



OFFICE OF THE
VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC

TEL +1 778 782 3925
FAX +1 778 782 5876
sfu.ca/vpacademic

Simon Fraser University
Strand Hall 3100
8888 University Drive
Burnaby BC
Canada V5A 1S6

MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate

TEL

FROM: Peter Keller, Vice-President, Academic and Provost, and Chair, SCUP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Peter Keller".

RE: External Review Mid-Cycle Report for the Department of Psychology (SCUP 18-49)

DATE: December 11, 2018

TIME

At its December 5, 2018 meeting, SCUP reviewed the Mid-Cycle Report for the Department of Psychology which resulted from its 2015 external review. The report is attached for the information of Senate.



OFFICE OF THE
VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC

TEL +1 778 782 4636
FAX +1 778 782 5876
sfu.ca/vpacademic

Simon Fraser University
Strand Hall 3100
8888 University Drive
Burnaby BC
Canada V5A 1S6

MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Peter Keller, Chair, SCUP

TEL

FROM: Wade Parkhouse, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic

RE: External Review Mid-Cycle Report for the Department of Psychology

DATE: November 22, 2018

TIME

The External Review of the Department of Psychology was undertaken in April 2015. As per the Senate guidelines, the Unit is required to submit a mid-cycle report describing its progress in implementing the External Review Action Plan. The mid-cycle report, together with a copy of the Action Plan approved by Senate, and the mid-cycle report on the Unit's assessment of its Educational Goals are attached for the information of SCUP.

c: Deborah Connolly, Chair, Department of Psychology
Jane Pulkingham, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences



DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

DR. DEBORAH CONNOLLY,
CHAIR
Phone: 778-782-3250
Fax: 778-782-3427
Email: debc@sfu.ca
Website: www.sfu.ca/psychology

RCB 5245
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6
Canada

ATTENTION: Glynn Nicholls, Director, Academic
Planning and Quality Assurance

DATE: November 6, 2018

RE: Mid-Cycle Report for the Department of Psychology

Attached please find the Mid-Cycle Report for the Department of Psychology which details our progress with the Action Plan stemming from the 2015 External Review.

The assessment of our Educational Goals is also attached.

If you require any further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. Connolly".

Deborah Connolly, LL.B., Ph.D.
Chair

External Review Update for the Department of Psychology

Action	Progress Made
1. Programming	
1.1.1 Undergraduate	
<i>(Recommendations 3 and 12)</i> We will not plan for developing new undergraduate programs at this time, in accordance with the Reviewers' recommendation that no expansion in programming be contemplated unless demand and enhanced resources (principally faculty renewal) are present.	Since the date of these recommendations, we have hired two Research Faculty members and one Lecturer. During the same period, we lost one Research Faculty member to retirement (phased to Dec 2018) and another renegotiated his contract to work part-time for 3 years. In addition, three faculty members have been on Family Leave and another one is scheduled to begin Jan. 2019. The net effect is that we have not had an increase in faculty available to teach. Notwithstanding that, we have added new courses in response to student demand and faculty expertise, including: Indigenous People and Psychology, Political Psychology, Cultural Psychology, and Psychology and Environmental Sustainability. We are in the process of obtaining approval for an exciting new course based on experiential learning - select students who work in research labs will be eligible to obtain course credit for their work. Our new HQT Lecturer is also planning a course to train senior undergraduate students on research methodology consulting and tutoring.
Recent enrolment figures have confirmed that our BSc in Behavioural Neuroscience is a viable and growing program. We have commenced a process to address bottleneck issues within this unique program, particularly the pre-requisite	The prerequisite structure has been reviewed and amended to facilitate students' progress through the program. Until recently, all required courses in Psychology were taught on a

