

Final Assessment Report

Sport Management (SPMA)

Undergraduate Programs

(Reviewed 2021/22)

A. Summary

1. The Department's Self-Study was considered and approved by the Senate Academic Review Committee on November 30, 2021.
2. The Review Committee consisted of two external reviewers: Laura Misener (Western University) and Norm O'Reilly (The University of Maine), and one internal reviewer, Mary-Beth Raddon (Brock University).
3. The virtual review occurred on March 28, 30, April 1, 2022.
4. The Reviewers' Report was received on June 8, 2022.
5. The Department response was received on July 12, 2022.
6. The Senate Undergraduate Program Committee response was received on September 8, 2022. It only provided a response to Recommendation #1.
7. The Dean of Applied Health Sciences response was received on September 12, 2022.
8. Annual Implementation reports will be submitted from 2023-2026.
9. The next Cyclical Academic Review is scheduled to take place in 2029/2030.

This review was conducted under the terms and conditions of the IQAP approved by Senate on May 25, 2016 and the Codicil to the Brock IQAP, approved by Senate December 15, 2021, which serves until the revised IQAP is fully approved by the Quality Council and Senate.

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
BSM Bachelor of Sport Management (Honours)			X	
BSM Bachelor of Sport Management (4-Year with Major)			X	

Concerns raised by the Review Committee, leading to the Program Outcome Categories above, are highlighted below in red.

Executive Summary:

The Reviewers wrote:

Overall, the Sport Management program at Brock University offers a quality undergraduate degree program. To say that it is one of the largest faculties in the field would be accurate. The complement of professors is deep and from a variety of the key sub-disciplines in the field. It is a very comprehensive program, with a significant breadth of course offerings, that certainly distinguishes it from any other institution globally. **However, despite the comprehensive curriculum and high volume of students, we believe that there is a strong need to review the entire curriculum and find more efficiencies within Brock University.** Internal collaboration is, in our view, a key element of this need, as is a thought-out approach to the learning objectives and course sequences that students follow.

In a nutshell, the program seems to function largely in isolation without leveraging other programs and resources both within and outside the faculty. The result is a significant demand on resources that risks not meeting the degree level expectations or providing graduates with competitive advantages to find jobs in a high-demand field. While the internship program is highly revered, there are clearly significant challenges with that part of the program, and a thorough review is needed to ensure continued quality practical experiences for the students. As the program continues to grow due to its high demand, the risk lies in the fact that the program is not meeting the needs of students and/or community partners with a high-quality experience. We fully understand that much of this is due to the rapid growth and large class sizes, but there are clearly some efficiencies and economies of scale that could be leveraged to create increased quality learning outcomes for the students.

Speaking to the Program Outcome Categories - The Department stated:

Understandably, the reviewers were faced with a task of placing us within a box for the “Outcome Category”; here, we’re sure there was much debate about where our program should ultimately “fit”, but after discussion and feedback, we don’t feel that a Category 3 classification - “Good Quality with Concerns” - is a deserving assignment”.

The Department felt that, given the positive comments noted by the Reviewers, Category 1 or 2 would have been more appropriate.

Speaking to the Program Outcome Categories and the Department’s statement - The Dean responded:

“I agree with the SPMA departmental assessment that the listing of the program in “Category 3” if viewed as a quality-based scale is perhaps inappropriate for the reasons the department has noted. However, ... the overall tone of the review was one which recognized the SPMA program as one of the leaders in its field in North America and one which is matched in scope and quality by few if any other programs in North America. As such, I would be in agreement with this overall tone of the assessment.”

Please see the attached Review Schedule (Appendix A), which outlines the individuals that the Review Committee met with during the virtual site visit.

Please see the attached Four-Year Report (2018) (Appendix B), which outlines the steps taken to continuously improve the program since the last review in 2013-14.

B. Strengths of the Program

The reviewers noted the following strengths:

A key strength of this SPMA program is the comprehensive nature of the sport management offering that is unparalleled at any other Canadian University and perhaps anywhere in the English speaking world. This demonstrates a clear uniqueness in the University landscape that provides Brock with an opportunity to continue to be a leading, if not the leading, sport management undergraduate program in Canada. The breadth of course offering is very comprehensive of many of the sub-disciplines in sport management (e.g., sport marketing, sponsorship, sport analytics, sport communications, etc.) which likely makes it attractive to students. However, as much as this is a strength, there is much overlap in the course content, so a curriculum review to expand, streamline and build these sub-disciplines will only enhance this strength.

