to improve the quality of clinical education in Rehabilitation Science Programs. This funding has allowed for capacity building in the clinical community, provision of financial support for preceptors, and student support for travel and accommodation. This has resulted in an increase in placements and students' ability to access placements outside of Kingston. The commitment from government for continuation of this funding on a permanent basis will help address the shortage of clinical placements; however, it does not resolve the lack of capacity for placements, particularly in some areas of clinical practice, in our geographic region.

The Internal Academic Review Team recommended an increase in core faculty and support staff complements to support existing programs in the School of Rehabilitation Therapy and implementation of strategies to protect research time of research-intensive faculty. The staff complement has been increased by 1.0 FTE; incremental graduate student funding related to growth in the professional programs has been allocated to a professional program assistant position, resulting in one assistant for each professional program (previously a shared position). A request has been submitted for base funding for this position.

Increasing core faculty complement or providing protected research time for research-intensive faculty is not achievable given current resources. The School of Rehabilitation Therapy encourages, and its faculty members do apply for external salary support as appropriate. An increase in budget, as recommended by the Internal Academic Review Team, would help to address recommendations related to core faculty complement and protected research time. Similarly, resources are not available to provide a nationally competitive scholarship program for students in the professional programs.

Follow-up on these recommendations and issues will take place during the annual academic planning and budget process between the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences and the Vice-Principal (Academic).

Attachment:

Review Team Report

Internal Academic Review

**School of Rehabilitation Therapy
Queen's University**

Report from the Internal Academic Review Team

Date of Review Submission: April 9, 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: IAR TEAM REPORT FOR REVIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF REHABILITATION THERAPY

Attached is the full document prepared by the Internal Academic Review (IAR) Team corresponding to review of the School of Rehabilitation Therapy at Queen's University. During the review process, a number of significant strengths of the School were identified:

- faculty are highly dedicated and committed to excellence in teaching and research;
- the recently-introduced entry-level graduate programs are of high quality, and attract excellent students;
- the recently-established Ph.D. program in Rehabilitation Science as well as the research M.Sc. program are growing well in excess of expectations;
- there are well-established areas of research strength in the areas of motor control and disability that mirror the research strengths of the faculty and that can form the basis of future growth of the research enterprise;
- there is demonstrated strength in interdisciplinary research evidenced by ongoing collaborative research with academic departments and units resulting in joint grant funding and co-supervision of students;
- there is some international recognition of research contributions;
- there is a high potential for future development of the School in both research and teaching;
- the School is well-respected both within the Queen's community and in Canada.

Despite the numerous strengths, there are some areas of concern that should be addressed by the Senate IAR Committee:

- i) There is a current lack of a strategic plan for the School which is needed, for example, to develop a staffing strategy and to identify areas of focus within the School.
- ii) The budget for the unit is inadequate. It appears that insufficient resources (faculty, support staff, space) are in place to support the plethora of graduate level programs currently offered within the school. Additionally, the budget process lacks sufficient transparency; this makes long-term planning difficult.

The IAR Team has made the following recommendations for the School which should be considered by the Senate IAR Committee.

1. Develop of a strategic plan as soon as possible which will, in turn, inform faculty hiring, staffing complement (i.e., adjunct versus tenure-track) and program delivery over the next 5 years;
2. Increase the budget for the School and make the budget process more transparent;
3. Increase the number of core faculty to support the existing academic programs;
4. Increase the number of support staff by 1.5 FTE to reflect the size of the graduate programs;
5. Implement a nationally-competitive scholarship program for students in the professional programs;
6. Evaluate methods of program delivery: the School should attempt to streamline the curriculum where possible to reduce contact hours. Additionally, consideration should be given to the removal of the Stream 2 programs for OT and PT if the workloads for individual faculty prove to be too onerous;
7. Implement better mechanisms for protecting the research time of research-intensive faculty. Efforts such as this would help the School to continue expansion of its research mandate by capitalizing on existing strengths in this area;
8. Immediately implement mechanisms to increase the number of clinical/fieldwork positions;
9. Resolve space needs for the School as soon as possible. The renovation of the basement of the Louise D. Acton Building for Community Research should be prioritized, as should be much-needed office renovations in that building. Plans for the development of new space should be included as part of the School's strategic planning exercise.

