

Minutes of the Faculty Council
Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education
December 2, 2013, 4:10p.m.
Margaret Eaton Board Room (Benson 302)

Present: Jack Goodman (Chair), Carla Hagstrom, Paula Paunic, Leah Sheriff, Kimberley Chau, Catherine Amara, Caroline Fusco, Gretchen Kerr, Ashley Stirling, Marius Locke, Ira Jacobs, David DiFonzo, Anthony O' Brien, Kwame Sarpong, Sara Iaboni, Daniel Moore, Peter Donnelly, Danielle Bentley, Katherine Tamminen, George Mammen, Kelly Arbour-Nicitopoulos, Tim Welsh, Scott Thomas, Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Karen McLeister

Regrets: Margaret MacNeill, Luc Tremblay, Guy Faulkner, Anita Comella

Guests: Robin Campbell

Secretariat: Zarine Ahmed

1) Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m.

2) Approval of Agenda

The agenda as circulated was approved. (**Motion:** Locke/DiFonzo)

3) Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the October 7, 2013 meeting were reviewed and approved with the additional note that Dean Jacobs was present and participated by teleconference. (**Motion:** Kerr/Locke)

4) Committee Reports

a) Executive Committee – I. Jacobs

Dean Jacobs announced that the Executive Committee met once since the last Faculty Council meeting in accordance with a request by Faculty Council at the meeting of October 7th to review wording of revised athletic financial award proposals. The Executive Committee met with the Advancement staff and the Executive Director of Advancement to review the proposals and endorsed a motion on behalf of Faculty Council to approve the amended wording. The motion will be appended to these minutes.

b) Undergraduate Examinations – L. Mainwaring

Lynda Mainwaring reported the Examinations Committee meets weekly and the full committee meets monthly. The committee is working on a project to examine grade review procedures for the Faculty and will provide a report at the next meeting.

c) Undergraduate Curriculum – G. Kerr & C. Amara

Catherine Amara reported that, with termination of the CTEP program, there is reduced demand for the BPHE degree resulting in a need for the committee to review the BKIN degree with a primary focus on revisions to the 3rd and 4th year requirements. The committee intends to bring recommendations to the Professoriate for discussion in January. Dean Jacobs recommended that entrance requirements also be considered.

Tim Welsh asked whether, in light of changes to the education program and the recent establishment of the College of Kinesiologists of Ontario (CKO), CCUPEKA requirements would continue to be a source of guidance for our curriculum. Catherine Amara commented that the CCUPEKA issue was discussed in regard to the current required Adapted Physical Activity course which in the past has been a required course for CCUPEKA accreditation of our degree programs. The committee felt that the Adapted Physical Activity course should remain in the curriculum even if it was not an accreditation CCUPEKA. Dean Ira Jacobs advised Council that CCUPEKA is the Canadian Council of University Physical Education and Kinesiology

Administrators. It provides a quality control mechanism that institutional representatives have agreed would represent a minimum requirement to receive the CCUPEKA accreditation for either a BPHE or a BKIN degree; two different certification processes. The CCUPEKA accreditations currently have no other legal or regulatory force in any jurisdiction. The degree accreditation by CCUPEKA has been used as a recruitment tool of prospective students by those universities that have the accreditation. Catherine Amara noted that the committee has debated the value of the CCUPEKA accreditation and its role as a strong recruitment tool as it may not be well-known outside of the academic community. Peter Donnelly asked if the BPHE degree or BPHE CCUPEKA accreditation will be dropped. Catherine Amara responded that our degree will continue to satisfy this accreditation as these requirements are met in the first two years and with required senior level courses that will remain unchanged. Gretchen Kerr concluded the discussion noting that the committee has considered the requirements of external organizations such as CKO and CCUPEKA but that the starting point is consideration of what would make sense for the best preparation of our students.

d) Undergraduate Admissions – M. MacNeill

Vice-Dean, Gretchen Kerr reported on behalf of Margaret MacNeill that our November count includes 256 full-time students and 2 part-time students enrolled. She congratulated the Admissions Committee for coming so close to the admission target of 250 full-time students. Since the last Faculty Council meeting, Fall Campus Day was held in October with over 200 participants attending each of our KPE information sessions. The committee is now planning for March Break events.

e) Graduate Committee – M. Locke

Marius Locke reported that the Graduate Committee is considering a number of items including recruitment of future graduate students and how to improve our ability to get the best PhD and Masters students; scholarship reviews; and, future graduate funding models. One item that remained outstanding from last year was consideration of the comprehensive examinations process for PhD students.