structure and required courses, and will work to improve access to the core courses. New language reflecting these improvements will appear in the next edition of the SFU Calendar.	regular basis by continuing faculty members. One of our faculty members who taught a core course in this program resigned effective August 2017 and we have not yet received approval to hire a replacement. Without a replacement, we will return to relying on sessional instructors to teach required courses in the Behavioural Neuroscience program. We continue to rely too heavily on sessional instructors for important courses.
• <i>(Recommendation 1)</i> We will work to streamline communication between staff tasked with administration/student advising for the Cognitive Science Program, and the Director (and Steering Committee) of the Cognitive Science Program. We will also arrange for periodic meetings with the Cognitive Science Program Steering Committee to discuss any matters of concern. However, the governance of the Cognitive Science Program is external to the Psychology Department -- it is an autonomous program within FASS -- and determinations about the long-term viability of the program lie with the CogSci Steering Committee and Dean of FASS, not the Psychology Department.	Transfer of management of the Cognitive Science Program to Psychology occurred February 6, 2015 shortly before the external reviewers' visit in April 2015. At that time, there was some uncertainty with respect to responsibilities, lines of communication, and resources. Many of these issues have been resolved. As this is a stand-alone program that comprises courses from a variety of departments across two faculties, administration of the program is complex. We continue to maintain open lines of communication to ensure students are well served. Until Aug 31, 2018 the Director of Cognitive Science was housed in Psychology, facilitating planning, communication, and administration of the program. As of September 1, 2018, the Director of Cognitive Science is in Math. So far, the administration has been smooth. We will continue to monitor moving forward.
• <i>(Recommendation 11)</i> Our plan for Education Goals and Assessment is appended. Faculty will continue to use innovative, pedagogically appropriate approaches to engage students - leading to students achieving the Educational Goals. With ever-increasing class sizes and shrinking resources (for TAs, temporary instruction, etc.), and with	Please see the attached report on Educational Goals. We have integrated several innovative, pedagogically appropriate, approaches to teaching including: skyping in content experts to allow students to interact with prominent scholars in the area;

fewer and fewer faculty members to share the teaching, innovation is driven by necessity as well as the desire of faculty members to become more effective educators.	team teaching where several faculty teach classes in their area of expertise; field schools (in preparation); providing course credit for hands-on research experience in faculty members' labs (in preparation); presenting innovative video demonstrations developed by faculty members; providing hands on training in EEG technology; and engaging with community collaborators to craft student assignments that will meet real-world needs. We are extremely proud of the creative and innovative approaches our faculty have developed to engage and teach students.
• <i>(Recommendation 11)</i> Assessment of the Educational Goals is a 'work-in-progress', with meetings already scheduled to create the necessary Department Policies for the first round of data collection from courses in the 2015/2016 academic year (as specified in the schedule supplied by the VPA's office). Department faculty members have self-identified aspects of their own courses that they believe assess some aspects of the Educational Goals as specified in the External Review Self-Study, so the task will be to determine which appropriate set of courses to assess in Fall 2015 and which set to assess in Spring 2016. In addition, as noted by the Reviewers (sec. 1.2), Goal Five is considered to be "in the context of post-graduate activities", so we have begun discussions with staff in Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) to determine how assessment of this goal might be best achieved (we understand that IRP has been tasked with this function for the university as a whole, so these discussions will have many beneficiaries).	See attached report
1.1.2 Graduate	
• <i>(Recommendation 2)</i> We will coordinate with the Dean of Graduate Studies to find ways to improve the clarity of the financial packages offered to incoming graduate students,	Many of the funding opportunities are beyond our control in the Department of Psychology. It is our understanding that GPS will be sending some new materials to guide us in the upcoming round of