I. Queen's University Internal Review Team: Composition, Source Materials, and Meeting Schedule

The internal review team for the review of the School of Rehabilitation Therapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, Queen's University was as follows:

Dr. Marlys L. Koschinsky – Chair (Department of Biochemistry)
Dean Tom Harris (Faculty of Applied Science)
Dr. John Kirby (Faculty of Education, Psychology)
Dr. Marianne Lamb (School of Nursing)
Ms. Michelle Dickinson (Department of Anatomy & Cell Biology)
Mr. Dany MacDonald (Department of Kinesiology & Health Studies)
Ms. Diane Reid (Faculty of Arts & Science)

The information for this report has been collated from the following sources: the Unit Self-Study document produced by the School of Rehabilitation Therapy, interviews with both the external consultants Ken Ottenbaucher - University of Texas and Maureen Simmons – McGill University on November 16, 2006 and Dr. Elsie Culham, the newly-appointed Director of the School on February 22, 2007, and from the external consultants' assessment which was made available to the Review Team on February 1, 2007. The review team met throughout the process in order to discuss how to approach the review task in general, and the format for the interviews with the consultants and the Director. The report reflects all of these sources of information and has been endorsed by the entire Review Committee team.

II. Overview of the School of Rehabilitation Therapy

A. Core Faculty Complement (19)

Faculty fall into 4 categories as follows; numbers in each category are indicated in brackets:

1. Tenured or tenure-track core faculty members whose involvement in the graduate program is solely within the School of Rehabilitation Therapy-related graduate programs. Membership in the graduate program, not the home unit, defines faculty in this category (5): Lysaght, McLean, Pelland, Pentland, Aiken;
2. Non-tenure-track core faculty members whose involvement in the graduate program is exclusively in the School graduate programs (4): Tata, Hopkins-Rosseel, O'Connor, Villeneuve;
3. Tenured or tenure-track core faculty members involved in teaching and/or supervision in other graduate programs in addition to being a core member of the School's graduate programs (9): Brouwer, Culham, Jamieson, King-VanVlack, Krupa, McColl, Norman, Paterson, Olney

4. Non-tenure-track core faculty members involved in teaching and/or supervision in other graduate program(s) in addition to being a core member of the School's graduate programs;
5. Other core faculty which may include emeritus professors with supervisory privileges; persons from outside appointed as adjunct professors (1): Peat.

The research interests of the faculty are relatively equally distributed across the fields of motor performance and disability in the community.

Since 1999, there have been no retirements of core faculty. Three new faculty positions were created in response to the need generated by the launch of five new programs in the School: the Rehabilitation Ph.D. program in fall 2000, Stream II MSc (OT), (PT) (2003) and Stream I MSc (OT), (PT) in 2004; the net result of changes in faculty since 1998 is an increase of three core faculty members.

The number of cross-appointed faculty increased from 6 senior faculty members in 1999 to the current number of 8. These cross-appointees hold primary appointments in affiliated departments and contribute to the graduate program and in some cases supervise students enrolled in the program.

The faculty complement (adjusted for enrolment) is the lowest of the three comparable programs in Ontario. Although the current faculty complement is adequate to meet current needs there is no reserve for unforeseen events such as leaves of absence, reduced periods of responsibility, or protected time to facilitate the receipt by faculty of large funded research projects.

B. Degree Programs

There are four programs in the School of Rehabilitation Therapy, all of which are at the **graduate level**. There are two-year masters professional programs in Occupational Therapy, leading to the degree of MSc (OT) and in Physical Therapy leading to the degree of MSc (PT), each being the entry-level degree to practice (Stream 1). Additionally, students holding baccalaureate degrees in Occupational Therapy or Physical Therapy may complete requirements for the master's degree in one year (i.e., Stream 2). Additionally, the School offers M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in Rehabilitation Science. Two streams are offered: Human Motor Performance and Disability in the Community, which reflect areas of research strength in the School. It appears that all programs are operating at capacity; any previous concerns regarding a lack of critical mass of doctoral students have been abrogated by the impressive enrolment numbers in this program.

At the time of preparation of the Self-Study document, **the total steady-state enrolment estimate for all programs was 214** (90 MSc(OT), 90 MSc(PT), and 34 MSc and Ph.D. Rehabilitation Science).

The student to faculty ratios has increased by 39.4 % (and the weighted ratio by 76.7%). This corresponds to the highest five-year average in the Faculty. The ratios should decrease, however, with the graduation of the double-cohort class in May 2006 which contained the last baccalaureate class.