The faculty members are very qualified with broad areas of expertise to meet the demand for the breadth of course offerings. Many of the faculty have very strong programs of research that are woven into the curricular offerings. The practical nature of many of the course offerings and the culminating internship are well aligned with Brock University’s mission to connect to key economic, social, and cultural issues with particular attention to

the local community. The partnerships for SPMA demonstrate a great strength for the program and offer potential opportunities to have a positive community impact.

Despite the high student: faculty ratio, the department has been extremely creative and innovative in its offerings and enabled faculty members opportunities to grow their own programs of research through teaching relief and alternative workloads. This serves to enhance the research culture of the unit. This needs to be continued in the context of rapid growth.

C. Opportunities for Improvement and Enhancement

Recommendation #1

Complete a deep curriculum review.

The Department responded:

The recommendation that the Department undertake a curriculum mapping exercise is well supported by the information in the self study and our discussions about a timely opportunity to review the curriculum following the review. To be sure, we agree with this recommendation. ... We are confident over the next 12-18 months (or sooner) we can review and revise the curriculum to ensure it maintains the high status that the reviewers acknowledged in their feedback. In fact, the Department retreat held at the beginning of May 2022, prior to receiving the feedback from external reviewers, involved preliminary background work on a curriculum review facilitated by Brock's Centre for Pedagogical Innovation (CPI). Given that since the last review there are 10 new faculty members in the department, 7 of which have 5 or less years experience in the department, the internal context is fitting for such a review. In addition, as noted in the self study, the context of sport management related undergraduate opportunities in Ontario, in particular, has changed since the last review... As such, the external context also warrants consideration as we aim to keep our place as the country's leading sport management program. ...

The other aspect mentioned as part of a curriculum review is to consider "streaming"; while we appreciate the suggestion, this strategy is antithetical to the purposeful philosophy that has underpinned the SPMA program since its origins—which is to provide a breadth of education to meet the expanding and diverse market. This is not to say that "efficiencies" cannot be made in the curriculum to ensure our diverse faculty expertise can be best utilized to provide the necessary content and meet program learning objectives....

The reviewers recommend examining the curriculum for "efficiencies" and recommend seeking partnerships with other units in the University.... This specific recommendation to find efficiencies by "off loading" courses to other Departments via agreed upon partnerships overlooks the history and identity of the program.

Indeed, the uniqueness of the only sport management program that is completely “owned” by a sport management department is something we take ownership of and see great merit in. This history is well documented in the self study - and while history is often reviewed so we are not doomed to repeat it, we also need to recognize that history shapes the present—we have established a unique place in the field of sport management undergraduate programs globally by providing in-house expertise—in part, in the early days as a result of an acrimonious relationship with the Business School, but also more recently to more strategically build strength within and develop a unique program. This independence, rather than being viewed as an inefficiency might be equally marketed as a unique approach to sport management. As such, negotiating partnerships with several other departments to provide SPMA students with the introductory level courses would mean altering the current program and starting from a position that SPMA faculty should only provide the “context” specific aspects of the subdisciplines rather than the fundamentals. This is the approach taken in many other institutions—simply because they do not have in-house expertise in their respective faculty complement of sport management faculty. The SPMA program’s depth is a result of internal expertise. The breadth is also a result of the desire to acknowledge and address within the program, the “entire” sport industry—not only the commercial sector, but also the not-for-profit sector and the important role of the public sector....

Discussing the idea of partnerships with other units on campus, we have expressed the desire (both in discussion and the self study) to explore “value added” partnerships across university units—(e.g., labour studies, business communications, etc.) that might provide valuable opportunities for students to specialize. However, in the “business” of operating the university, there is a finite amount of willing, synergistic, and beneficial collaborations across campus. Here, the feasibility of other departments, across campus, taking on the significant load (using their resources) to deliver programming to our students is certainly questionable. It is then noted that such synergies “*would open some opportunities for students from other programs to take some of the sought-after SPMA courses*” (p. 5); while we would love to further disseminate the knowledge and expertise around sport business areas that we are so passionate about, this would only compound the strain currently on the department and its faculty where “*SPMA currently has the highest ratio of ‘Students : Faculty’ in the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences*” (p. 7).

Thank you to the reviewers for their commentary and thoughts on additional / complementary delivery options within the program.... We would expect that these elements would be further developed in a comprehensive curricular review.