and further, to identify best practices in communicating funding information to incoming and continuing graduate students. Unfortunately, the allocation of TAships is governed by the TSSU Collective Agreement, so we are unable to guarantee TAships beyond priority as specified in the collective agreement. As noted by the External Review Committee the average funding level for our graduate students is comparatively high, and contains elements -- e.g., a travel allowance of \$600 per annum, a research allowance, free office supplies and support -- that we believe to be uncommon.	admissions (September 2019). We continue to nominate our best students for entrance and ongoing scholarships. Our students have been very successful in securing scholarships from SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR, and Vanier. Increasingly, faculty members are encouraging and facilitating our graduate students to apply for MITACS funding. As noted in Recommendation 2, TAships are governed by the TSSU Collective Agreement. It is rare for a priority 1 graduate student to apply for and be denied a TAship. Our graduate students are informed of all funding opportunities; however, we could continue to improve in this area. We have put in a request for a new Communications staff person and part of this person's role will be to maintain a webpage where graduate students can easily identify funding opportunities.
• We will work with the Psychology Graduate Student Caucus to address concerns about transparency in funding decisions, and to develop language in our Graduate Student Handbook that explains funding more simply. We will also consult with the Dean of Graduate Studies to explore ways to provide funding opportunities for international graduate students, many of whom are ineligible for federal scholarships	Faculty and grad students have completed several sessions learning about MITACS funding opportunities (available to international students). Our Associate Chair of Graduate Studies also met with the MITACS representative to discuss opportunities for our students. International students are eligible for Vanier scholarships and we strongly encourage them to apply. Five of our graduate students currently hold Vanier scholarships. A web page that describes current funding opportunities will also help address concerns.
• Although Graduate students are represented on all Departmental Committees, we will explore methods to streamline communication with the Graduate caucus; for	Graduate student reps continue to attend all department meetings and they are on all major department committees, including all

example, by establishing a periodic meeting between the Chair's Advisory Committee and the Graduate Caucus, devoted solely to graduate matters.	hiring committees. The Associate Chair of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Program Assistant frequently meet with graduate students and graduate students are very comfortable approaching both. The Chairs Advisory Committee meets infrequently. Grad students are always invited to these meetings.
We will continue to support clinical training opportunities by directing resources to the Clinical Training Program and Clinical Psychology Centre. An important search is currently under way to replace the recently retired Director of Clinical Training -- success in this search is essential for the continued success of the clinical training program.	Since this report, we hired a Director of Clinical Training as an Assistant Professor of Professional Practice. We also hired an Assistant Director. Both of these individuals are Clinical Psychologists and are registered with the College of Psychologists. In 2017, significant improvements were made to the Clinical Psychology Centre with the installation of high-tech video and audio equipment. This allows us to obtain high-quality recordings of therapy sessions (with permission) for training and supervision purposes. We are very proud of our CPA (Canadian Psychological Association) accredited Clinical Psychology program. We provide excellent training for future Clinicians.
We will explore the possible development of new premium-fee graduate programs leading to degrees or certificates, as we believe there may be significant demand for such (and revenue generated would be a boon for Departmental initiatives, such as funding postdocs). A few examples: quantitative methodology consulting; criminal risk assessment; interviewing and measurement techniques; neuroscience methodology. However, to quote the external reviewers: "should the department or university choose to develop new revenue-generating graduate programs that	We agree that we have the expertise to launch premium fee programs that would be in demand. However, we do not have the faculty resources to proceed. We currently have 38 faculty members associated with Psychology. However, not all contribute to teaching. Our tremendous success in research has led to multiple teaching releases: two faculty are LEEF Chairs with full course releases, two are CRC scholars with 1-course loads, we have one Michael Smith scholar with a 1-course

