

# Final Assessment Report

## Master of Professional Kinesiology

### Graduate Program

(reviewed 2024/25)

#### A. Summary

1. The Program's Self-Study was considered and approved by the Senate Academic Review Committee December 19, 2024.
2. The Review Committee consisted of two external reviewers: Shilpa Dogra (Ontario Tech University) and Jonathon Fowles (Acadia University), and one internal reviewer, Jeffrey Atkinson (Brock University).
3. The site visit occurred February 27-28, 2025.
4. The Reviewers' Report was received March 24, 2025.
5. The Senate Graduate Studies Committee response was received April 23, 2025.
6. The Program's response was received April 28, 2025.
7. The Dean, Faculty of Applied Health Sciences, response was received April 29, 2025.
8. The Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs response was received July 7, 2025.
9. Annual Implementation Reports will be submitted from 2026-2029.
10. The next Cyclical Academic Review is scheduled to take place in 2032/2033.

The Self-Study was prepared under the conditions of the Codicil with the Review and responses conducted under the terms and conditions of the June 2023 IQAP.

## Program Outcome Categories:

Based on their knowledge of the discipline, the content of the Self-Study and the interviews conducted during the site visit, the Review Committee gave the programs the following Outcome Categories:

Program(s)	Excellent Quality	Good Quality	Good Quality with Concerns	Non-Viable
Master of Professional Kinesiology	X			
<i>If you have chosen 'Good Quality with Concerns', please summarize the specific concern(s) briefly below. If you have chosen 'Non-Viable', please summarize the specific reason(s) below.</i>				
As you will see throughout this report, the MPK program at Brock meets the standard of excellence. Our recommendations provide insight into opportunities to further enhance the student experience, and to ensure long-term sustainability of a program that has significant reputational rewards, particularly with the local community.				

## Executive Summary:

### The Reviewers wrote:

The Brock Masters of Professional Kinesiology (MPK) is a high-quality, discipline-leading program that prepares graduates to meet and exceed requirements for registration as qualified health professionals and to excel in diverse applications of kinesiology. The self-study provided substantial evidence for a robust, comprehensive, and well-thought out Masters program that has grown appropriately since its inception in 2016. The site visit and meetings with faculty, students, alumni, community partners, administration and university support personnel all confirmed and re-iterated that the Brock Masters of Professional Kinesiology is “a great program” that is highly valued by students, colleagues, employers, and the community; it produces some of the most highly trained, confident and well prepared graduates in the field. Relative to other programs in the country that are preparing kinesiology graduates to practice as professionals in healthcare, ergonomic, clinical, community and high performance environments, the Brock program provides a robust education with extensive practical skills development and well-organized and highly valued practical placement opportunities. This program exemplifies and actions the institution’s mission and academic priorities to make a positive difference in the community, contribute to the health and well-being of society and provide a discipline leading example of quality academic programming that elevates Brock’s reputation in the highly competitive regional and national academic landscape.

The recommendations in this report provide actionable steps that can continue to strengthen this program amidst the climate of significant budgetary pressures. With the strength of the current kinesiology faculty that contribute to the MPK, the collaborative work done with other programs (e.g. Gerontology), innovations in course delivery already occurring, and economies and efficiencies that can be created synergistically with the new Masters programs in Athletic Therapy and Sport Management, there are ample opportunities to build resource supports for the program to thrive into the future. It is evident from the overall review that this program ‘hits above its weight’ in impact and is providing incredible value to Brock, in the lasting effects this program has on a very positive reputation among graduates, the community, employers, regulators and others.

## B. Program Strengths

### The reviewers noted the following strengths:

Undoubtedly, the greatest strengths of this program were 1) the high-quality and diverse practicum placements, 2) the breadth and depths of the experiences provided in the professional seminars, and 3) the commitment of the Graduate Program Director (K. Gammage) and Graduate Program Coordinator (A. Parker) to create these outstanding experiences and support the individual paths of each of the students. These strengths were consistently highlighted by all parties involved with the program, including students, alumni, faculty, placement supervisors, employers, and staff. This consistency from across groups highlights that these program elements are critical components for the excellent quality of this program.