In sum[mary], we think the fundamental idea behind recommendation #1 is very fair and we appreciate and thank the reviewers for this suggestion; here, we’re already taking steps in examining/revising the curriculum (e.g., retreat discussion). Our goal would be to take this recommendation and implement a curriculum review that will look to build on the strength and excellent standing of our existing program as was identified by the reviewers...

The Senate Undergraduate Program Committee responded:

Recommendation #1 calls for a relatively major overhaul of the curriculum which will result in substantial requests for calendar changes that would impact this committee.

The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:

I am in agreement with the reviewers' recommendation of a curriculum review and the SPMA department's positive response in this regard... I agree that some form of "grouping" of courses, with or without specialized streaming could be considered as part of this curriculum review process. The evaluation of the curriculum for "efficiencies" within the program would also be important. While the recommendation to explore possibilities of other Brock units, specifically the Goodman School should not be entirely discounted, I am in agreement with the SPMA response that a critical strength and uniqueness of the program is its ability to deliver the full range of curriculum requirements within its program is not one that can or should be discarded lightly.

As this recommendation to "farm out" some program delivery to other units at Brock, was made primarily in an attempt to reduce the demands on an over-stretched department, rather than for pedagogical reasons, I would not be supportive of a wholesale move in this direction.... I would suggest that these types of considerations should only be addressed if it would be demonstrated improve the quality of the program and its delivery and not so that resources which are needed by the department go instead to another University division to service SPMA students that are otherwise best served by program delivery and targeted pedagogy by the SPMA department itself.

Other components of this recommendation and the departmental responses do align with my thoughts and have my support. I expect that such a review and its implementation may take place over several years.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to conduct a deep curriculum review to be accepted and in the process of implementation. The Committee encourages the Department to continue working with the Centre for Pedagogical Innovation as they undertake this review.

Implementation Plan (1st Priority)	
Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2022/23.

Recommendation #2

Complete overhaul of the internship program.

The Department responded:

The self study identifies the need to review our 4th year “flag ship” courses - internship and honours thesis, in addition to reviewing experiential opportunities across the program—which are in alignment with the reviewers’ recommendation. However, the language of “*complete overhaul*” ...-contradicts the feedback presented in the self study which indicates that the internship is addressing the experiential needs of students. ... To be sure, the internship is a very attractive part of the SPMA program. While it does have drawbacks (i.e., affordability... we have allowed ‘paid internships’ and/or ‘stipends’ to alleviate some of these expenses. There certainly may be a need to review the assessment aspect of the courses,... This we would envision would become clearer within the curricular review (recommendation #1). As such, while a “complete overhaul” as recommended by the reviewers implies a complete rethink of what we are doing—and given there is contradictory evidence of the need to overhaul the internship—there is a need for a strategic review of the internship and additional experiential opportunities. For example, in response to commentary surrounding the placements of students in the internship..., the information at our disposal is not in alignment with this assertion at all. Indeed, in a recent document tracking internship placement (Winter and Sp/Su 2022), every one of the 50 students were placed in a sport-related organization! We are not sure where the foundation for this assertion originated, but it does not have empirical support.

One consideration, beyond the internship specifically, is addressed within our self study; here, we identify the extension of experiential learning throughout our program, and we have recognized the need to consider this aspect as part of a curriculum review. Here, it is noteworthy that experiential learning (EL) is not limited to the internship within SPMA; the depth and breadth of this learning deliverable that faculty members and staff provide our students is notable and goes beyond the one internship class.

The statement made by reviewers that, “*Although you do not measure this currently, our expectation is that a very low proportion of your graduating class end up working in sport*” (p. 13) is a non sequitur - not related to internship experiences or quality or pathways. It is beyond our control ... nor is it an assessment criterion. Further, understanding the basis for such a judgement (or expectation) is unclear; why do the reviewers expect a low proportion of our graduating class to find employment in sport? How do we know how many choose to pursue different options after obtaining an undergraduate education with significant depth and breadth?

The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:

I agree with the SPMA department response to the reviewers' recommendation that a "complete overhaul" of the internship program may be an over-reaction to what, based on their internal review is really a largely successful "flagship" component of their undergraduate program. The perhaps limited opportunity the reviewers had to assess this component of the program and the very small number of students they interacted with may have provided them with a very limited understanding of the overall success and strength of the internships. The departmental response provides clear evidence to refute many of the reviewers' assessments. That being said, the internship program can still be improved and the SPMA self-assessment report and response have identified areas which can and should be addressed as part of an overall review of the program with a timeline as suggested above.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to be accepted for consideration. The Committee expects that the Department will do a thorough review of the internship program in the context of a larger curriculum review, as mentioned in recommendation #1.