Distinctive Aspects of the Programs

The **doctoral program in Rehabilitation Science** has attracted many high quality students. Both masters and doctoral programs stress the multidisciplinary nature of Rehabilitation Science. The students in these programs have the opportunity to see the relationship between the distinct fields of Motor Performance and Disability in the Community; this approach is unique to the Queen's program. Two major initiatives [Queen's University Inter-Professional Patient-Centered Education Direction (QUIPPED)], and the Integrated Rehabilitation Science laboratory for the evaluation, enhancement and restoration of human mobility and function have helped to advance both research fields, and many faculty are involved in one or both projects.

The **MSc (OT) program** embraces a number of innovative features including access to the Glaxo-Wellcome Clinical Education Centre, the focus on community development which is an emerging area of importance in OT, the involvement of healthcare consumers in the design and delivery of the curriculum, the sharing of resources with the PT program, OT 898 critical inquiry research projects, and the opportunity for interdisciplinary research in the Faculty of Health Sciences. The **MSc (PT) program** also is to be commended for unique aspects of the program including: the acceptance of students from across Canada, access to the Glaxo-Wellcome Clinical Education Centre, access to a state-of-the art motor performance laboratory, the presence of strong linkages between the Motor Performance Group within the School and the Human Mobility Research Centre, and the Physical Therapy Clinic in the School which provides clinical education and cohesiveness in the Program.

Although the quality of students in the programs is excellent, efforts should be made to continue to entice top-quality students through aggressive marketing of the programs, as well as the creation of nationally-competitive entry-level scholarships for OT and PT programs. Additionally, there are concerns with respect to finding fieldwork/clinical placements which could jeopardize the attraction of quality students to the School.

C. Teaching

The teaching capacity of the school is 19 members who fall into the following categories:

1. Tenure-track/tenured without significant administrative responsibilities (11 members): 4.0 teaching workload units (TWU) per member (40% time), where a lecture or course worth 0.5 credit without a lab component is worth 1.0 TWU and a 0.5 credit course with a major laboratory component is worth 1.4 TWU;

2. Tenure-track/tenured with significant administrative responsibilities (4 members): 2.7 TWU (25% time);
3. Continuing/renewable adjunct without clinical fieldwork coordination responsibilities (2 members): 7.0 TWU per member (70% time);
4. Continuing/renewable adjunct with clinical fieldwork coordination responsibilities (2 members): 5.50 (55% time).

The MScOT and MScPT programs correspond to 24.6 and 24.9 TWU respectively, not counting critical enquiry streams in each program. The MSc/PhD programs in Rehabilitation Science correspond to 13.30 TWUs.

In this workload distribution, the maximum amount of time available for scholarship is 40%, which is low especially for members holding research funding with significant graduate student supervisory duties and high teaching loads. Furthermore, there are no provisions for reductions in teaching capacity related to unscheduled leaves of absence, secondments, etc. Clearly, the existing faculty must operate in an extremely efficient and effective manner to deliver the teaching required to support the programs. The workload should be re-evaluated now that steady-state has been achieved in the School with respect to the course-offerings: is the current faculty complement adequate to deliver the programs and produce high quality research? Curriculum delivery should be examined critically to determine if any streamlining is possible to provide some reductions in teaching in the absence of the creation of new faculty positions.

D. Research

As outlined above, there are two areas of ongoing research in the School:

1. *Motor Performance*
2. *Disability in the Community*

Researchers in the Motor Performance area are focused on research directed at the evaluation, enhancement and restoration of human mobility and physical function. The Motor Performance Laboratory reflects a state-of-the-art multi-user facility that has been funded by CFI funding. The Disability in the Community research focus is centered on the description, explanation and prediction of mental and physical disability and handicap relative to individuals, communities and societies, including the evaluation of community-based interventions.

Since 1999, the level of research funding in the School has grown by approximately 30%. This reflects the School's research mandate and reflects the capacity of the School to continue to grow in this area. Particularly large growth has been seen in the Motor Performance research area, with funding from Heart and Stroke Foundation, CIHR, as well other sources such as CFI, OIT, and the Ministry of Health. Growth in research within the Disability in the Community field has increased almost 1.2 times since 1999, and reflects growth in core faculty members who

receive support from agencies such as the Ontario Neurotrauma Foundation, SSHRC, and Health Canada.

Across faculty and years, the average number of articles published was just over 2 per year. For this discipline this is considered to be a good level of productivity, particularly for faculty who shoulder relatively large teaching loads. This productivity reflects contributions by a relatively small number of senior investigators; care must be given to ensure that junior faculty receives appropriate mentorship to establish a solid research focus. Additionally, the protection of time for faculty holding peer-reviewed funding would be desirable so that the investigators can remain competitive for future funding.