Alternate methods for comprehensive examinations have been considered that will assure that students have knowledge broad enough that they could teach at the undergraduate level and have a broader base of knowledge in their area of PhD studies than just the specific area of their PhD research. In preparation for the comprehensive examinations, the PhD supervisory committee identifies 3 areas of knowledge and reading lists are provided to the student after approval of the lists by the graduate department. Once the reading lists are approved, the student has 3 to 4 months to complete the readings at which time the written and then the oral comprehensive examinations should occur. The committee recommended significant changes to the current comprehensive examination process. A key proposed change is that the current written portion of the comprehensive examination would become a take-home exam consisting of 3 questions based on the 3 reading lists, with the understanding that the topic of research design and statistics would be embedded within one or more of the 3 questions; the student will have 10 days to complete and submit the written take-home exam. After the student returns the written examination, the examiners will be expected to evaluate the answers within 72 hours and report either a pass or fail result for each of the three questions. If the student passes all 3 questions, they may then proceed to the oral phase of the comprehensive examination which must occur within 6 days of receiving the assessment results. A failing grade assigned to the responses of any one of the 3 questions will automatically result in asking the student to withdraw from the PhD program and the oral exam will be cancelled. Note there is a chance to appeal with legitimate grounds. The oral examination may involve an assessment of oral responses of the student to the examiners' questions derived from the reading list, further probing of the student's responses to the written exam questions, or any other area of inquiry deemed relevant to the student's area of scholarship. If the student passes the oral comprehensive examination then they become a PhD candidate (PhD Cand). If a student fails the oral examination, they are then asked to withdraw from the program. On behalf of the committee, Marius proposed a motion for this process, outlined in general terms above, to be endorsed by Faculty Council as our procedure for PhD comprehensive examinations and that this new process be

forwarded for approval by any other relevant bodies, such as the School of Graduate Studies, and implemented effective immediately. (Motion: **Locke/Amara**)

Caroline Fusco commented that, in the past, PhD students were assigned a grade for each question on the written comprehensive examination and that she thought that remedial work was possible for questions that were not satisfactorily answered. Others commented that in the past there was no allowance for remedial work, but that the written comprehensive examination could be re-written one more time if failed the first time. Caroline Fusco asked what happens if a student does well on two and does not do well on one question. Marius Locke commented that the committee can decide whether they move forward to the oral or not.

Peter Donnelly commented that it was his understanding that given the different disciplinary cultures, when these guidelines were being developed this requirement was a minimum and the graduate committees could ask for more from students, particularly in terms of the reading lists and the estimated time required to complete the readings. Scott Thomas clarified that the result of the committee deliberations was this was not considered as a minimum and that it was not the committee's view that there would be scope for differences in the application of the comprehensive examination process. Scott added that this change was in part motivated by a lot of concerns voiced about inequities between areas in the process. He continued by stating that it would be inequitable to have some students doing 8 months of preparation for their comprehensives and only then starting on their dissertation research work while others can do so much earlier. Dean Jacobs commented that the total duration of a PhD program is a very important factor affecting many operational aspects of our graduate program and it is therefore important that expectations be transparent and defined. He further explained that the commitment of the university to fund a graduate student ends after a specified period of time.

Dean Jacobs noted that the major conceptual difference, other than the fact that it is a take home exam and gives more time for thought, is that there is no rewrite after the written question as there previously had been an option for a second written examination. This change will mean that the student has to withdraw from the program if they failed the written exam or go through an appeal. He asked about the rationale for this change. Gretchen added that the thinking was that considering that a student will have 3-4 months to prepare and 2 weeks to write the answers, if a student cannot write a passing response to the questions in that period of time then that is an important indicator of future success in the program.

Ashley Stirling asked if the "3 areas of knowledge" is a change and Kelly Arbour-Nicitopoulos confirmed that it is. Gretchen added that the methods question remains required, although it can and likely should be embedded within one or more of the 3 questions, and confirmed that the proposal entails a reduction in areas of focus from 4 to 3. Peter commented that the equity issue does not apply because our students do not have to compete against the lab science students on the job market. We have to train our students to compete with those from social cultural areas at other universities rather than looking for equity within our own program and that is why he supported establishing a "minimum" which would serve as a reference point for supervisors. Scott responded that we still need to be concerned about equity because graduate students will have grounds for appeal against the university if the approaches are different across the areas and they have not been treated in the same manner as other students going through the same process.

Caroline commented that students coming into the program will know that the requirements are going to be different across our areas. In addition, with regards to equity, the reading that we may assign may not actually be able to be completed in 3 to 4 months so, if the reading has to be reduced, it would not give them the comprehensive in-depth knowledge required to compete with other students. Scott confirmed that this was already a movement from 3 months for everybody to 3 to 4 months for preparation. Students have to compete with others for positions based on the record of what they achieve during their doctoral program and achieving success on a doctoral exam is not something that most hiring committees will take into

account. Jack Goodman asked whether last year's committee discussion on this issue was voted on and agreed to and Scott confirmed that it had been.