Implementation Plan (1st Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2022/23.

Recommendation #3

Prioritize a staff hire with any new resources.

The Department responded:

There is total agreement for this recommendation and we thank the reviewers for this acknowledgement; however, as a department we have had very little control over staffing—we operated for a substantial portion of the 2018 academic year without a Department Administrative Assistant—our existing staff (academic advisor) and Department Chair (at that time) filled in with some part time help until a substitute could be found—upper administration must prioritize this and act accordingly. As the reviewers note: "*the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) sets a benchmark of one (1) counsellor for every 400 undergraduate students. It is noted that the current ratio is closer to 1:1000, which is concerning*" (p. 8). To be sure, administrative support is a priority, as is continued discussion around faculty hires to

bring SPMA in line with other units, in terms of 'Student: Faculty' ratios, where we currently lag far behind other departments in the Faculty and across campus.

The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:

While I agree that further staff hiring could be an important addition to the department, where this falls as a priority relative to additional SPMA faculty hiring needs and other departmental and Applied Health Sciences needs is a discussion best had between the department and the Dean. Recent additions to the FAHS student advising capacity and upcoming changes to Central advising may address at least some of the concerns noted by the reviewers. Additionally, a recent successful replacement of a long serving academic advisor in another FAHS department went smoother than perhaps envisioned by the reviewers with regard to academic advisor replacement in the SPMA program.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation, to prioritize a staff hire, to be not accepted as the allocation of resources lies outside of the Committee's jurisdiction. The Committee expects that the program will proceed through normal channels of advocacy for resources.

Implementation Plan

Recommendation not accepted as it lies outside of the jurisdiction to the Committee.

Recommendation #4

Explore revenue generation opportunities. Micro-credentials, consultancy work/lab with students, etc.

The Department responded:

Work around micro-credentialing has been on the department's agenda and radar for a while, most prominently in the past 12-months. The Centre for Sport Capacity (CSC) has been in existence for close to 15 years and is operating in this space. It is a possibility that "more" opportunities could run through this unit. Further, is an additional Centre, one with a more specific mandate to drive revenue for the department, worthy of exploration? If this is a possibility, we would gladly explore the opportunity. Lastly, the proposed Master's in Sport Management (MSM) is in the final stages of approval with ARC and would be in this revenue-generation space, as would opportunities for certificate programs with corporate Canada (discussions are currently occurring).

The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:

I agree with the reviewers' recommendation and the departmental response to explore a range of "revenue generating" and related opportunities. I would note that it is not expected that these types of "revenue generation" opportunities will in the short to medium term yield revenues to the extent that the significant departmental resource and personnel needs would be substantively addressed by these activities. These types of opportunities could be developed on an ongoing basis.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to explore revenue generation opportunities to be accepted for consideration by the Department. Further, ARC considers the recommendation to specifically explore Micro-credentials to be already current practice and part of the larger discussion about curriculum review, as mentioned in recommendation #1.

Implementation Plan (1st Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by the end of academic year 2022/23.

Recommendation #5

Dedicated student space for learning.

The Department responded:

It is undeniable that "space" is a limitation on Brock's campus. This recommendation is certainly beyond the control of the SPMA department, but we would welcome the investment in "Sport Management Labs" to assist our course delivery and prepare students for the sport industry. Indeed, the reviewers note "*We believe a balance of theory and practice is key to an applied program like this and suggest that a curriculum review ascertain if the balance is in place*" (p. 4). We would welcome space that can accommodate our large classes while also easily mimicking the sport industry environment (i.e., boardroom, call centre, courtroom, trading desk, manufacturing facility, ticketing centre, e-sports venue etc...). Here, the "labs" could be stand-alone (for smaller groups) or retro-fits of existing classrooms to allow for the front of the room to be converted to these business "environments". To be sure, we would welcome additional space to support our program.

The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:

This recommendation may be beyond the scope of the review and as such may not be accepted by ARC. To the extent that the recommendation is deemed acceptable, I am in agreement that such space is needed by the SPMA program and the Dean's office is continuing to work on these and other space needs for the SPMA program and the Faculty as a whole.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation, of dedicated student space for learning, to be not accepted as it lies outside of the Committee's jurisdiction. The Committee expects that the program will proceed through normal channels of advocacy for space resources.

Implementation Plan

Recommendation not accepted as it lies outside of the jurisdiction to the Committee.

Recommendation #6

Pursue Accreditation.