E. Service Contributions

Many faculty contribute to the academic community outside of Queen's, in the capacity, for example, of editors, members of editorial advisory boards and members of peer-review committees. Additionally, the majority of faculty review grants and manuscripts and some have been invited to serve as external consultants for other programs.

Faculty members from the School also contribute to professional communities and many assume leadership responsibilities both in provincial as well as national capacities. Some faculty have also made contributions to the development of physical therapy curricula and graduate programs in other countries.

At the local level, individual members of the faculty have made important contributions; these include the development of a community-based programs and fund-raising for community groups.

There is a general concern that workloads are increasing with respect to service/administrative tasks which reduce the time available for scholarship. For example, ACCE (academic coordinator of clinical education) for the OT and PT programs is under-budgeted with respect to time commitment required.

F. Budget Allocation and Accountability

The School has a structural budget deficit that was handled in the past by the use of the School's contingency funding. Currently, the budget issue is under review by the University (VP Academic's mandate) and a resolution is expected through the implementation of a University-wide budget model under current discussion.

The School receives a budget allocated annually by the office of the VP (Academic). The Director of the School has direct responsibility for budget allocation in consultation with the Chairs of the three Programs in the School. **There is currently no strategic plan available, the development of which will assist in the budgetary planning and clearly identifying the needs of the School in the coming years.**

In the current budget allocation model, it appears that a **disproportionate fraction of the BIU income plus tuition fees flows back to the School (approximately 35%). This distribution makes it very difficult to justify tuition increases to students.**

III. Strengths of the School

During the review process, a number of significant strengths of the School were identified for which the unit should be commended. Although many of these were identified in the External Consultants' Report, the Committee felt that reiteration of these was merited in the context of this report. These are itemized below:

- faculty are highly dedicated and committed to excellence in teaching and research;
- the recently-introduced entry-level graduate programs are of high quality, and attract excellent students;
- the recently-established Ph.D. program in Rehabilitation Science as well as the research M.Sc. program are growing well in excess of expectations;
- there are well-established areas of research strength in the areas of motor control and disability that mirror the research strengths of the faculty;
- there is demonstrated strength in interdisciplinary research evidenced by ongoing collaborative research with academic departments and units resulting in joint grant funding and co-supervision of students; there is some recognition of research contributions at the international level;
- there is a high degree of potential for future development of the School both in research and teaching;
- the School of Rehabilitation is well-respected both within the Queen's community and in Canada.

The Committee wants to also recognize the tremendous dedication of faculty and staff that was very evident during the past years when the School transitioned from an entry level program to a second entry program for the OT and PT programs.

IV. Areas Requiring Attention

Despite the numerous strengths, there are some areas of concern that should be addressed by the Internal Academic Review Committee. These areas are expanded upon below.

1. *Strategic Planning and Visioning*

Clearly the School has been in a period of major transition over the past 5 years due to the shift to graduate entry-level programs. This has corresponded to a tremendous amount of work and effort in the sheer volumes of documentation that have been required to introduce these new programs. As such, there appears to have been little opportunity to plan beyond this task. Additionally, the past year has seen some instability in the School associated with the search for a new Director. **This issue has now been solved with the internal appointment of Dr. Elsie Culham to this position.** The sense is that the School is poised to enter a period of relative stability that will **promote much needed forward-thinking, visioning exercises, and an enhanced research focus.** In this regards, Dr. Culham is committed to undergoing a strategic planning exercise within the next 6 months.

2. *The Budget*

A consistent theme echoed in all aspects of the review process is that the budget for the School of Rehabilitation therapy is inadequate. It appears that insufficient resources are in place to offer the plethora of graduate-level programs that are currently offered within the School. This results in high workloads for faculty, and a very high student/faculty ratio in programs, both of which are problematic. There is some sense that "burn-out" might be occurring within the Faculty due to the high demands on their time. It is difficult for the School to deal with unexpected leaves of absence and the several seconded positions that currently exist in the School. Additionally, the sense that the system is pushed to capacity does not allow for the protection of time (through major reductions in teaching workloads) for research-intensive faculty members. This is unfortunate, since there is clearly potential in the School to grow the research portfolio significantly in the coming years. The budgetary situation raises the question of whether or not the programs currently offered by the School are sustainable at the current level of funding. This is somewhat disappointing, since the University supported the creation of each of the new programs which are judged to be of excellent quality and they are all operating at capacity with respect to enrolment.

