

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC
MEMORANDUM

To: Senate

From: J.M. Munro, Vice-President, Academic

Date: July 9, 1993

Subject: External Review - Department of Psychology

Attached for the information of Senate is a summary of the external review of the Department of Psychology which was carried out in April, 1992. The report and the response of the Department were reviewed by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning at its meeting on July 7, 1993 and the Committee approved a motion to receive the report. The full report and the response by the Department are available from the Secretary of Senate for senators to review.

The review team had the following membership:

Chair: Dr. Terrence P. Hogan
Professor and Vice-President (Research and External Programs)
The University of Manitoba

Members: Dr. Robert S. Lockhart
Professor
University of Toronto

Dr. Sandra W. Pyke
Professor and Dean of Graduate Studies
York University

Dr. Phil Winne of the Faculty of Education was the internal member of the committee.



External Review - Department of Psychology March, 1992

Summary

The report indicates that the Department is regarded as an important Department both inside and outside the University. The Department's undergraduate programs and service teaching are highly valued, and the Department is seen as a key research unit in the University. In general terms, the review committee noted that the size of the faculty was marginally adequate for the tasks required of them; they also expressed concern about computing resources and the extent to which the Department is being served by the new distributed computing strategy. Library resources were also of concern to the review committee. The external reviewers recommended attention to the following areas:

Undergraduate Program - the reviewers supported the Department's progress towards increased structure of the undergraduate curriculum; they addressed the issue of the lack of pre-requisites for many upper level courses, an initiative which the Department has moved to address with recent curriculum changes. In addition, the committee suggested that the Department should consider ways to broaden the basis of teaching assessment away from reliance on student evaluations. Since the review, the Department's Undergraduate Studies Committee has discussed suggestions for including external evaluations and other measures. The Department has considered the recommendations concerning the use of graduate students as teaching assistants and is considering the issues of training and evaluation carefully.

Graduate Program - the reviewers commented that the recent faculty hiring has strengthened the graduate programs and there is an uneven distribution of graduate student supervision in the Department. Initiatives under consideration to define specific areas of concentration within experimental psychology, such as developmental psychology, were noted by the review committee. The Experimental Program Committee is undertaking an examination of the structure of the program and has developed a weekly seminar series and an e-mail forum, in addition to planning workshops on publishing and grant writing.

Academic Staff - the recent hiring of a number of new high calibre and energetic faculty has caused some tensions in the department. The value of all faculty contributions needs to be clearly addressed and understood. The reviewers noted that fewer than one third of the 25 senior faculty currently hold a research grant from a major granting agency, and encouraged more faculty to seek external research grants. Concern was also expressed about off-campus consulting and clinical responsibilities of some members which take them away from active

participation in departmental activities. As part of a broader concern for communication between faculty and between faculty and graduate students, the committee recommended that the Department should reinstitute a regular colloquium series.

Sexual Harassment and Discrimination - serious issues of sexual harassment and discrimination arose in a graduate student survey immediately prior to the review. At the request of the University, one of the reviewers undertook a separate investigation and made a series of recommendations concerning harassment and discrimination. The Department has subsequently responded by undertaking many of the suggestions, including scheduling educational and awareness sessions, circulating the Canadian Psychological Association's policy statement concerning harassment, and setting up a special ad hoc committee chaired by the University's Harassment Policy Coordinator to deal with issues.

Space - the reviewers noted the lack of common space which might encourage interaction and communication between department members. In addition, the committee indicated that there may have been bias in the allocation of offices, and the Department has put in place a more representative process for space allocation.

Departmental Governance - a new process for selecting members for departmental committees was suggested by the reviewers and has been adopted by the Department. The reviewers also encouraged a greater amount of information be provided to staff and students about decisions and the reasons upon which they are based.

PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT REVIEW SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

The following report details the results of the external review of the Department of Psychology at Simon Fraser University. The review committee was made up of the following:

Dr. Terrence P. Hogan,
Professor and Vice-President (Research and External Programs)
The University of Manitoba

Dr. Robert S. Lockhart,
Professor
University of Toronto

Dr. Sandra W. Pyke,
Professor and Dean of Graduate Studies
York University

The site visitors spent March 2-4, 1992 in the Department of Psychology. We would like to note the cooperation we received from members of the University administration and the various constituencies in the Department of Psychology during our visit. We were provided complete information about the Department; and both individuals and groups openly and frankly shared their views of the Department and the issues facing the Department with us. In particular, we would like to thank Dr. Roger Blackman, Chairperson of the Department of Psychology, for establishing our schedule and for providing us with whatever information or aid we required during our visit.

Our information base for the review consisted of the internal self-study of the Department, copies of the curricula vitarum of all of the academic staff in the Department, and a variety of descriptive materials concerning the University, the Department and its graduate programs. In addition, interviews were held by Committee members with the majority of the Psychology Department staff either individually or in groups, with representatives of the undergraduate and graduate student bodies, and with both the clerical and secretarial support staff and the technical support staff within the Department. Finally, the site visitors toured the whole of the Department including its basic space in the academic complex, the new space for the psychological clinic operated by the Department and the animal research space in the animal care facility on campus. In addition, the site visitors were given a tour of the space recently made available to Professor H. Weinberg in Discovery Park, a research park adjacent to the Simon Fraser University campus.

This report is primarily structured around certain major issues that evolved during the site visit. Prior to our discussion of these major issues, other elements in the "Charge to the Psychology Review Committee" that were presented to us will be discussed more briefly under "General Comments."

I. GENERAL COMMENTS

The Psychology Department at Simon Fraser University is a large and important department in the context of that University. The size of its staff and student body place it amongst the largest academic departments in the University. Its importance to the University is seen not only in its size but in the perceptions of the Department held by other parts of the University and by the general community. The Department was described as "one of the best" in the University by one of the University's administrators. The Department's undergraduate programs are both highly valued and have large enrolments. It is a primary source of service courses to many other departments and faculties in the University. In addition, the Department is seen as a key research unit in the University in regard both to the grants and research contracts it receives and its research output in terms of publications in refereed journals and presentations at prestigious academic conferences. In general, the Department is respected both inside and outside of the University and this respect has been earned by its members and students. This overall positive view of the Department should be kept in mind by readers as they examine subsequent portions of this report that examine areas where improvements in the Department's functioning might be achieved.