The Department responded:

COSMA [Commission on Sport Management Accreditation] accreditation is largely (perhaps exclusively?) an American institutional offering. With all due respect, it does not appear to be a "gold standard" of professional accreditation and would not seem to be a huge value-add to our program. If there is greater rationale or explanation for this recommendation, we could certainly revisit.

The Dean of Applied Health Sciences responded:

I am in agreement with the SPMA departmental response which rejects the reviewers' recommendation to pursue accreditation. This recommendation to seek some form of "accreditation" from a little known, self-accrediting American organization will bring no immediate benefits to the department and program, is irrelevant in the Canadian context and will not enhance program quality or reputation.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to pursue Accreditation to be not accepted as it lies outside of the jurisdiction of the Committee. The Committee believes the Department is best-positioned to determine whether to move forward with this.

Implementation Plan

Recommendation not accepted as it lies outside of the jurisdiction of the Committee.

D. Summary of Recommendations:

First Priority:

Recommendations 1,2,4

Not Accepted:

Recommendations 3,5,6

APPENDIX A

Sport Management Cyclical Academic Review Brock University

March 28,30, April 1, 2022
Via Videoconference (Microsoft Teams)

Meeting Connection Information:	
Platform:	Microsoft Teams
Meeting Name:	Review-SPMA
Join by Video:	Click here to join the meeting
Video Conference ID:	119 751 357 3
Join by Audio:	1-888-862-4985 CANADA
Phone Conference ID:	938 051 690#
Find a Local Number:	Find a local number
	Learn More Help

FINAL Schedule

Monday, March 28	
9:00-9:45am	<p><u>Review Team Orientation</u> Brian Power, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic Peter Tiidus, Dean, Faculty of Applied Health Sciences Christina Phillips, Manager, Quality Assurance</p>
9:45-10:00am	Transition
10:00-10:30am	<p><u>Department Chair</u> Chris Chard, Associate Professor</p>
10:30-11:00am	Discussion/Writing time
11:00-12:00pm	<p><u>Program Committee</u> Craig Hyatt, Associate Professor (Program Committee Chair) Lisa Kikulis, Associate Professor Cheryl Mallen, Associate Professor Stephanie Brooks, Undergraduate Program Coordinator/Academic Advisor Michael Van Bussel, Assistant Professor</p>
12:00-1:00pm	Lunch Break
1:00-1:30pm	<p><u>Faculty</u> Nick Burton, Assistant Professor Chris Chard, Associate Professor Michele Donnelly, Assistant Professor Dawn Trussell, Associate Professor</p>

1:30-2:30pm Transition/Writing

2:30-3:00pm **Faculty**
 Ryan Clutterbuck, Assistant Professor
 Kirsty Spence, Associate Professor & Assoc. Dean, Teaching & Undergraduate Studies
 Cheryl Mallen, Associate Professor

Wednesday, March 30

9:00-9:30am **Academic Advising Supports**
 Stephanie Brooks, Undergraduate Program Coordinator/Academic Advisor

9:30-10:00am **Co-op, Career and Experiential Education**
 Cara Krezek, Director, Co-op, Career and Experiential Education
 Michael Fawkes, Experiential Education Coordinator

10:00-10:15am Transition

10:15-10:45am **Faculty**
 Craig Hyatt, Associate Professor
 Lisa Kikulis, Associate Professor
 Michael Naraine, Assistant Professor
 Michael Van Bussel, Assistant Professor

10:45-11:00am Transition

11:00-12:00pm **Meeting with Students**

12:00 - 1:00 **Lunch Break**

1:00-2:00pm **Writing time**

2:00-2:30pm **Faculty**
 Shannon Kerwin, Associate Professor
 Curtis Fogel, Associate Professor
 Brad Millington, Associate Professor

2:30-3:00pm **Administrative Supports**
 Cindy Curtis, Administrative Assistant

Friday, April 1

9:00-9:30am **Library**
 Elizabeth Yates, Liaison/Scholarly Communications Librarian
 Alicia Zorzetto, Head of Collections

9:30-10:00am	Transition/Writing
10:00-11:00am	<u>Closing meeting with Dean, Faculty of Applied Health Sciences</u> Peter Tiidus
11:00-12:00pm	<u>Closing meeting with Provost & Vice-Provost, Academic</u> Lynn Wells, Provost and Vice-President, Academic Brian Power, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic

Reviewers:	
Laura Misener	Associate Professor and Director, School of Kinesiology Western University
Norm O'Reilly	Professor and Dean, Graduate School of Business Maine Business School The University of Maine
Mary-Beth Raddon	Associate Professor Department of Sociology Brock University



APPENDIX B

Sport Management Undergraduate Program Review Four-Year Report (2018)

A. Summary of Review

This review was conducted under the terms and conditions of the IQAP approved by Senate on June 6, 2011.