Within these primary strengths were several creative attributes that clearly contribute to quality. For example, students in the program are polled in the professional seminar to tailor the guest speakers and topics to the needs and interest of the cohort. The seminar is also used to fill significant gaps in undergraduate training as it relates to job applications and professionalism, such as coaching students through the placement application and interview process. From our knowledge of the discipline, this level of integration and mentorship is a high-quality touch that is unique to the Brock Masters of Professional Kinesiology experience and is a significant contributor to the sustainability of a high-quality program.

We would be remiss not to mention additional strengths that came to light during this review.

- The timeline of the program was raised as a significant strength: this is a 1-year intensive program that prepares students for registration with the College of Kinesiology as well as certifications across a breadth of sub-fields (e.g., Strength and Conditioning Coach for those interested in high performance sport). This timeline is particularly attractive to new grads who are uncertain of next steps and see the value in continuing their education before making further decisions related to their careers or post-graduate education.
- The diverse range of courses, skills, and experiences were emphasized as a strength as it allows students to ‘explore’ or specialize while developing a strong foundation to work in the broad field of Kinesiology. This lends to the diverse wants of students to broaden knowledge for further study develop work-ready skills for immediate employment in the field.
- The cadaver functional anatomy course – this is relatively unique to Brock MPK students, and from our review, is a significant draw for students who are interested in the MPK at Brock.

## C. Opportunities for Improvement and Enhancement

### **Recommendation #1: Make the Advanced Clinical MSK Anatomy course an ELECTIVE.**

*Supporting/clarifying text: Although the current students enjoy a ‘refresh’ of advanced anatomy with the cadaver lab, the alumni reported that the advanced clinical anatomy course did not add as much value once they were practicing in the field. A gap identified in course offering in the self-study was summarized in section 16.0 stating a need for fundamental surface anatomy. This content could be incorporated into the other required assessment courses (functional and ergonomic assessment). It was also mentioned by alumni that anatomy could be covered in courses such as injury assessment. Given that the cadaver anatomy course is a major limiting factor to the number of students in the program (i.e. max capacity is 26), making this an elective course, may open up opportunities to grow the program.*

**The Program responded:**

We thank the reviewers for this feedback, and the MPK committee engaged in a great deal of discussion around this particular recommendation. We do recognize the need for greater surface anatomy within the program and appreciate the importance of it for students in practice. We will embed this content to a greater degree within our current functional anatomy course as well as within other existing courses (i.e., functional and ergonomic assessment, injury assessment and prescription) to better meet this need.

We do acknowledge the challenge the Advanced Clinical Anatomy course presents in terms of limiting the number of students that we can accept into the MPK program, as there is a strict room capacity limit in the cadaver lab set by McMaster University. However, making this course an elective will not solve this issue, as two of our other required courses (Physiological Assessment; Functional and Ergonomic Assessment) also have limits based on space in labs and equipment. In order for us to grow the MPK program beyond 26 students, we would essentially need to double our intake, and schedule two sections of each of these required courses. However, given high utilization of these labs (CA221, CA313, WC203) in the undergraduate programs in addition to the new Master of Athletic Therapy Program, which may also require space in many of these labs, it is unclear whether this would be feasible.

Finally, Advanced Clinical Anatomy was originally an elective when it was developed and was made a required course subsequently based on feedback by practicum supervisors and course instructors. Of relevance here, instructors of the injury assessment course found that they had to spend such a significant amount of time teaching functional anatomy, that it hindered their ability to actually teach injury assessment and prescription within the course – particularly given the varied background of students coming into the program. Further, anatomy is a key content area on the Registered Kinesiology exam and our high rate of student success suggests the importance of this course. Given the need to increase greater fundamental surface anatomy into existing courses, it further limits the time available to incorporate more content from Advanced Clinical Anatomy into these other courses. Consequently, at this time, we will retain this as a required course. However, we will continue to monitor the utility of the course in the future through consultation with practicum supervisors, current and former students, and course instructors to ensure it is still meeting the needs of students and practicum supervisors.