The Department's faculty as a group are competent and well-trained. The size of the faculty, however, is at best marginally adequate to meet the needs placed upon them. While the new staff recently added to the Department are clearly of some help, the increase in the growth of the staff complement has lagged behind the increase in student numbers both at the graduate and undergraduate levels. While the issue of the relationship and integration of new staff members into the rest of the Department will be dealt with in greater length later in the report, there is little doubt that the competencies of the new staff as a group are clear and have served to improve the Department. The faculty members as a whole are meeting an immense teaching demand with hard work and dedication. As well, research productivity and the amounts of monies being received for the support of research externally are reasonably good. At the same time, there are great differences between various members of the Department both in terms of their teaching loads and, in particular, in regard to their research productivity. While this is not totally atypical in a large department, it certainly is a problem that was brought to our attention with some frequency.

The administrative, secretarial and technical support staff complement is in the average to above-average range when compared to departments in other

comparable institutions. While some individuals remarked to us about the lack of certain types of expertise in the current support staff, there generally was praise for the support staff and for the contributions being made by all of the support staff groups to the development of the Department.

The relationships of the Department of Psychology with individuals and groups both within Simon Fraser University and outside of the University appear to be quite good. Members of the Department appear to be doing their fair share in regard to University service and governance and, as well, members of the Department appear to be valued as scholars and as professionals by members of the greater Vancouver community.

A number of comments were made to us concerning the adequacy both of the library and of the computing resources in the University. Both of these key areas of academic support received criticism from academic staff, undergraduate and graduate students, and, to a lesser degree, support staff. The Department itself is reasonably well-served in terms of numbers of personal computers. There is some question, however, about how well the Department is being served by the new distributed computing strategy of the University administration. We certainly received complaints about network adequacy, the lack of access to mainframe computing and the incompatibility of computer systems both within the Department and in the Department's interaction with the University computing environment. While the site visitors believe that some of these complaints are due to the implementation of the change-over in computing environments in the University, some of them are also more basic and likely should be examined in discussions between the Department and the central authorities.

The library also was a source of concern to many people, in particular, graduate students. This is touched on later in the section of the report concerning graduate programs but should be noted in a general sense as well. The perception of most of the students to whom we talked as well as several of the faculty is that the Simon Fraser library does not meet the needs of psychological researchers to any reasonable extent. This affects not only those individuals with active research programs (in fact, it may affect them less than others as their operating grants may serve as a cushion) but is a particular problem for graduate students and senior undergraduates, such as those in the honours program. Most people viewed the library at the University of British Columbia as the "real" library that serves their needs. While this might be acceptable if UBC were handier to SFU, it is not. Hence, students and staff are faced either with a lengthy commute to the UBC campus or to inter-library loan which while effective puts a time lag into accessing most library materials. There were particular vexations noted by students in regard to how materials can be obtained from the UBC library and how they are to be returned. If the UBC library is to continue to be a major source of research materials, more efficient methods of transporting materials have to be developed to serve the SFU student body. While not currently at a crisis point, the University needs to consider carefully how well the library and

the computing centre are serving graduate students and active researchers. It is clear that a number of serious problems currently exist in both of these areas.

II. UNDERGRADUATE MATTERS

Psychology at SFU suffers from the problem of large undergraduate enrolments as do most psychology departments in North America. Also common is the fact that many of these enrolments are students whose specialty is something other than psychology. At SFU, for example, 50% of upper level enrolments are non-psychology students. We heard some complaints from undergraduates majors of being unable to get into seminar courses, with preference sometimes being given to non-psychology students. Although these problems are common to psychology departments, two circumstances at SFU make the situation more difficult than at most universities.

1. The Tutorial System

This admirable system is an integral part of the founding philosophy (and even the architecture) of Simon Fraser and we are certainly not about to suggest its abandonment. It is a system, however, that is acutely sensitive to enrolment pressures and thus poses special problems for the SFU Psychology Department. Under these circumstances, there is a cost to such a system beyond the obvious ones of money and space.

There is a cost to the graduate program. As mentioned elsewhere, the need for teaching assistantships to support the undergraduate tutorial system has a strong steering effect on the graduate program. TAs provide a means of financial support for graduate students that seems to have helped undermine the motivation to provide graduate students with Research Assistantships. Experience in undergraduate teaching is a desirable part of graduate training but at SFU it would appear to occupy more graduate student time than is optimal.

The heavy reliance on graduate students as TAs creates certain difficulties for undergraduate teaching itself. There are problems of unevenness in the aptitude, experience, and motivation of graduate student TAs, a problem that is especially apparent in laboratory classes and large courses with many TAs operating in parallel. In some cases, training TAs is time-consuming for instructors. In general, the training of TAs is a problem that warrants attention. Some undergraduates felt that too much responsibility is sometimes given to TAs, especially in matters of grading.

Apart from exercising more selectivity in the use of tutorials, the only solution to this problem involves either resources or substantial reductions in enrolment. Neither of the latter solutions seems realistic in the near future.

2. The Lack of Pre-requisites in Many Upper Level Courses

This situation in conjunction with the unilateral restrictions imposed by some programs (Criminology was the one most frequently mentioned) results in what has been termed an "underflow." The underflow consists of students who have been excluded from their program of choice because of their low academic standing and who enrol in Psychology courses often in the hope that by so doing they will be able to improve their grades and then be readmitted to their preferred program. This strategy is possible because Psychology has no corresponding restriction, and because its upper level courses have few pre-requisites. Not only are classes thereby overcrowded, the underflow represents students who presumably have lower grade point averages and are typically less committed to the discipline.

3. The Issue of Undergraduate Course Pre-requisites

A partial solution to this problem advocated by some is to impose tighter pre-requisites on 300-level and 400-level courses. The question of pre-requisites, however, raises deeper issues than that of controlling class sizes. Controlling enrolments by the use of pre-requisites in the absence of a sound pedagogical rationale is a questionable practice. In fact, differences of opinion within the department on the question of pre-requisites have less to do with class size than with different views about the goals of undergraduate education. The core issue concerns the relationship between undergraduate teaching and research.

The question of course pre-requisites and program structure is a source of tension within the department. SFU has a tradition of placing a strong emphasis on teaching. Some members of the department feel that this emphasis on teaching is threatened by new faculty who are seen as wanting to shift the balance away from teaching and onto research. On the other side, we heard expressed the view that too much of the undergraduate teaching at SFU follows a "junior college" model rather than presenting psychology as a rigorous research-based scientific discipline.

The distinction between teaching and research can never be a sharp one. There is some justification for the claim that at the university level, high quality teaching presupposes the teacher's active involvement in research and that the lack of such an involvement communicates itself to students in a perceived lack of commitment to, and enthusiasm for, the subject matter. On the other hand, students also complain about the attitude of instructors for whom teaching seems to be an unwelcome intrusion into their research activities. We heard expressions of both these sentiments, the former mainly from graduate students, the latter from undergraduates.