1. The academic programs offered by the Department of Sport Management which were examined as part of the review were: BSM Pass and Honours in Sport Management.
2. The Review Committee consisted of two external reviewers: Janet Fink (University of Massachusetts), David Legg (Mount Royal University) and an internal reviewer: Heather Chalmers (Brock University).
3. The site visit occurred on January 29-31, 2014.
4. The Final Assessment Report was approved by Senate on November 12, 2014.
5. The reviewers assigned the following Outcome Category: Category 3, "Good Quality with Concerns", however ARC found a major discrepancy between the high assessment of the program in the Reviewer Report and the Reviewers' conclusion that there were significant concerns for the program. While ARC acknowledged that the Review Team was asked to provide an outcome category, the Committee believed this review indicated a level of Category 2 "Good Quality" with only relatively minor concerns for the program.
6. The next review of the undergraduate programs in the Department of Sport Management will be in 2021/22.

B. Recommendations

The reviewers provided 7 recommendations.

Recommendation #1

Make the Experiential Learning Coordinator a permanent position.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC acknowledges that resource issues can have an impact on the academic quality of a program, but recognizes that the provision of resources lies outside of the Committee's area of responsibility. ARC expects that the Department will proceed through normal channels of advocacy for these resources.

Implementation Plan

Recommendation NOT accepted.

Actions Taken	Year Action Started	Year Action Completed
Action #1 Reorganization of experiential coordinators in the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences enabled the position to be converted to a permanent position and allocation to the Department of Sport Management.	2014	2014

Explanation of Actions Taken, Status and Results:

This recommendation was not accepted as it was outside of the parameters of the review. A reorganization did, however, allow for a permanent position to be allocated to the Department of Sport Management. This position is highly valued by the Department that is cognizant of the value of an Experiential Education Coordinator solely dedicated to the Department of Sport Management to aid in embedding experiential opportunities throughout the four years of the program. The Department will continue to advocate for this position to remain dedicated to the Department.

Recommendation #2

Add a fulltime Instructional Limited Term Appointment (ILTA).

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to be accepted and implemented. The Committee encourages the Dean and Department to continue to advocate for tenure-track positions to address long-term teaching concerns and to maintain standards in the program.

Implementation Plan

Recommendation implemented. No further action required.

Explanation of Actions Taken, Status and Results:

In addition to the ILTA, the Department has hired four tenure-track Assistant Professor positions (one in July, 2013; two in July, 2016; and one in January, 2018). Additionally, the Department is currently in the process of hiring another tenure-track Assistant Professor to begin in 2018. These additional faculty members will aid in addressing the long-term teaching concerns with the rising student numbers and to maintain the standards in the program.

Recommendation #3a

Strategically reduce the curriculum.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation.

Implementation Plan (First Priority)

Responsible for approving: Department
 Responsible for resources: Department
 Responsible for implementation: Department
 Timeline: Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by end of academic year 2014/15

Actions Taken	Year Action Started	Year Action Complete
Action #1 The Department conducted a curriculum review of the first 3 years of the program (with the guidance of a hired facilitator) that involved curriculum mapping and a strategy of ongoing review in the Spring Retreat of 2015	2015	2015
Action #2 The Department implemented 2 curriculum changes established from the 2015 curriculum review. The outcome was a decision to revise the sequencing of the 2 nd and 3 rd year core courses. These revisions were	2015/16	2015/16

submitted to UPC and approved for the 2016/17 undergraduate calendar.		
Action #3 Spring Retreat held in April, 2016 (with the guidance of the same hired facilitator) focused on an examination of the years 1 and 4 of the program	2016	2016
Action #3 The Department implemented the Retreat decision to revise the year 1 Sport Management core course requirements and expanded the range of courses that could be included in the 4 th year core to the 3 Alpha 90 level. These revisions were submitted to UPC for approval the 2017/18 undergraduate calendar.	2017	2017
Action #4 The Department continues to examine the requirements for the 4 th year of the program. The Department is discussing a more in-depth examination of the 4 th year related to the requirements to compete 4 th year, the complexities of integrating the experiential opportunities, and the potential of common core in the 4 th year of the program.	2017/18	On-going

Explanation of Actions Taken, Status and Results:

The recommendation to “strategically reduce the curriculum” was not the decision derived from the multiple curriculum reviews held by the Department. With the review and consultation, the number of core courses was deemed important to retain and, in fact, the department expanded electives to accommodate the increased enrollment and the desire of students to take as many courses within their major as is allowed. Reducing the curriculum in an era of continued student number growth would mean that there would not be enough spaces for all students to register in the required number of courses (without greatly increasing the class size). Strategically reducing the curriculum was, thus, rejected. Further, the curriculum has since increased to meet the new areas in the field - such as courses in analytics and digital communications.