**The Senate Graduate Studies Committee responded:**

This recommendation related to student feedback on the relevance of the advanced clinical anatomy course content attached to the cadaver lab and the potential to increase enrollments if it was made an elective and essential core content moved to other required courses. This recommendation is a pedagogical issue for the program to consider in conjunction with recommendation #2.

**The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:**

I appreciate the Program's careful consideration of this recommendation and support their response. Further growth of the number of students in the program is limited by laboratory and other related resources, including the availability of suitable practicum placements. Capacity for further growth is still desirable and can be assessed on an annual basis, as resource availability evolves.

I also support the program's considered response to not change the requirement for the Clinical Anatomy course to an option and to provide additional opportunities for surface anatomy instruction for the reasons and via the pathways noted.

There are no additional resource requirements for these changes at this time. Possible increases in future student intake and consequent resource needs would be assessed going forward based on cost-benefit balance and space availability. I anticipate the implementation timeline to be short to mid-term-1 year.

**The Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs responded:**

I agree with the program's thoughtful and thorough response to this recommendation. Given there is no change to be made in requirements, this can be addressed immediately, however, the program will continue to monitor whether this course should remain a required course or an elective.

**ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted for consideration. The Committee believes the Program is best positioned to assess potential changes to the Advanced Clinical Anatomy course.

**Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)**

Responsible for approving:	Program
Responsible for resources:	Program/Dean
Responsible for implementation:	Program/Dean
Timeline:	Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2025-26.

**Recommendation #2: Make the Advanced Exercise prescription course CORE.**

*Supporting/clarifying text: As indicated in this report, exercise prescription is a critical foundational course for professionals practicing as Kinesiologists and should be required. The Alumni Survey identified that students did not feel prepared going into placements (Section 15.3; scored 2.5/5). This may be due to the lack of exercise prescription knowledge leading into placements. Current students also indicated a desire for such a course, but with content that was more relevant. As such, it is our recommendation that this course be taught at an advanced level with sufficient theoretical and practical application by an instructor with current experience in the field to address clinical, rehabilitative, occupational and high-performance applications of exercise prescription. This course could also incorporate case-scenario or community participants to have students practice exercise prescription.*

**The Program responded:**

As highlighted by the reviewers, exercise prescription is a foundational course for Kinesiologists and should be made a required course. Not only will this better prepare students for the RKin exam, but it will also lead them to be better prepared for practicums. Starting with the next cohort (2025-26), this course will include both a lecture and a lab component (currently it is lecture only) to increase relevance and practical application of the content. The course will also be instructed by one of our lab supervisors who is an RKin and a CSEP-CEP, ensuring practical relevance to students choosing a wide variety of career options in clinical, rehabilitation, and sport settings.

One consequence of this change will be a reduction in the number of electives (from 2 to 1). As a result, the MPK committee discussed the need to add one additional elective credit to the program requirements to allow students to tailor the program to their professional goals. After consultation with the Vice-Provost & Associate Vice-President, Academic, a major modification for this change will be submitted to be implemented Fall 2026.

**The Senate Graduate Studies Committee responded:**

Based on feedback from students about preparedness for the workplace the reviewers recommend making this a required course with more advanced coverage of the content. This recommendation is a pedagogical issue for the program to consider in conjunction with recommendation #1.

**The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:**

I support the Program’s acceptance of the Reviewers’ recommendation to make Advanced Exercise Prescription a required course, add a laboratory component and add an additional elective credit to the program.

The relatively modest cost for these changes would be added during FAHS budget development for the year for implementation.

I anticipate the implementation timeline to be mid-term to 1-2 years- as outlined in the Program’s response.

**The Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs responded:**

FGSPA supports this recommendation and the program’s response. As this will be a major modification and require a calendar change, FGSPA is prepared to support the program through this process. The timeline for this should be 6–8 months depending on scheduling with ARC for the major modification and then SGSC and their calendar sub-committee for the calendar submission.

**ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee expects that the Program will work through the necessary processes to make *Advanced Exercise Prescription* a required course, add a laboratory component and add an additional elective credit to the program.