involve the department, it should do so using budget models that include new faculty resources to provide the needed instruction."	load, and one faculty member teaches only in the Cognitive Science Program—not in Psychology. Our administrative course releases include: the Department Chair has a 2-course release per year, the 2 Associate Chairs each have a 1-course release, the 6 Area Coordinators each have one course release every 3 years (equivalent to 2 course releases per year), the Chair of the Research Ethics Board has 1 course release per year (from the VPR), the Chair of the Animal Ethics Committee has 1 course release per year (from VPR), the MHLPI Institute Director has a 2 course release per year (as per agreement with previous VPA and Dean), and the Director of the Terrorism, Risk, and Safety Services program has a 2 course release (from the Dean). Based on our success in research and our major contributions to the administration of the University, we have 27 course releases per year—equivalent to 9 CFL positions. We are teaching more students than any other department in FASS (Fall 2018) with the equivalent of 29 faculty members! Without more faculty resources, launching a premium fee program would seriously compromise our undergraduate and graduate teaching.
2. Research	
As noted throughout this Plan, we will work with the Dean's Office to prioritize faculty hiring in Psychology.	We have submitted a number of faculty renewal plans to the Dean's Office.
<i>(Recommendation 8)</i> We will explore ways to more fully integrate the Institutes into the Department's research and teaching missions. In particular, we will explore ways to maximize graduate and postdoc participation in Institute activities, and elevate the visibility of the Institutes within and beyond the Department. (See also	We currently have three Institutes directed by psychology faculty: the Mental Health Law and Policy Institute (MHLPI, Ron Roesch), the Institute for the Reduction in Youth Violence (IRYV, Bob McMahon), and the Behavioral and Cognitive Neuroscience Institute (BCNI, Urs Ribary). Since 2015, together these institutes have trained 10 graduate students, and have funded 15 grad

the proposed External Relations Committee in Part 3).	students per year to present annually at key conferences. They have also hosted 10 visiting scholars, pre- and post- docs; and have more than 145 associate members, representing 20 countries. Ongoing formal research and training agreements are held with a number of universities and research centres throughout the world. These agreements promote institutional exchange by inviting faculty and staff of the partner institution to participate in a variety of teaching and/or research activities and professional development; organize symposia, conferences, short courses, and meetings on research issues; carry out joint research and continuing education programs; and exchange information pertaining to developments in research and training at each institution. The following agreements are in place with the MHLPI: 1. Vrije Universiteit (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) 2. Institute for Forensic Research (Craców, Poland) 3. Department of Psychology, Glasgow Caledonian University 4. Division of Forensic Psychiatry, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden 5. Institut Philippe Pinel de Montreal (Quebec) 6. Università Degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy 7. ARES Social Research and Policy Implementation Institute, Siena, Italy 8. University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain 9. University of the Basque Country, Clinical Psychology Program, Gipuzkoa, Spain We will continue to encourage Institute Directors to train students and to elevate their visibility within and outside of the university.
--	---

• <i>(Recommendation 10)</i>. The reviewers correctly note that the powers of the Department to expand post-doctoral participation are limited, and that post-docs are often externally funded. However, in recent discussions with VPR Joy Johnson, the Dept Chair conveyed willingness to explore the use of Departmental resources (such as funding from FIC instruction) to leverage contributions from elsewhere in the University, perhaps via matching grants of some sort. We will continue to explore innovative ways to encourage post-doctoral fellowships in the Department.	While the VPR was enthusiastic about this idea, the funding has yet to be secured. We intend to continue to pursue collaborative funding for post doctoral fellowships.
3. Administration	
• <i>(Recommendation 4)</i> In accordance with the recommendations of the Reviewers, we will start the process of developing a new Strategic Plan. The timing is fortuitous, as we will be able to dovetail our strategic planning with that of the Vice President Research, Joy Johnson, who has commenced the development of a new university-wide 5-year strategic research plan.	In the past year, we have written both a 5-year academic plan and a 3-year faculty renewal plan for the Psychology Department.
• <i>(Recommendation 5)</i> As part of the strategic planning exercise, we will specifically re-examine the Department's current Area organization, as we do every few years.	The current Area organization includes all of the core areas of Psychology that are represented in most Departments of Psychology in North America plus an HQT Area and a Law and Forensic Psychology (LFPP) Area. The LFPP is one of the most successful and highly ranked forensic programs in North America. In fact, studies by independent researchers at Kennesaw State University reported that its Clinical-Forensic Stream is ranked 1st in North America, out of approximately 40 programs (Helms, 2008; Schnorf & Helms, 2011)