Lynda Mainwaring asked for clarification on the methods question as it was not clear where the methodology is included and there is concern about equity on this issue. Marius advised that there used to be four questions with one being a methods question however now methods is incorporated into the three questions. Lynda requested that this be clearly indicated in the documentation. Marius highlighted that this issue had been already approved by the Graduate Committee.

Tim Welsh added that, although the comprehensive exam process is very important, it is one part of the program and there are a lot of other opportunities for the student to learn throughout their academic program. Jack commented that there was very extensive discussion last year in the Graduate Committee and what is being proposed is a compromise and that this issue is not a policy matter but rather a curricular issue in the graduate program.

Dean Jacobs commented that the nature of this is something that needs to be discussed fully as there is no other forum to discuss these things that end up being translated into academic policy and guidelines. He suggested a friendly amendment to note that the 3 written questions include one or more questions that address research methodology. He also noted that he heard disagreements about the duration part in terms of the readings but did not hear many other disagreements to what is before us. The duration is important as we have a PhD program that was designed to be completed in the normal course of events within a certain duration and there are lots of reasons for that and to extend it beyond that is a very significant difference both for the student and for the exercise program.

George Mammen commented that, as a graduate student, he is content with the change as it would be less stressful for the student, but there may be the need to solve some minor problems. Marius confirmed again that, as this is a minimum guideline more can be assigned and can be modified accordingly however there are certain requirements that need to be completed within a certain amount of time in order to meet candidacy. If a student fails to do so, they will be removed from the program by the School of Graduate Studies.

Jack asked Marius if it would be appropriate to think of this as guidelines rather than prescriptive so that it offers scope for some variation across areas. Marius responded that it would be a discussion between the student and the committee.

A vote was held to accept the proposed changes to the comprehensive PhD examination process as presented by Marius. The motion was passed.

f) Research Committee – G. Faulkner

Scott Thomas, on behalf of Guy Faulkner, reported that the Research Committee met and reviewed internal grant applications and the results will be announced in the next 2 to 3 weeks. The Symposium on Extreme Physiology is taking place tomorrow (December 3) at 6pm with 440 attendees registered. The committee has established a grant library for researchers to access successful grants to use as a resource in developing their own submissions.

g) Council of Athletics & Recreation – A. Comella

Leah Sheriff reported on behalf of Anita Comella, that the committee has now held their third meeting where there were briefings on the proposed revisions to the intercollegiate sport model as a result of the Sport Model Review, and the construction schedules for the Goldring Centre and Back Campus projects. Recent elections have filled most of the positions however the committee is still looking to fill a faculty position. Anthony O'Brien asked if the faculty position is to be outside of the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical

Education. Dean Jacobs confirmed that the intent was to bring on an external faculty member as there already is a KPE staff member representative who is also a faculty member.

h) Equity Committee – G. Kerr

Gretchen Kerr reported that, as the first meeting for this committee is scheduled in January, there is no report at this time.

i) Awards Committee – J. Goodman

Robin Campbell reported that there are 4 new awards which were reviewed and recommended for approval by the Awards Committee: the Dalt White Football Award of Merit, the Zoltan Tenke Track and Field Award of Merit, the Warren Goldring Fellowship as well as a name change of the R. Tait McKenzie Admission Scholarship to the Wenda Kwong Entrance Scholarship. **Motion** (Campbell/DiFonzo) All in favour.

Peter Donnelly asked about the number of needs-based awards for athletics. Robin responded that there are about 160 awards available. The needs-based awards were primarily created in the 1990s and we have not received many new ones in the past few years. We had about 100 students apply last year and we were able to give financial assistance to over 40 students. We had a recent internal audit from the university that highlighted the need to give out all available monies. The committee makes a concerted effort to make sure that all funds are provided to students.

j) Restricted Funds Committee – R. Campbell

Robin Campbell reported that the midterm report for the committee is almost complete and he will provide more information on restricted funds at the next Faculty Council Meeting. He noted that the annual advancement activities of the Faculty are on track to reach to \$2 million by end of the fiscal year.

k) Sponsorship Committee – R. Campbell

Robin Campbell reported that the committee is scheduled to meet in mid-January. They are on target to raise \$600,000 from all areas of sponsorship in the current fiscal year.

5) Centres' Reports

a) Centre for Sport Policy Studies – P. Donnelly

No report

b) Centre for Motor Control – T. Welsh

Tim Welsh reported there was a first presentation at a conference this fall and goals for next year are to improve membership and to obtain funds for students at the centre.