Recommendation #3b

Address the first year program.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to be accepted and in the process of implementation.

Implementation Plan (First Priority)

Responsible for approving: Department

Responsible for resources: Department

Responsible for implementation: Department

Timeline: Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by end of academic year 2014/15

Actions Taken	Year Action Started	Year Action Completed
Action #1 A committee was struck in the summer of 2014 to review the first year courses. A report was submitted to the Department for approval of curricular changes regarding content and reflected in changes in SPMA 1P91, 1P92 and 1P94.	2015/16	2015/16
Action #2 MGMT 1P93 was dropped as a required course in first year and SPMA 1P97 Research Design and Evaluation was moved to first year. Approved by UPC fall 2016.	2015/16	2015/16

Explanation of Actions Taken, Status and Results:

All changes discussed above have been implemented.

Recommendation #3c

Initiate course partnerships.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to be worthy of consideration and suggests that the Department is best positioned to determine appropriate strategies to move forward with this issue if it is deemed feasible.

Implementation Plan (Second Priority)

Responsible for approving: Department

Responsible for resources: Department

Responsible for implementation: Department

Timeline: Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by end of academic year 2015/16

Actions Taken	Year Action Started	Year Action Completed
Action #1 The Department of Sport Management has cross listed courses available to its students from Communication Studies (SPMA 2P22), Labour Studies (2P90) and Sociology (3P55)	2016	2016

<p>Action #2 In the fall of 2015 the Department chair and instructor for SPMA 2P06 was approached by Canadian Studies with the request to have SPMA 2P06 (Sport Policy) cross listed to allow Canadian Studies majors to take the course. The course is focused on sport policy in Canada and seemed like a good fit. The Department did not support this recommendation and desired further information on the resource implications for this course.</p>	<p>2016</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
--	-------------	----------------

Explanation of Actions Taken, Status and Results:

Above and beyond the course partnerships to offer courses in two different departments, the Department of Sport Management has considered course partnerships with the industry. For example, a partnership was made with the Sport for Development course with groups such as the North American Indigenous Games and Right to Play. As opportunities arise, the course Instructor is developing the ability for student participation in key roles of event management. Also, partnerships have included the Research Design and Evaluation course and Canoe Kayak Ontario. Further, the Department of Sport Management secured a \$5,000 Queen Elizabeth Scholarship grant in which we are partnered with Commonwealth Games Canada to send students internationally to developing countries to complete an internship. To date, partnerships have existed with the Samoa 2015 Commonwealth Youth Games, St. Vincent and the Grenadines Olympic Committee, Turks and Caicos Islands Rugby Football Union, Swaziland Olympic & Commonwealth Games Association, Botswana National Olympic Committee and the Bahamas 2017 Commonwealth Youth Games. The Department engages with these partnerships as they arise for the duration of the opportunity.

Recommendation #4

Increase admission standards.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to be worthy of consideration and suggests that the Department is best positioned to determine appropriate strategies to move forward with this issue. The Committee understands that enrolment targets set the number of admissions and that admissions requirements are not used to decrease enrolment in a program.

Implementation Plan (Second Priority)

Responsible for approving: Department

Responsible for resources: Department

Responsible for implementation: Department

Timeline: Dean of Applied Health Sciences to report by end of academic year 2015/16

Actions Taken	Year Action Started	Year Action Completed
Action #1 The addition of MATH 4U was approved by ARC starting in 2016/17	2015/16	2015/16

Explanation of Actions Taken, Status and Results:

Recommendation implemented. No further action required.

Recommendation #5

Re-evaluate unscheduled teaching standards and better standardize service commitments.

ARC Disposition of the Recommendation

ARC considers the recommendation to be not accepted as it lies outside the jurisdiction of the Committee and has implications with respect to the Brock University/Faculty Association Collective Agreement.

Implementation Plan

Recommendation NOT accepted.