	and its Experimental Law and Psychology Stream was ranked 3rd out of approximately 40. After careful consideration we conclude that our area structure is appropriate given student interest and faculty expertise. See below for comments on the HQT area.
• <i>(Recommendation 5)</i> Several years ago, the HQT area was developed from the former Theory and Methods Area. We feel that the three foundational areas represented (History, Quantitative methods, and Theory) actually have a great deal in common, at least as practiced by the HQT faculty in this Department: our HQT faculty happen to work at the intersection of H, Q, and T and have strong interests in all 3 areas. The HQT area thus built directly onto strengths already present in this department. The area represents an important -- and distinct -- component of our undergraduate programming, and has experienced a 3-fold increase in graduate enrollment since its establishment. Nevertheless, we will explore ways to ensure that the mission of the HQT area is more clearly articulated.	Psychological Methods Consulting was identified by faculty and students as a need that could be met by HQT faculty. In response, we hired a lecturer whose responsibilities include offering consulting services within the department. In addition, and in response to this need, another faculty member in HQT is providing additional consulting. We are in the early stages of constructing space within the HQT area that will be used to provide consulting services. We also have a plan to train senior students to provide this service as a way for students to develop marketable skills and earn course credit.
• <i>(Recommendation 9)</i> We will develop an External Relations Committee to guide the Department in several objectives: • Improved alumni relations • extra-curricular programming for students (for example, workshops on career development) • Pursuit of fundraising opportunities for targeted projects (such as research infrastructure, endowed Chairships, etc.), in conjunction with University Advancement and the FASS Dean's Office • External promotion of the Department	One of our faculty colleagues agreed to Chair this committee. While the parameters were being established, a new university priority was identified—Indigenous Reconciliation. Resources that were initially dedicated to the External Relations Committee were redirected to Psychology's Indigenous Reconciliation Committee (IRC). Notwithstanding our limited resources, we have been able to achieve many of the objectives listed in this Recommendation. We have hired a part-time undergraduate student as an Engagement Program Assistant. She has managed extra-curricular programming

- Public Engagement through special events, such as public lectures
- Development of social media and website-based communication.

We anticipate creating a RA position for at least one graduate student to provide social media support.

for students such as an annual research lab fair (very well attended in 2017 and 2018) and prepares a weekly newsletter that is sent to all undergraduate students. In addition to this, the Psychology Student Union organizes regular social activities as well as two annual information sessions, one on “Life after a BA” and another on “Applying to Grad School.”

We have actively pursued community engagement. Since 2015 we have hosted 4 major free public lectures in downtown Vancouver, approximately 4 department colloquia per year, and over 50 smaller seminars each year. These talks are open to the public—the major public lectures are heavily advertised with community invitations, and the smaller seminars are advertised on our website and also open to the public.

For example, on November 26, Dr. Itiel Dror, from University College in London, will deliver a free public lecture at the Centre for Dialogue. As of Nov. 1, 136 have preregistered for this talk and almost half (60) are from the community. The community members include members of the RCMP, VPD, lawyers (defence and Crown), Attorney General’s office, Indigenous Reconciliation, and Children’s Advocacy Centers.

We have submitted a request to the Dean for a full-time Communications staff member. We have also redefined an IT position to include technical support for the communications person and for faculty. Part of their portfolio will include alumni relations, social media, and external promotion of the department.

Pursuit of fundraising opportunities for targeted projects will be pursued at the Dean and VP level.