In analyzing this problem, it is important to distinguish two aspects. The first concerns the relative weighting of excellence in teaching versus research

achievement in matters such as annual salary increments, tenure, and promotions. This does not seem to be the main issue; we found general agreement that undergraduate teaching is important and we did not hear the view that an increased emphasis on research was to be achieved at the expense of down-playing the role of undergraduate teaching. The critical issue concerns the matter of course content and the closely related matter of what kind of teaching will count as excellent. That is, the debate seems not to be over the importance of undergraduate teaching as such, but rather over what style of teaching should be valued, what kind of courses should be offered, and the degree of structure that the undergraduate curriculum should have. In its crudest form, this issue pits a "general education" or "liberal arts" model of the undergraduate curriculum against one that is more tightly structured and more oriented towards research and research training.

Some members of the department feel satisfied with things as they stand, apart perhaps from some minor adjustments. Others feel that the undergraduate curriculum is too "junior college" in its orientation and that the style of teaching most rewarded is whatever proves entertaining among undergraduates. On the other side, the view was expressed that the curriculum and teaching methods should not be overly weighted towards the very small minority of students who plan to go on to graduate school.

These issues are the subject of current discussion within the SFU department and progress towards their resolution is being made, although perhaps less quickly than some would like. Any solution requires a distinction between the needs of the three groups of undergraduates that enrol in psychology courses: non-majors, majors who are not honours students and, of course, honours students.

In serving the needs of non-majors within the context of the Faculty of Arts curriculum, Psychology has a responsibility to offer courses that will add breadth to the education of students from other programs. It is reasonable that such courses should have few pre-requisites. The 100-level "issues" course is a good example of a general interest course, but clearly there might be a selection of upper level courses as well. More controversial are course requirements for majors who are not honours students. How research-oriented should their curriculum be? In contrast, it is relatively non-controversial that honours students, typically aiming at graduate school admission, should have a program with a strong methodological and research orientation. Majors are unlikely to go on to do graduate work. But many faculty members seem to hold the view that although they may not continue into graduate work, these students have chosen psychology as their area of specialization and that a strong case exists for a program with a more hierarchical structure through more course pre-requisites. A reasonable supporting argument is that although most majors may never conduct research, they should have a firm grounding in the methodological skills

needed to evaluate research and to appreciate the nature of psychology as a scientific discipline.

In sum, it is essential to recognize the legitimacy of the diversity represented by the interests of three groups. One suggestion is that the Department explore ways of introducing increased structure into parts of the undergraduate program through greater "streaming" of the undergraduate curriculum. By streaming, we mean courses and course sequences designated for each of the three groups. Whereas there may be some (perhaps considerable) overlap of courses available to the three groups, the overlap would not be complete. The educational needs of the non-specialist must be recognized in courses with appropriate content and few pre-requisites. But psychology majors, even those who do not plan to enter graduate school, should receive training in the basic research methodologies of the discipline in which they have chosen to specialize, and it seems reasonable for upper level courses for such students to require such training as pre-requisites.

4. Teaching Assessments

Several of the recently appointed faculty expressed dissatisfaction over the way in which teaching is assessed, particularly over the fact that teaching evaluations are based almost exclusively on undergraduate ratings. It was felt by some faculty members that such ratings often reflect little more than popularity based on the entertainment value of lectures and are too prone to the influence of factors such as the generosity of the instructor in grading. Some also felt that insufficient weight was given to the amount and quality of research supervision in directed study courses and the like. Consideration should be given to ways of broadening the basis of teaching assessment.

III. GRADUATE PROGRAM IN PSYCHOLOGY

The graduate program in the Department of Psychology is bifurcated into two quite different programs (reminiscent of the traditional schism between clinical and experimental psychology), each with its own set of concerns.

1. Quality

A number of recent hires in the department have strengthened the faculty complement considerably and have contributed to further enhancement of the quality of both the experimental and clinical graduate programs. In addition to faculty resources, another index of graduate program quality is the time taken for students to complete their graduate degree requirements. Although masters students in psychology have a shorter average time to completion than most masters programs in the University, 2.7 years (8.2 semesters, Table 5.1 of the Internal Report) is not exceptionally fast. The average time taken to complete the doctoral program at 5.7 years (17.1 semesters, Table 5.2 of the

Internal Report) is quite comparable to the average for psychology doctoral students in the Ontario university system. Yet another measure of quality is the assessment of external examiners of the dissertations produced by the students in the program. The Dean of Graduate Studies observed that the comments of external examiners are almost uniformly laudatory.

As a consequence of various improvements over the past few years, there is now a very consistent and clear perception, both within the program and beyond, that the clinical program is of high quality. Contributing to or supporting this perception is the fact that, given the very large applicant pool, the program can be highly selective in admitting candidates and once admitted, the number of students completing the program is reasonably good (low attrition rate). Also contributing to this positive perception is the success of the program in achieving accreditation from both the Canadian Psychological Association and the American Psychological Association. Further, the recent creation of the Clinical Psychology Centre is seen as a enormous boon to the program.

In contrast, the experimental program is considered to be weaker, in part as a consequence of: 1) attracting a smaller number of outstanding applicants; 2) its heterogenous (apparently less structured) character; 3) longer time taken by students to complete all degree requirements; and 4) the small number of graduands obtaining tenure track positions. The differential popularity of clinical versus other areas of psychological specialization is not peculiar to Simon Fraser and should not in and of itself be viewed as a consequence of quality differences. In addition, the average GRE scores (Advanced form) of admitted students reveal that the experimental and clinical students are more or less equivalent on this measure (Internal Report). With respect to structure (point 2 above), there is some interest among members of the experimental program in developing more clearly defined areas of concentration or fields or foci under the experimental umbrella, or perhaps creating new free-standing programs equivalent to the clinical program (eg., a developmental program). Impediments to such an initiative are difficult to identify but there seems to be an assumption that a critical mass of interlocking faculty research interests is an essential prerequisite. Certainly there is sufficient faculty strength to sustain a graduate program in developmental psychology and this would appear to be an appropriate initiative to pursue. No doubt additional applications from good quality candidates would be attracted were developmental psychology to be identified as a separate and distinct graduate program on a par with the experimental and clinical programs.

2. Load

Sizeable differences between the clinical and experimental programs exist with respect to work load, for both faculty and students. The clinical program has imposed a significantly greater number of requirements on students. If the calendar description is accurate, it appears that clinical masters students in the

two years of the masters program, must complete 16 courses in addition to the thesis. By contrast, experimental masters students must complete 6 courses plus a thesis. This differential extends into the doctoral program as well. Although the clinical students were well aware of this differential and regarded their work loads as extremely heavy, there did not seem to be any strong desire to reduce requirements. And, if requirements were restricted in some way, this might impact negatively on accreditation renewal. Contributing to the heavy work load is the program decision to require doctoral candidates coming into the program with masters degrees from other universities, to complete masters level courses in addition to the regular doctoral requirements. This suggests that the program has reservations about the merits or quality or appropriateness of masters level training in psychology as provided in other universities. Given this orientation in combination with the design of the clinical program as a relatively seamless progression from the undergraduate degree to the Ph.D., it may be preferable to restrict admission of external candidates to the masters level.