C. Unit Summative Analysis and Evaluation

1. To what extent has the Unit achieved the improvements suggested by the reviewers?
The Department has acted to implement 5 of the 7 recommendations as follows:

Recommendation 1 Implemented: *Make the Experiential Learning Coordinator a permanent position.*

- Even though this recommended was rejected by ARC as outside the Reviewers mandate - the Department worked through the channels of advocacy and the Faculty Experiential Learning Coordinator was assigned on a full-time basis to the Department of Sport Management.

Recommendation 2 Implemented: *Add a fulltime Instructional Limited Term Appointment (ILTA)*

- A fulltime Instructional Limited Term appointment (ILTA) was hired for the Department.
- As well, the Department has hired three tenure-track Assistant Professor positions (one in 2013 and two in 2016).
- Additionally, the Department is currently in the process of hiring another tenure-track Assistant Professor to begin in 2018.

- These positions aid in addressing the long-term teaching concerns to maintain the standards in the program in an era of rising student numbers.
- **Recommendation 3b Implemented: *Address the first year program.***
 - The Department addressed the first year of the program by generating a committee in the summer of 2014 to review the courses that recommended curricular changes regarding content and reflected in changes in SPMA 1P91, 1P92 and 1P94. Further, MGMT 1P93 was dropped as a required course in the first year and SPMA Research Design and Evaluation was moved to first year. All was approved by UPC for implementation in the fall of 2016.
- **Recommendation 3c Implemented: *Initiate Course Partnerships***
 - The Department has cross listed courses available to its students from Communication Studies (SPMA 2P22), Labour Studies (2P90) and Sociology (3P55)
 - Further, the Department, along with Canadian studies, is discussing the resource implications concerning cross listing SPMA 2P06 Sport Policy.
 - Additionally, the Department has multiple course industry partnerships.
- **Recommendation 4 Implemented: *Increase admission standards***
 - The addition of MATH 4U was approved by ARC to begin in 2016/17.

The Department did NOT ACT on 2 of the recommendations as follows:

- **Recommendation 3a NOT Implemented: *Strategically reduce the curriculum.***
 - The recommendation to strategically reduce the curriculum was not a decision that was supported at the Department level during both the Spring 2015 and 2016 Retreats. The number of core courses were deemed important to retain. It was determined by the Department that implementing this recommendation would result in leaving the program with not enough spaces for all students (with the growing student complement) to register - without greatly increasing class size.
 - Alternatively, the curriculum was increased for the new areas in the field such as analytics and digital communications.
- **Recommendation 5: NOT Implemented: *Re-evaluate unscheduled teaching standards and better standardize service commitments.***
 - The recommendation to reevaluate unscheduled teaching was not accepted by ARC as it is outside of the Reviewers' mandate - thus, this recommendation was not completed.

2. What overall impact has it had on the Unit's programs?

The impact has been to guide the continuous review of the program for efficiencies and advances to keep the program as the best in the country.

3. Is the Unit adopting a process of continuous quality improvement for its programs?
The Department is absolutely adopting a process of continuously working towards quality improvements for the program. Please see also the answer to #5 below.
4. How well do the programs now align with Brock University strategic priorities?
The Department aligns well with multiple strategic priorities of the institution. For instance, the Department fits well within the priority of offering “a broad spectrum of health and well-being disciplines.” Additionally, the Department is involved in the “institutional approach to improving student experience” with an imbedded experiential learning approach throughout the four years of the program, with the development of partnerships and an emphasis on capstone courses.
5. How does this review and its results position the programs as the Unit moves into the next review cycle?
The Department is involved in the priority of “career preparation” with a continuous review and the addition of courses that relate to new areas in the field (such as analytics and digital communications); in addition to providing students regular networking opportunities via guest speakers in classes and the annual Sport Management alumni day events. Further, the program is aligned with “high-impact practices” as each student receives multiple opportunities to be involved in seminars and labs, collaborative projects, participate in research, service learning, international exchanges, field courses and internships, as well as capstone courses. Finally, the program strongly promotes the priority for “experiential opportunities” throughout the four years of the program.

The Department is preparing to develop a curriculum map to aid in the next review cycle.

The Department of Sport Management has worked to understand and respond to the recommendations and is situated well for the next review in 2021/22.

D. ARC Final Summary

In final summary of the 2013/14 cyclical academic review of the programs offered by the Department of Sport Management, ARC has determined the following:

1. The Reviewers’ Recommendations have been addressed satisfactorily.
2. The Unit has established a direction for next steps as it prepares for the next review cycle.
3. The Unit has achieved a broad-based, reflective and forward-looking self-assessment.