3. *Available Resources*

Space: In addition to the space available in the Louise D. Acton, there is investigator-negotiated research laboratory space elsewhere, both on (ex. Cataraqui Building, KGH, Botterell Hall) and off campus. However, the space in which the School is housed has been deemed by an external accreditation agency as being one of the worst in Canada. The office space which is housed entirely in Louise D. Acton is also inadequate to support the administrative activities of the programs.

Support Staff: There does not appear to be adequate support staff for the size of the OT and PT programs. Currently there is 1 FTE who is responsible to the two program Chairs. Given the large volume of each of these programs it is not unreasonable to suggest a full-time program secretary for each program Chair. Additionally the Graduate/Research Assistant is currently devoting 50% time to day-to-day management of the graduate program in Rehabilitation

Science: this could easily be expanded to 100% time given the rapid expansion of the PhD program.

V. Evaluation of External Consultants' Report by the Review Team

Overall, the review team agreed with the majority of points raised by the external consultants. As was the case for the review team, the consultants identified a number of important areas of strength in the School. However, this was tempered by a number of areas of weakness noted by the consultants. The review team is in agreement with some of the issues raised, including the lack of a strategic plan, concerns around the budget including the annual financial deficit, lack of transparency and clarity in the budgetary process and resource limitations (space constraints as well as limited clinical placements); additional concerns were raised with respect to the stress that Faculty and Staff have endured during the development and implementation of master's entry level programs and the PhD program and a sense that the multiple Programs offered by the School may not be sustainable with the current resources available. The IAR team also agreed that the School may want to reconsider offering Stream 2 programs in PT and OT if new resources are not made available to support the other programs.

The Internal Academic Review Team did not agree with the consultants that Faculty lack creative problem solving abilities and that they are incapable of moving existing Programs to the next level of excellence. In fact, the Review Team perceived that a major strength of the School is the dedication, commitment and enthusiasm of the faculty for the School. Additionally, the Internal Academic Review team did not support the recommendation by the consultants to recruit a new Director for the school from outside Queen's and potentially from outside the discipline. The search for the Director was conducted completely in keeping with Queen's policies with respect to search committee composition. A comprehensive search for the director considered both internal and external candidates. The IAR review team was impressed with their interview of Dr. Culham and her responses to their questions. Based on the interview with Dr. Culham, a number of concerns raised by the external consultants were addressed; these include the re-evaluation and streamlining of the MSc entry level curriculum, which is apparently underway, as well as better utilization of existing space, for which creative plans to maximize space utilization in the LDA building are in place. Additionally, Dr. Culham indicated that the strategic planning process in the School would be initiated within the next 6 months.

VI. Final Recommendations

Based on the information contained in this report, the internal review team feels that the following recommendations for the School of Rehabilitation Therapy should be considered by the Senate Internal Academic Review Committee:

1. Develop a strategic plan: the School needs to undergo a strategic planning exercise as soon as possible which will, in turn, inform faculty hiring, staffing complement (i.e., adjunct versus tenure-track) and program delivery over the next 5 years;

2. Increase the budget for the School of Rehabilitation Therapy and make the budget process more transparent. This could be achieved by increasing the percentage of BIU plus tuition revenues that are directed to the School;
3. Increase the number of core faculty to support the existing academic programs. Although a commitment has been made to retain 19 core faculty members (i.e., permission has been given to fill vacancies), this number may not be adequate to deliver the accredited programs and ensure that the programs of research and graduate studies can achieve the expected level of excellence;
4. Increase the number of support staff by 1.5 FTE to reflect the size of the graduate programs;
5. Implement a nationally-competitive scholarship program for students in the professional programs. This would help to attract even better students to the program (currently the very top students are choosing programs at McMaster or the University of Toronto);
6. Evaluate methods of program delivery: the School should attempt to streamline the curriculum where possible to reduce contact hours. Additionally, consideration should be given to the removal of the stream 2 programs for OT and PT if the workloads for individual faculty prove to be too onerous;
7. Implement better mechanisms for protecting the research time of research-intensive faculty (i.e., those holding external sources of grant funding, for example). Efforts such as this would help the School of Rehabilitation Therapy to continue to expand its research mandate by capitalizing on existing strengths in this area;
8. Immediately implement mechanisms to increase the number of clinical/fieldwork positions to assist in the continued attraction of high quality students to the program;
9. Resolve space needs as soon as possible. The renovation of the basement of the Louise D. Acton Building for Community Research should be prioritized, as well as much-needed office renovations in that building. Plans for the development of new space should be included as part of the School's strategic planning exercise.