Clinical faculty are clearly stretched given the necessity for servicing the myriad graduate courses and the supervisory responsibilities for a significantly larger student complement for both thesis/dissertation research and clinical case work. Fewer than a third of the faculty have responsibility for about 60% of the students. Interestingly, reducing enrolment or limiting the number of supervisees held little appeal to faculty. Rather, implementation of some form of teaching credit for supervisory activities was seen as a way of responding to the heavy demands. Nevertheless, there are great inequities in numbers of students supervised with some faculty supervising as many as 10 or 12 students while others supervise none or one. Understandably, there is reluctance to admit experimental students into clinical courses and this is a bone of contention for some of the students.

3. Financial Support

It is difficult to determine, from the data provided, the average amount of financial support allocated or available to the graduate students. It is not clear whether any students are unfunded although given the number of teaching assistantships available, this would seem to be unlikely. As is the case for most if not all graduate programs in psychology, the principal source of internal support is via teaching assistantships. The stipends described appear to be roughly comparable to what is allocated for teaching assistantships in the Ontario university system. Detailed information permitting comparisons on funding variables in graduate psychology programs across the country are not available, however, the funding described in the Internal Report appears to be appropriate and students did not complain about inadequate levels of support.

4. Comprehensives

Another area of difference between the two graduate programs concerns the design of comprehensives. Among clinical students, comprehensives are a source of considerable anxiety. They perceive inequities here both across the programs and within the clinical program itself.

5. Supervisors/Supervision

Assignment/selection of supervisors is perceived as problematic by some students. A few students have experienced difficulties in arranging a supervisor switch and hence other students are reluctant to attempt a change even when current arrangements are unsatisfactory. Students must be reassured that assigned supervisors are truly temporary and that students have the right and are encouraged to establish the most appropriate supervisory relationships possible within the constraints of research interest, faculty availability and the like.

Inequities in supervisory load and the absence of a formal system for some form of recognition of supervisory responsibilities in the teaching load computation have been alluded to earlier. Faculty also note a failure to include supervision responsibilities (and to evaluate individual supervision practices) in considerations of salary adjustment, merit assessment, and so on.

Students and some faculty report a lack of commitment to the supervisory process on the part of some professors who are rarely on campus and/or who are unavailable during the summer. Some of these difficulties might be ameliorated through the development and adoption of supervision guidelines which would define in general terms, at least minimal expectations for both students and faculty. This is a project which may be pursued at the national level by the Canadian Association of Graduate Schools.

In the past, all supervisory committees for doctoral students included an expert on statistical design and analysis. Although the rationale for this regulation is very sensible and persuasive, the department simply does not have the requisite faculty resources to sustain it given the size of the graduate program. As noted in the Internal Report, regulations have been changed in an effort to correct this major workload imbalance.

6. Communication

In spite of the wealth of orientation materials provided to students, they complain that communication on a number of issues is "opaque." To illustrate, they regard the process of assigning ranks for scholarship purposes as quite mysterious. Similarly, clinical students fail to understand why they are not allowed to see their scores on the comprehensives. And, some students report that often parts of meetings are held in camera and although the students are

legitimate members of the committee in question, they are not allowed to remain for the discussion nor are they informed of the decisions made at the meetings.

It is important that the faculty meet with the students and clarify these matters. A sufficient level of detail in written materials must be provided so that potential sources of ambiguity are eliminated. In the case of in camera meetings, perhaps, as a minimum, the agenda items could be identified. In this regard, the Committee was pleased to note plans for revision of the graduate program brochure which is out-of-date.

IV. ACADEMIC STAFF

1. Appointments -- New and Old

The Psychology Department has made eight (nine if R. Mistlberger is included) new appointments in the past four years. All these new appointees are of the highest calibre and are energetic researchers who will greatly strengthen the research reputation of the Department. SFU is to be congratulated on what has clearly been a highly successful period of faculty recruitment. The creation of so many new positions in so short a time has, however, created something of a "generation gap" in the Department. Although many departments across Canada suffer from a similar generation gap created by low levels of hiring over the period that spans the late 1970s through the 1980s, the SFU Psychology Department presents something of an extreme case. The median year of appointment of the 25 faculty, excluding those recently hired, is 1973. Apart from the recent hirings, only four appointments had been made since 1977. The situation at SFU is not without its problems. In our discussion with faculty and graduate students, we were repeatedly made aware of a number of sources of tension between the recently hired faculty and those of longer standing.

The tension has several dimensions but its major source is the perception on the part of recent appointees that the entrenched tradition of the Department is one that undervalues research. As the major source of evidence, they point to what they consider to be a lack of research activity among many of the more senior faculty. There are, of course, many notable exceptions to this generalization. But, that said, it is possible to point to symptoms (of which recently hired faculty seem to be acutely aware) that support the perception. The record of promotion is unimpressive: only 10 of the 21 faculty appointed 15 years ago or more have the rank of full professor. Several faculty members pointed out that very few Ph.D. graduates over the past decade or so have obtained academic appointments. A further point is the relatively low rate of external grant support, a matter discussed at greater length later in the report.

A question we asked ourselves as site visitors was why this situation was the source of such intense concern among recently appointed faculty. Most departments have some proportion of faculty, often senior, who are less than energetic researchers, but their fate is usually to be ignored rather than becoming a focus of tension. Furthermore, it should be noted that the above points notwithstanding, most faculty have a considerable involvement in some form of research. Nor is it the case that the energy and ambitions of the younger faculty are unappreciated. We heard many senior faculty express the view that they welcomed the influx of new appointees and the energetic research orientation they have brought to the Department, even if, as one person observed, the Department might as a consequence be "a less gentle place."

The answer to our question would seem to lie in several points. There is the perception that it is the relatively inactive researchers who also hold much of the power and who have the greatest investment in the status quo. A second issue is that of sexual harassment and gender discrimination, a matter that is clearly of deep concern to the younger faculty. There is also the perception that the undervaluing of research is reflected in the undergraduate program curriculum and in the basis on which teaching is evaluated. This matter is also discussed elsewhere. But perhaps the chief source of the intensity of feelings was the perception that the reward structure within the Department does not reflect research achievement. Annual salary step-increases, allocation of resources such as summer challenge research studentships, and other forms of internal research support are seen as being allocated in a way that does not reflect, and therefore, does not reward research achievement. Put bluntly, the view expressed on several occasions was that in terms of these rewards "it doesn't matter whether you do research or not; there are no real consequences of not doing research or of never being on campus."