6) Deans' Reports

a) Dean – I. Jacobs

Dean Ira Jacobs reported that after the Faculty Council's endorsement of the new Academic Plan at the October 7th Faculty Council meeting, the plan was then presented at Governing Council's Planning and Budget Committee, University Affairs Board, and Academic Board. The plan received positive feedback at all three levels of university governance and heightened awareness of our dual mandate and the integration of our curricular and co-curricular programs. Dean Jacobs thanked everybody involved with the Academic Plan and noted that we are moving to the implementation phase with several committees being formed to prioritize the Plan's initiatives. Dean Jacobs commented that the Sport Model Review discussed at CAR, including how sport is delivered at the University of Toronto, is one of the items in the Academic Plan. He also recognized a significant accomplishment in receiving our first allocation of a Canada Research Chair which represents the recognition of the impact and future impact of our research. A notice will be issued before the end of term seeking applications for our Canada Research Chair.

Dean Jacobs also mentioned that Cathie Kessler is a new member of faculty in the role of Undergraduate Teaching Lab Coordinator.

b) Vice-Dean, Academic – G. Kerr

Gretchen Kerr reported that most of her items were already addressed by the various standing committees. She noted that at this year's November convocations 15 undergraduate students graduated with BPHE (6 students) and BKin (9 students) degrees along with a record number of 15 graduate students.

c) Associate Dean, Research Program – S. Thomas

Scott Thomas informed that his items were already covered.

d) Assistant Dean, Co-curricular Physical Activity & Sport – A. Comella

Dean Ira Jacobs, on behalf of Anita Comella, thanked the CAR co-chairs for volunteering their time to be engaged in such significant work this year. He had attended the recent CAR meeting and reported that it was well-attended with fulsome discussions on a variety of issues. The Varsity Blues Achievement Awards is taking place December 2nd and there is an upcoming banner raising ceremony for water polo, golf and tennis teams who have won OUA Championships. He highlighted the staff on Michelle Brownrigg's team and noted that the MoveU Campaign has achieved a great deal of momentum in promoting physical activity opportunities across the University.

e) Chief Administrative Officer – R. Lopers-Sweetman

No report

7) Student Governments' Reports

a) KPEUA – A. O'Brien

Anthony O'Brien reported on the recent online election for their name change where 281 out of 931 students voted and 64% selected KPEUA. The change of name has been shared across the university. Two new student projects have come forward including KPE Lift, a religious group meeting once a month, as well as another group of 42 students going to Vermont over the winter break for skiing and snowboarding. He thanked the professors for their involvement in Exam Jam last week as well as Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman for facilitating the inclusion of Therapy Dogs for two days. The unofficial date for the formal is May 5, 2014. The KPEUA clothes have come and will be given out tomorrow. Paula Paunic asked about updates on the Career Café; Anthony reported that he had attended a sponsorship meeting with TD MBNA and they now have \$3000 of sponsorship funds for the event. The event will take place on March 6th and there is a list of a 15 professions that students are interested in. Marius Locke asked for more information on Exam Jam. David DiFonzo responded that Exam Jam provides an opportunity for professors to hold review sessions to help prepare students for the exams in whatever format they feel is best to do this. Exam Jam is generally held in the last week of school to accommodate faculty and students.

b) KPEGS – G. Mammen

George Mammen reported that the committee had a successful toy drive raising \$1400 and next week will be buying toys to deliver to Sick Kids Hospital. A Food Drive will be held after Christmas in collaboration with the undergraduate society. The third KPEGS meeting will be December 3rd. Danielle Bentley reported that the Bodies of Knowledge Conference is scheduled for May 8th and 9th and an organizing sub-committee has now been established. An update on the conference will be provided at the next Faculty Council Meeting.

8) Other Business

Marius Locke requested clarification about recent changes to Canada West athletics regulations. Dean Jacobs responded that Canada West endorsed an initiative over a year and a half ago, led primarily by University of British Columbia, with the objective to contribute to Canada's national sporting aspirations by retaining as many student athletes as possible in Canada and reducing the number who go to American educational institutions. The initiative includes increased flexibility in the amount of scholarships available to individual student athletes as well as eliminating the requirement for Canadian athletes wishing to return to Canadian university sports teams to sit out a year. A 5 year pilot project has been endorsed by CIS (Canadian Interuniversity Sports league) for women's hockey to see if the changes have an impact. No university is obliged to follow this.

Peter Donnelly enquired about potential changes to GPA guidelines associated with the increased flexibilities around the awarding of athletic financial awards, and Leah Sheriff confirmed that there would be no change.

Leah Sheriff provided a link for follow-up information http://english.cis-sic.ca/sports/cis_news/2013-14/releases/20131126-cis

9) Announcements

None

10) Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 5:35pm (Campbell/Locke)

FACULTY COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of November 19th, 2013

Formal motion that revised athletic awards records as discussed be accepted.

Moved by Gretchen Kerr/Seconded by Scott Thomas

All in Favour