<b>Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)</b>	
Responsible for approving:	Program
Responsible for resources:	Program/Dean
Responsible for implementation:	Program/Dean
Timeline:	Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2025-26.

**Recommendation #3: Make the placements pass/fail.**

*Supporting/clarifying text: The students and GPD commented on the repetitive nature of the reflections from placements. There was also some concern regarding inconsistency in evaluations between placement supervisors and how these disparate evaluations from supervisors are translated into grades. Making these pass/fail also reduces the burden on the GPD and students for quantifying performance, possibly allowing for expansion of the MPK program.*

**The Program responded:**

We thank the reviewers for this suggestion and agree with the recommendation. We investigated the possibility of making these courses pass/fail in previous years, but there are currently structural challenges preventing this change. Pass/fail (according to the faculty handbook) are available only to theses and courses completed on Letter of Permission. Satisfactory/unsatisfactory are only applicable to co-op work terms, internship options and non-credit courses. We have consulted with the Vice-Provost & Associate Vice-President, Academic on this issue. This change could be feasible as the practicums are similar to co-op placements in evaluation (which can be pass/fail), but we will need to consult with the Office of the Registrar and Enrolment Services (ORES) and the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs (FGSPA) in terms of the mechanics, as well as have discussions with and seek approval through Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC). We will continue with these consultations to determine the feasibility of this change.

**The Senate Graduate Studies Committee responded:**

The recommendation relates to feedback from students and GPD on the inconsistency of grade assignment from placement supervisors and reducing burden on GPD to support program growth. This recommendation is a pedagogical issue for the program to consider.

**The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:**

I support this recommendation and the Program's pursuit of its implementation within the framework of Brock's regulations. Its' implementation would result in reduced work for the GPD and for placement supervisors and provide for more consistent evaluation, thus perhaps having positive resource savings. I anticipate the implementation timeline to be mid-term 1-2 years.

**The Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs responded:**

FGSPA supports this recommendation and the program's response. We will work with the program to determine the logistics and implementation as well as any FHB changes that may need to be submitted to SGSC to support moving to a Pass/Fail option. We would imagine this change is short to medium term.

**ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee expects that the Program will work through the necessary processes to change placements to pass/fail grading.

<b>Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)</b>	
Responsible for approving:	Program
Responsible for resources:	Program/Dean
Responsible for implementation:	Program/Dean
Timeline:	Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2025-26.

<b>Recommendation #4: Investigate revenue generating opportunities with the MPK students and laboratory spaces.</b>
<i>Supporting/clarifying text: There are opportunities to provide services to the community members and Brock University faculty and staff that can generate revenue to cover costs related to laboratory consumables and equipment. These include testing for local sports teams, one-on-one consultations with those in need of exercise counseling or training, providing on-site testing for certifications (e.g. CSEP) and more.</i>

**The Program responded:**

We appreciate this recommendation and agree that not only does this have the potential to generate revenue for the program but will also provide additional practical experience for students. The Department of Kinesiology is currently developing a new program (Brock Exercise Assessment Testing; BEAT) Hub through one of the department lab supervisors, who is also a member of the MPK committee. This program will include community testing for local sport teams as well as running practical exams for the CSEP-CEP certification. We have reached out to this program to ensure that MPK students will be included in the program. This could be in the form of practicums or employment.

Further, we have discussed the possibility of incorporating these types of community testing opportunities into our courses (e.g., KINE 5P05 - physiological assessment). Current course instructors are open to including this type of assessment, potentially as capstone testing at the end of the term. However, there is some concern about the level of administration that might be required to manage this type of service. In the time since writing the brief, the full-time graduate program coordinator position has been reduced to a two-third-time position to support a new professional program in the faculty. As a result, it is unlikely that the coordinator would have the ability to assist with the administrative oversight required. Given the reduction in administrative support and increased workload for instructors, we will not pursue this option at this time. However, if the situation changes, we are open to considering this option in the future.