As a review panel, we do not have the data necessary to evaluate the details of this claim. But regardless of whether the perception is valid or an exaggeration based on a few atypical isolated instances, the perception that excellence in research is not rewarded in itself is an important reality and constitutes a problem that needs urgent attention.

2. Other Matters Pertaining to Research Activity

Research Grants

Fewer than one-third of the 25 senior faculty currently hold a research grant from a major granting agency. Some faculty are able to conduct publishable research without the benefit of such grants, although the resulting publications tend not to be in the major mainstream refereed journals. Internal means of support for research is an enviable resource, often allowing a researcher to pursue lines of research that are unfashionable or high-risk. Indeed, a number of senior faculty expressed their appreciation of the fact that SFU allowed

them to pursue their own line of enquiry without undue external pressure. Over-reliance on internal support, however, is not without risk. Not the least is that internal support is likely to be less available in the future than it has been in the past. More important, application for research grants to major agencies such as NSERC or SSHRC exposes both the research proposal and the applicant's publication record to the scrutiny of a broader peer review than is typically the case with internally allocated funds. Although there must always be allowance for individual cases and special circumstances, especially for new faculty, a good argument can be made for a policy that links internal awards to the parallel application for external funds. It is disheartening to those who work to obtain outside funds if they see internal resources being allocated to colleagues who have made no such effort.

A further aspect concerning external grant support relates to the support of graduate students. In most departments, grant funds are a major (often the major) source of support for graduate students. At Simon Fraser the use of undergraduate RAs seem more common. This strategy is economical and undoubtedly beneficial to undergraduates but it forces graduate students to seek income from sources unrelated to research and this in turn extends the time necessary to complete the degree.

Post-doctoral Fellows

The research atmosphere in many departments is strengthened by the ability of its senior members to attract and support Post-doctoral Fellows and Research Associates, usually in conjunction with a major grant. The Simon Fraser Department would seem to have few researchers in these categories.

Colloquia

A weakness in the intellectual life of the SFU department is the absence of a regular department colloquium series. Some faculty members we asked attributed the failure of past efforts to hold regular colloquia to a lack of interest reflected in poor attendance. We recommend that serious consideration be given to the possibility of re-instituting a regular colloquium series. Given the limited funds available, such a series may have only occasional outside speakers (perhaps arranged in coordination with UBC), but if intra-departmental "in-house" speakers from other Simon Fraser Departments and from UBC were used, it could result in a successful weekly colloquium. A key to the success of such a series is that (a) it become a regular part of people's schedules and (b) that it successfully serve the social function of bringing together faculty and students (especially graduate students and honours undergraduates). It seems likely that many of the intra-departmental tensions, so apparent in our discussions with faculty and students, are exacerbated by the lack of a regular opportunity for research-focused departmental meetings. On this matter, the question of departmental space, discussed elsewhere in this report, becomes relevant. Departmental

retreats have served a useful purpose but they are infrequent and can do little to foster understanding and mutual respect among faculty members for each other's research interests.

3. Off-Campus Activities

A serious concern was expressed both by a number of faculty and graduate students about the physical availability of a small number of senior faculty in the Department on campus. Essentially the concern is that some faculty members are not "pulling their weight" in Department activities and in their personal scholarly and research careers. Two scenarios were posited by individuals who talked to the site visitors. The first is that these faculty have essentially pre-retired from their positions; hence, they are now fulfilling only their basic teaching requirements and are doing relatively little else as members of the Department. The second was a focus on individuals who are spending large amounts of time away from campus either consulting or doing clinical work. In either situation, the faculty members involved are relatively unavailable to students and, as well, have external interests that dominate their professional and personal lives and which are in clear competition with the University for the faculty members' time, attention and professional responsibilities.

The site visitors do not believe that it is their role either to make judgements about individual faculty members or to deal with significant personnel issues. At the same time, we would like to underline the fact that these concerns are held fairly widely amongst the group with whom we talked and in our view this is an issue which should be examined by responsible individuals within the Department. We also view a homogeneous model for a faculty member's workload as unrealistic. Some faculty members will put more time on teaching than they do on research and vice versa. We do believe strongly, however, that full-time faculty members should be serving the Department and the University on a full-time basis even though the balance of activities might vary from one person to the other. At the same time, we believe it is appropriate and often academically helpful for individuals to use their professional and scientific expertise in serving the community and recognize that this type of service is often done for remuneration. We would note again, however, that full-time faculty members owe the bulk of their professional time to the University and that the University should not be seen as a supplementary activity for those individuals holding full-time appointments.

V. SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND DISCRIMINATION

A survey conducted by the graduate student caucus included two questions dealing with sexual harassment. Of the 100 students in the program, 50 completed and returned the questionnaire. Approximately 25% of the respondents (12 or 13 students) reported experiencing some form of sexual discrimination or sexual harassment. It seems likely that the proportion of students exposed to sexually harassing experiences is an underestimate given the high level of anxiety about the consequences of disclosure. Indeed, some students commented verbally that they did not respond to these questions for fear of being identified and subjected to subsequent reprisals. Additionally, some students may have failed to respond to these items because of a sense that such reporting would not yield any positive outcome--i.e., the problem is perceived as intractable. In any event, as described in the summary report of the survey results, the types of harassing behaviours observed or experienced included: "faculty telling sexist jokes in classes;" "suggestive and inappropriate sexual comments" from supervisors; "sexual pursuit of students;" and "personal and inappropriate comments regarding appearance."

Although the graduate student survey questionnaire did not specifically probe for instances of sex-based discrimination, it seems clear from the responses in general that there is a perception that faculty members are more supportive of male than female students (especially in the area of future career opportunities). There is also a sense that there is a lack of recognition and/or understanding about differential commitments and concerns (eg., the significance of family issues for women students).

At a meeting with a small number of honours students, we specifically asked about the students' experience or perception of so-called "chilly climate" factors in the context of their undergraduate program participation. ("Chilly climate" factors are those aspects or characteristics of the academic environment which tend to marginalize or alienate women such as, ignoring women in the classroom, expression of stereotypes or demeaning attitudes toward women, use of sexist language, etc.) Although some examples were provided, the students did not see this as a big issue, regarding SFU as no better or worse than any other academic institution.

Women faculty clearly recognized the difficulty of unequivocally labelling or identifying any given behaviour as sexist or discriminatory. Nevertheless, the number and nature of many of the incidents described support a conclusion that women professors are indeed both harassed and discriminated against. Women faculty observe or report one or more instances of: salary anomalies; sex differential in research start-up funds for new faculty; priority given to male colleagues in the assignment of available laboratory space; contributions or input at meetings ignored; support of male faculty in male/female disputes; the awarding of internal grants; favouritism of male faculty toward attractive female students; anecdotal accounts that feminist/women's studies content is not well-

received; and with the exception of a very recent exception, no women faculty are full professors. Some of the younger male faculty members were in full agreement with their female counterparts that sexist behaviour was not uncommon in the Department.

The observation of sexist and harassing behaviour and the experience of discrimination, in combination with other factors, have seriously eroded the trust and confidence of the younger faculty in the operation and governance of the department. Deprivation (eg., lack of research space) is sure to breed discontent but if discrimination is seen as a factor contributing to the deprivation, the effect is much more intense.

Individual faculty reactions and/or the stance of individual faculty on these issues varies considerably. There are the faculty who claim personal experience of gender discrimination and there are those who support these claims although not themselves recipients of or parties to discrimination. Other faculty appear to be completely nonplussed by the charges of sexual discrimination. In the case of some of those alleged to have behaved in a discriminatory fashion, it is clear that they view themselves as both unbiased and sensitive/responsive to women's issues. Still others, especially some of the more senior women faculty, are well aware of the "chilly climate" characteristics but are resigned and/or accepting and/or tolerant, in part because they have a longer time perspective and recognize the significant improvements in the status of women students and faculty that have occurred over the years (e.g., implementation of employment equity policies). In times past, concerns about sex-based discrimination and sexual harassment would have been dismissed out-of-hand. The seriousness with which the student survey results were treated was noted as a case in point. Some faculty are reluctant to apply the sexual harassment label to incidents and behaviours involving adults even when one of the adults is a student. Given an Ombudsperson as well as a Sexual Harassment Office at the University, some faculty have assumed that any difficulties in these areas would be and are handled elsewhere (a perception which appears to be inaccurate). Finally, there seems to be a category of faculty (which includes both women and men) who appear to lack even a modest appreciation of the issues. They can't understand what all the fuss is about. One male faculty member, who observed that he could see no evidence in the Department of any "chilly climate" features, went on to comment, "Women are so ready to become victims."

In general, there would seem to be sufficient evidence that both sexual harassment and gender discrimination are not rare events in the Psychology Department. There is a clear sense at least among more junior faculty that women don't get a fair shake and among the graduate students that although discrimination and harassment have been debilitating, disclosure will produce not resolution or respite but rather retribution and reprisal.

There is obviously a need at the faculty level for the introduction of some form of educational program on these issues. Further, a University, Faculty of Arts, Graduate Studies, and Department public statement on the importance of maintaining professional relationships between faculty and their students and the absolute unacceptability of other forms of relationships might help to protect future students from harassing experiences. Finally, special sessions should be held with the students to inform them of the options/services available through the Harassment Office and elsewhere and to provide them with a repertoire of coping strategies and behavioral alternatives designed to enhance their ability to deal with these situations in less damaging ways.

VI. SPACE

The Committee was told on several occasions during its site visit of the problems the Department of Psychology has with the amount and quality of space available to it. The space needs for the Department as explained to us were for research space, particularly for new faculty members, social space for graduate students and for the Department as a whole, and for conference room facilities. The site visitors are in substantial agreement with the notion that additional space is required for the Department. At the same time, the site visitors were impressed by the amount of space and the quality of the space already available to Department members and the new space that has come on stream within the last couple of years to the Department (for example, the space available to animal researchers in the animal holding facility, the new clinic, and the space being rented for activities in the Discovery Park). As well, there was some evidence in our minds of a dysfunctional distribution of space in the Department, some of which is not due to the Department but rather is related to the tutorial instruction program at the undergraduate level.

In discussing space with a number of individuals, a strong desire and high priority was given to obtaining space that was contiguous to the current space under the control of the Department. In our view, the contiguity of space holdings is desirable if it is possible. If non-contiguous space, however, is more readily available we would urge the Department to give this possibility (as it has in regard to animal and clinical space) its fullest consideration.

In the opinion of the site visitors, the need for an improved social and working climate in the Department should take a priority at this time over other space needs. In our view, it is vital that Department members and graduate students have space available to them in a lounge or a similar environment for the informal contacts that are so vital to professional and scientific discussions amongst colleagues. A number of faculty members told us that they use the Diamond Club for social space. We would only note that the environment of the Diamond Club could prove intimidating for some graduate students even if those students could afford to become members when living on a graduate student

budget. Similarly, a conference room for Department and committee meetings is sorely needed. The socialization of the Department is clearly being negatively affected by space constraints. For many staff and students the inavailability of space where they can visit informally with other students or with colleagues is a real detriment to both the education of students and the intellectual fermentation necessary for research to progress.

We recommend that the University administration give a high priority to allocating increased space to the Department of Psychology. In our view, the Department should consider giving precedence to lounge and conference space in their considerations of the allocation of space within the Department.

VII. DEPARTMENT GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

A significant number of concerns were noted by faculty members and students concerning the governance and administration of the Department. Most of these concerns were focused either on the degree of democratization of the Department and its procedures or on the "opaqueness" of a number of Departmental practices, procedures and decision-making processes.

The democratization issue largely focused on the fact that Departmental committee chairs (and possibly even their memberships) are selected by the chairperson of the Department as opposed to being elected either by the Department as a whole or by the membership of the committee. The general feeling of most of the staff and students who discussed this issue was that committee chairs and other similar positions should result from an electoral process rather than a selection process by the head. We would note in this regard that most of the input we received addressed the process of selection rather than the qualities of current or past committee chairs.

The "opaqueness" of practices and procedures essentially addressed the problem of access to information about how decisions are made. Examples that were brought to the attention of the site visitors included the hiring of sessional or part-time staff (how are they selected, using what criteria, with what sort of consultation), the determination of salaries for new staff (the concern being that of equity), the prioritization of research space, etc. Again, the concerns that were expressed did not always touch on the outcome of the decision process but rather on the openness of the environment in which the decision was made.

The site visitors recommend that the Department consider a greater democratization of its internal governance system, and, as well, the provision of as much information as is practicable to staff and student representatives on how decisions are made in the Department and why one process versus another is used by the Department administration in making these decisions.