**The Senate Graduate Studies Committee responded:**

This recommendation relates to the potential for generating revenue to offset costs for lab consumables and equipment by offering fee for service Kinesiology services to the campus and community. This recommendation relates to departmental resourcing and finances and is therefore outside of the purview of SGSC. SGSC feels that it is important to bring revenue generating opportunities to the attention of Senior Administration and more broadly to Senate, especially in these times of fiscal uncertainty.

**The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:**

I support the recommendation and the Program’s response. This type of activity is already planned for and is best administered at the departmental level with resultant revenues used to support a wide range of departmental laboratory needs including those of the MPK program. The opportunities for MPK students are also noted. This will be net revenue generating, thereby reducing the need for budgetary resources (albeit modestly). I anticipate the implementation timeline to be short-term-1 year.

**The Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs responded:**

FGSPA supports the program’s response to this recommendation and appreciates the logistics involved in generating revenue through these initiatives. The opportunity to include MPK students in the new BEAT Hub program will create additional practical experiences. We are available to discuss and support the exploration of other revenue generating opportunities through MPK course or otherwise should the program decide to move forward in this space. This is a medium to longer term goal that will require support from the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences Dean if it is accepted by the program down the road.

**ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee believes the Program, in consultation with the Deans, is best positioned to assess potential revenue generation opportunities.

<b>Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)</b>	
Responsible for approving:	Program
Responsible for resources:	Program /Dean
Responsible for implementation:	Program/Dean
Timeline:	Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2025-26.

<p><b>Recommendation #5: Integrate knowledge translation/mobilization and critical evaluation of research into more core course learning outcomes.</b></p> <p><i>Supporting/clarifying text: This was a gap identified in the programming mapping, (Table 3.3) Curriculum Map; that few ‘mastery’ level outcomes in knowledge translation/mobilization and critical evaluation of research appear in any courses. The unit should review learning objectives in core courses so that more KT and critical evaluation appears across the curriculum. Additionally, and related to this review of learning outcomes, it was identified that many mastery level outcomes appear in electives and the placements (which may have variable delivery depending on the nature of the placement). Making the Exercise Prescription course core will help with increasing the number of Mastery level outcomes in the MPK core, but the unit should also think about what elements of mastery that are important to the whole profession from current elective concentrations (Exercise and Chronic Disease, Injury Assessment and rehab, Lifestyle counseling) could be incorporated into CORE courses.</i></p>
---

**The Program responded:**

Thank you for this recommendation; we agree with the need to ensure more consistency such that all students have the opportunity to achieve learning outcomes related to both knowledge translation and critical evaluation of research. Requiring the exercise prescription course will assist with these goals.

We also engaged in discussion around how to incorporate more of this content into existing courses. For example, in the professionalism course, professional communication will be emphasized, and students are required to do a research paper to emphasize evidence-based practice. Functional and ergonomic assessment includes a research paper and labs that require critical evaluation of research. Practicum reflection assignments embed evidence-based learning in their assessments. Finally, we are currently scheduling a seminar session on knowledge translation for professional practice in our required seminar course. We will continue to look for ways to further incorporate this content into the existing Core courses.

**The Senate Graduate Studies Committee responded:**

This recommendation relates to correcting a gap in the curriculum map for mastery of knowledge mobilization and critical evaluation of research by reviewing course learning outcomes and determining how these will be covered. Further there were concerns that several mastery level outcomes were attached to elective courses rather than required courses.

This recommendation is a pedagogical issue for the program to consider. SGSC encourages all programs to review their curriculum and mapping regularly and to take advantage of the resources available through CPI.

**The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:**

I support the recommendation and the Program’s response which will better integrate knowledge translation/mobilization and evaluation of research into the curriculum via the ways noted above. This has no resource implications, and I anticipate the implementation timeline to be short term- 1 year.

**The Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs responded:**

FGSPA supports this recommendation and the program’s response. FGSPA also provides opportunities for students to present their work and share their knowledge (e.g., MNK conference). We are open to working with the program, if it makes sense, to support their students’ participation in these opportunities. This is a short-term goal to implement.

**ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted. The Committee believes the Program, in consultation with the Deans, is best positioned to determine appropriate strategies to better integrate knowledge translation/mobilization and evaluation of research into the curriculum.