Submitted by:

Dr. Terrence P. Hogan, Chairperson
Dr. Robert S. Lockhart
Dr. Sandra W. Pyke

April 29, 1992

PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

RESPONSE TO EXTERNAL REVIEW

1. GENERAL

1.1 In the prefatory section of their report, the external reviewers paint a broadly positive picture of the Psychology Department:

"...The Department's undergraduate programs are highly valued and have large enrolments. It is a primary source of service courses to many other departments and faculties in the University. In addition, the Department is seen as a key research unit in the University in regard both to the grants and research contracts it receives and its research output in terms of publications in refereed journals and presentations at prestigious academic conferences. In general, the Department is respected both inside and outside the University, and this respect has been earned by its members and students" (p.2).

The external review team did have some concerns about our programs, policies and practices, which they addressed in the remainder of their 19-page report. These concerns were only occasionally accompanied by suggestions for improvement; no "recommendations," as such, were offered. The Psychology Department offers the following responses to the reviewers' concerns and suggestions.

2. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

2.1 The problems with our undergraduate program identified by the external reviewers reflect in large part the openness of much of our curriculum. These problems include:

- "underflow" students who fail to meet the requirements of other programs;
- overcrowded courses;
- absence of streaming and prerequisites;
- inaccessibility of seminar courses to majors.

2.2 As acknowledged by the external reviewers, the Psychology Department had identified these problems prior to the external review, and was in the processes of adopting measures to redress them. Such measures, and more, have now been approved by Senate for implementation in 93-3. We have revised our undergraduate curriculum in ways designed to:

- create a more coherent course sequence that reflects the cumulative nature of knowledge in psychology;
- offer a representative set of courses that introduce the main areas of psychology to majors and non-majors;
- constrain the "underflow" problem;
- decrease the size of 300-level courses;
- increase the sophistication of students in 300-level courses;
- give upper-division priority access to psychology majors (or students willing to fulfill the requirements of at least a minor);
- rationalize our community college transfer credit system.

More specifically, PSYC 201 (Research Methods in Psychology) is now a prerequisite for all 300-level courses. Five new 200-level courses have been created, most transferred from the 300-level - (PSYC 221: Cognitive; PSYC 241: Abnormal; PSYC 250: Child; PSYC 260: Social; and PSYC 270: Personality). These, with our two Introductory Psychology courses, will provide the prerequisites for corresponding upper-level courses. We have added a breadth requirement: majors must complete one of PSYC 221, 280, and one of PSYC 241, 250, 260, 270, plus 30 credit hours of upper division courses, including PSYC 307 or 308 (this is over and above the requirement of PSYC 100, 102, 201 and 210).

2.3 The external reviewers commented on the varying views of faculty members on curriculum philosophy. Such divisions exist in all psychology departments; we believe that they are no more extreme in ours. Indeed, as a measure of consensus, 23/33 faculty surveyed after the curriculum changes responded positively to the statement "the proposed revisions will solve most problems" [in the undergraduate program]; another five were neutral.

2.4 A number of concerns about the tutorial system were expressed by the reviewers:

- the amount of time graduate students spend on TA work;
- reported unevenness in the quality of TA performance;
- the amount of responsibility given to TAs, especially in grading;
- TA training.

In response to these concerns, the departmental Undergraduate Studies Committee (UGSC) is (a) preparing a survey that will assess student satisfaction with their tutorial experience, (b) examining graduate student TA records, and (c) discussing ways of improving the tutorial system. Among the suggestions the UGSC are considering are the following:

- a system should be developed to offer training for TAs before and during their first tutorials;
- all graduate students who receive poor TA evaluations should be required to take remedial training before they are assigned additional TAs;
- a teacher-training course should be offered for graduate students.

2.5 The final set of problems relates to the assessment of faculty teaching, in particular an over-reliance on student evaluations. The UGSC is discussing the following suggestions with regard to these concerns:

- a survey of 4th-year undergraduate students regarding their needs and experiences;
- additional bases for evaluating teaching: external evaluations; evaluations of course materials; evidence of updating; information from TAs and graduate student supervisees; records of meetings with TAs and graduate students; and evidence of efforts to improve teaching.

3. GRADUATE PROGRAM

3.1 We agree with the reviewers' comments on the Experimental Program; it is not as strong as we would like, and over the past few semesters we have taken a number of steps to improve it. We have strengthened our recruitment efforts to admit more and better experimental students, both through the publication of an updated and more informative Graduate Program Brochure (this was underway at the time of the review), and through the use of personal interviews in the final stages of the graduate student admission process.

We are engaged in an active self-study of the Experimental Program, collecting information concerning the best programs in Canada to consider as models, as well as reviewing the structure of our current program. We also held a half-day faculty retreat in 93-1 to initiate the development of distinct Experimental Program streams involving specialized requirements. To contribute momentum to these discussions, the Experimental (Program) Committee has taken the following initiatives designed to raise the profile of the department's experimental researchers and to stimulate a greater sense of an active research community:

- During 93-1, a weekly seminar was held in which an experimental faculty member described current research activities and in which all experimental faculty and students discussed research values, policies and practices.
- An e-mail forum was established for the sharing of relevant information and opinion.
- Planning is underway for workshops on publishing in journals, getting an academic job, and writing successful grant proposals.

3.2 The reviewers recommended that graduate admissions be restricted to Master's candidates in light of our relatively seamless program design with respect to masters and doctoral requirements. This is consistent with existing policy in both programs, although each wishes to preserve the possibility of admitting the occasional doctoral student when a truly exceptional applicant is identified.

3.3 *New Guidelines for the Experimental Comprehensive Examinations* have been developed within the GSC, approved by the department, and circulated to all experimental students and faculty in order to clarify expectations of the nature and magnitude of the requirement, and to reduce the likelihood of inequities across the Experimental and Clinical Programs. Detailed comprehensive examination guidelines have existed for some time within the Clinical Program. In response to complaints noted in the external review from some clinical students who wanted to see their detailed comprehensive examination scores, the Clinical Program has changed the grade format to an S/U basis in order to reduce excessive grade-orientation among students.

3.4 Regarding graduate supervision, the reviewers observed that, even though all students are matched to a temporary supervisor at the time they are admitted, some students had difficulties obtaining a good continuing match with a faculty supervisor. This problem involves a relatively small number of students. The temporary assignment procedure is designed to allow transfers to occur easily when the student wishes, and students do make use of the procedure occasionally. The reviewers' concerns that some faculty members are not sufficiently available to their students is accepted as legitimate. Remedies are partly a matter for action by the Department Chair and the Department Tenure Committee (DTC), although in addition the GSC has developed Guidelines for Students and Supervisors that will outline in general terms the expectations for both.

3.5 Significant imbalances across faculty members in graduate student supervisory workloads were the subject of comment in the review. It was noted that affected faculty preferred to have this problem solved through receiving credit for their heavy supervisory workloads rather than through unduly restricting student numbers. This is a problem that has no simple fix. Nevertheless, discussions are underway, both in the Department and at the Faculty of Arts level, on a set of policies and procedures regarding faculty workload. The goal is to reduce the variation in overall workload across Psychology faculty. A greater weight will probably be accorded to student supervision.