<b>Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)</b>	
Responsible for approving:	Program
Responsible for resources:	Program /Dean
Responsible for implementation:	Program /Dean
Timeline:	Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2025-26.

**Recommendation #6: Increase number of international students in the program.**

*Supporting/clarifying text: The GPD identified the delicate process to incorporate international students into an applied program; they need relevant knowledge and language specific to the field of study. With appropriate interviewing and screening, it is possible to increase the international student contingent marginally (likely from 1-2 to 3-4). This would also help to embrace EDIAR initiatives.*

**The Program responded:**

We agree with this recommendation as our experience is that international students help to enrich the experience of all students. In fact, for this coming intake, we have received approval from FGSPA to take up to four international students and have sent out offers in accordance with this number.

**The Senate Graduate Studies Committee responded:**

This recommendation relates to the low number of international students (1-2) that are in the program and suggests trying to increase that modestly (3-4) to promote diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism initiatives, while acknowledging the intricate process required for screening applicants to set them up for success when admitted. This recommendation is a pedagogical issue for the program to consider. SGSC encourages all programs to explore opportunities to promote diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism as is consistent with the collective goals of the University and Brock’s Academic Plan.

**The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:**

I agree with the recommendation and the Program’s response to attempt to increase international student enrollment as it is able within the current climate of international student demand and restrictions. If successful, this will result in increased revenues for the University from international student fees. While starting with the incoming enrollment cycle, the implementation will be ongoing and with a long-term timeline.

**The Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs responded:**

FGSPA can work with the program to develop a recruitment strategy to increase the number of international students in their program. They are already seeing an increase in interest. This is a short to medium term implementation goal.

**ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted for consideration. The Committee believes the Program in consultation with the Deans is best positioned to determine appropriate strategies to increase international student enrolment.

**Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)**

Responsible for approving:	Program
Responsible for resources:	Program /Dean
Responsible for implementation:	Program /Dean
Timeline:	Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2025-26.

**Recommendation #7: Create skills-based evaluations for the placement supervisors that provide meaningful opportunities for feedback to the students.**

*Supporting/clarifying text: Students and placement supervisors identified some uncertainty around how evaluation of student performance is quantified. Incorporating skill-based evaluations may assist with this.*

**The Program responded:**

We appreciate this suggestion as it addresses several of the challenges identified previously around inconsistency of evaluation in the practicum courses. The difficulty has always been finding a balance between providing students with meaningful feedback in their placements and the diversity of settings, populations, supervisor backgrounds, and activities in the practicum offerings, while also making sure that supervisors do not feel overburdened with administrative tasks.

Moving to a pass/fail format will help to alleviate inconsistencies in assessment. We will also form a working group to identify groupings of practicums where there is a consistent set of skills that could be expected to be learned within the practicum settings (e.g., clinical, exercise prescription, high performance training). This could in turn reduce the administrative burden on the supervisors and provide more meaningful feedback to students.

**The Senate Graduate Studies Committee responded:**

This recommendation relates to the uncertainty of some students and placement supervisors regarding student performance evaluations and recommends developing skill-based evaluations to rectify this. This recommendation is a pedagogical issue for the program to consider. SGSC encourages programs to consider opportunities to enhance student and community partner experiences.

**The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:**

I support this recommendation and the Program's response to find creative ways to move toward its implementation. This is in part dependent on the successful implementation of recommendation #3 and as noted above will incorporate other means of grouping skills learning practicums. I anticipate the implementation will be medium term- 2-3 years.

**The Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs responded:**

We support this recommendation and the program's response. As stated above in Recommendation 3, we will work with the program to support the exploration of moving to a pass/fail format for practicum courses.

**ARC Disposition of the Recommendation**

ARC considers this recommendation to be accepted. The Committee understand that the implementation of this recommendation is closely related to that of recommendation #3 as both are related to practicum course evaluations.

**Implementation Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Priority)**

Responsible for approving:	Program
Responsible for resources:	Program/Dean
Responsible for implementation:	Program/Dean
Timeline:	Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2025-26.

**D. Summary of Recommendations:**

First Priority:

Recommendations: 1-7