3.6 The reviewers concluded that information about some matters was "opaque" to graduate students and recommended that faculty meet with graduate students to provide information. This criticism was received with some puzzlement. From Department's early days, graduate students have had formal representation on the GSC and on the Clinical Committee, and have been able to attend departmental meetings. Our graduate secretary is a full-

time employee who constantly provides help and information to students who seek it. A formal graduate orientation meeting is held each fall for new and returning students at which all key staff are introduced, their roles explained, and resources described. Information is provided concerning the criteria for graduate student participation in relation to open and closed department and committee meetings. This information has been freshly provided to the graduate students. The criteria and methods used in ranking Graduate Fellowship applications had already been under review in open meetings of the GSC. Details were distributed to all graduate students for information before the external review was conducted. As an annual routine the DA publishes a lengthy information document for all graduate students providing great detail about available resources and general operations, and this is regularly updated and distributed to all graduate students each fall.

3.7 The small number of graduate students supported by RAships, which drew comment from the reviewers, is a function of a number of factors, including graduate student preferences for the higher salaries of TAships. We established a central information service with the graduate secretary that each semester provides names of students who are interested in RA work and of faculty members with RA positions.

4. SPACE

4.1 The external review had two criticisms of space-related matters within the department. One was the lack of any common area where faculty and students can meet on an informal basis; the other was concern about the possibility of gender bias in the allocation of space.

4.2 Regarding the issue of common space, negotiations have been in hand with the Dean for some time to acquire space for a common room. These negotiations are continuing: at the moment, it appears likely that the department will acquire a common-room-cum-seminar-and-meeting-room within the next year.

4.3 Regarding the issue of gender bias in space allocation, it is true that during the recent rash of hirings the research space needs of some new women faculty were not accommodated rapidly enough. This delay had a negative impact on the research programmes of these faculty members, but it was generally accepted not to reflect intentional discrimination on gender lines. The Department in general

and its Space Committee in particular are committed to the principle of equity in the allocation of space. The only relevant criteria for allocation are the needs of the faculty member, the availability of space, and the needs of other members of the Department. In order to guard against the possibility of discrimination in space allocation in future, and against the perception of discrimination, the Department Chair will exercise critical attention to the allocations made by the Space Committee. We will also ensure that specific space assignments to newly appointed faculty will be made in writing.

5. DEPARTMENT GOVERNANCE

5.1 Having made a relatively large number of junior appointments in the past few years, the Department was faced with a dilemma in familiarizing these new faculty with departmental and university policies and practices. The most efficient way to achieve this goal was to involve new appointees in departmental administration. That, however, would have impeded their efforts to establish research programs, prepare courses, and develop instructional competence. In retrospect, we erred by giving these latter goals higher priority and failing to devise alternative means of educating new faculty in the ways of the department. We also have not moved far or fast enough, in the opinion of some, to modify administrative policy and practice in response to the fresh ideas and expectations of the new faculty members. Change is occurring in response to these pressures, and more can be expected when the current department chair hands over to his successor in 93-3.

5.2 We have responded to one specific issue raised by the reviewers. The membership of standing departmental committees, and in particular the committee chairs, are now chosen by the DTC.

6. HARASSMENT

6.1 In preparation for the external review, our graduate students conducted an extensive survey of the experiences and preferences of graduate clinical and experimental psychology students. Two of the questions asked were: "Have you experienced what you would consider to be blatant sexual harassment from faculty?" and "Have you experienced situations that were more subtle but in which you still felt a degree of sexual harassment from faculty?" Of about 100

graduate students polled, 50 responded to the questionnaire. Of these, about 25% (12-13 students) reported experiencing some form of sexual harassment. These findings, which were reported to the department about a week before the external review was due to start, warranted an immediate response.

The administration asked York University Graduate Studies Dean Sandra Pyke, a member of the external review team, to come early and stay late to hear from any students (or faculty and staff) who wished to talk about their sexual harassment concerns. In order to preserve confidentiality, arrangements were made for off-campus and telephone contact. Ten different students and faculty responded to the invitation to talk to Dr. Pyke. In addition, she met with the Director of the Counselling Service, the Coordinator of the Harassment Policy, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Director of Academic Relations, and the Director of Academic Planning Services.

The external review report included a brief section on sexual harassment and discrimination. The topic was more thoroughly addressed by Dr. Pyke in a separate 7-page report.

6.2 In response to these concerns, the Department established an *Ad Hoc Committee on Discrimination and Harassment* (AHCDH) to which were elected or selected two undergraduate students, two graduate students, two staff members and two faculty members. The Committee was chaired by Dr. Patricia O'Hagan, the University's Harassment Policy Coordinator. This Committee was asked to respond to the concerns raised during the external review regarding allegations of harassment and/or discrimination in the Psychology Department. The Committee has met several times, and is tackling the issues in a number of ways. One is through faculty/staff/student workshops. The first of these, on the topic of "boundary setting," was held on January 21st, 1993. In attendance were some 90% of available faculty and staff and more than 50% of available graduate students. Based in part on discussion at the workshop, a set of guidelines has been drafted covering the setting of boundaries in supervisory, instructional and other relationships. In separate referenda for faculty, staff and students, these guidelines were recently approved by more than 96% of those voting.

8.3 In other actions taken in response to recommendations in the Pyke report...

--- The University Harassment Policy Coordinator has met with Psychology graduate students as a group to discuss their concerns and explore ways of dealing with them.

- The University, through the Harassment Policy Coordinator, scheduled a number of educational or informational awareness sessions for faculty, staff and students that addressed the question: *What constitutes harassment and how can it be avoided and prevented?*
- The 1981 policy statement of the Canadian Psychological Association concerning harassment will be included in our Graduate Brochure and in material describing our programs to undergraduates.
- The Harassment Policy Coordinator will do a specific workshop as a part of departmental orientation for new graduate and honors students in the fall.
- More effort will be put into the existing "buddy system" for new graduate students.
- The CPA Guidelines for the Elimination of Sexual Harassment are being widely distributed.

9. OVERVIEW

9.1 The Department was dismayed that the external review not only included very few specific recommendations, but that it also lacked a summary. Since the tenor of many sections in the report was rather critical, it would have been useful to repeat the external reviewers' cautionary comment offered in the introduction to their report:

"This overall positive view of the Department should be kept in mind by readers as they examine subsequent portions of this report that examine areas where improvements in the Department's functioning might be achieved" (p.2).

\xrev7\depresf