4. Working Environment	
• <i>(Recommendation 13)</i> Although we must rely on external units for provision and maintenance of space, we endorse the reviewers' recommendation that maintenance issues receive priority. In particular, departmental washrooms are in need of renovation, and we continue to deal with water ingress problems, although a new skylight system currently being installed may help in the latter case.	The washrooms on the 5th floor were renovated and washrooms on several other floors are under renovation. Many skylights have received maintenance. A few faculty labs have been renovated.
• We will continue to work with the Dean's Office to deploy lab space as rationally as possible, while recognizing that certain infrastructure needs (chemical lab safety, for example) can no longer be met within RCB Hall. We anticipate a serious space shortage in the event of new hiring, coupled with highly successful programs that have recently attracted major funding -- and thus require expanded space.	We are doing a thorough and thoughtful review of our space needs. We are in the process of negotiating with department areas and the Dean's office to renovate current lab space. Our objective is to create common graduate student spaces to encourage collaboration within areas and across faculty members. We have plans in place to begin this with our Social Psychology area and an agreement in principle to begin this in the HQT area. This plan is expected to help mitigate the space needs that naturally flow from hiring additional faculty. Notably, this concept of common graduate student spaces is not a feasible plan for all Areas as data collection needs vary widely across areas and faculty.
• Despite its reputation as a friendly and collegial work environment, the Department suffers from a lack of social spaces (currently limited to a single uninviting, windowless lunchroom). We will pursue opportunities to expand the social space inventory -- in particular, we would like to add a departmental lounge for faculty staff and students. If	We have not yet been able to secure space to meet this objective. It remains important to us, and we will continue working towards securing additional social space.

appropriate space can be identified, the Department undertakes to bear the costs of renovating and furnishing the space.	
5. Faculty/Staff Renewal	
• <i>(Recommendations 3, 4, 7, 12)</i> We will work with the Dean's Office to prioritize faculty renewal in the Department.	We have submitted faculty renewal plans to the Dean.
• <i>(Recommendation 6)</i> We note that under our organizational scheme some members of the Clinical Science Area have cross-affiliations in other areas. Given this fluidity, we feel that the suggested establishment of a formal minimum number of faculty per area is unnecessary, but accept that the recommended minimum of 5 is useful guideline.	Several areas are below the recommended minimum of 5 faculty members. Although we don't expect to be able to meet this threshold of 5, we hope to get closer in the next few years with new faculty hires.
• We will incorporate succession planning into forthcoming strategic planning exercises. Several outstanding long-serving staff members who have played crucial roles in the success of the Department are nearing nominal retirement age. Planning for these transitions, establishing a process to capture and retain the "institutional memory" of individuals transitioning through key departmental positions, and perhaps aiding the development of potential replacement personnel, will minimize disruption and ensure continuation of best practices established over long periods of time.	As expected, three long-term staff colleagues retired in the past few months: Bev Davino, Anita Turner, and Peter Cheng. Bev, Anita, and Peter had each been with the Department of Psychology for more than 35 years! Although the loss of our staff colleagues was a significant blow to the department, we have been able to hire replacements for two (an ad is currently posted for Peter's position). Bev and Anita have spent (and continue to spend) a considerable amount of time with their successors to ensure a smooth transition. We are grateful. I expect at least one more staff retirement in the upcoming year and another in the next few years. We continue to be concerned with faculty replacement. Based on data from the past 5 years, Psychology regularly teaches the equivalent of about 1350 AFTes each year (1475 in 2018). We are listed as having 38 faculty members. However, as described earlier in this response, the equivalent of 9 faculty members do not contribute to our teaching due to course releases provided for with

	research Chairships and heavy administrative duties. Of the faculty who teach in our program, I am confident that two will retire within the next few years. Five others will be at or past normal retirement age. Assuming nothing more changes and none of the faculty members who will be at or past normal retirement age retire, in the next three years, we will have the equivalent of only 27 faculty member to provide all the teaching in Psychology. This is unsustainable and nearing a crisis. We need to hire more faculty soon.

Interim Report – Educational Goals Assessment, Department of Psychology, Nov. 2018

As articulated in the Department of Psychology: Educational Goals and Assessment Action Plan (Sept. 2015), the introduction and assessment of Educational Goals will be a multi-year process with an evolving process and product. This update articulates activities to date, with significant progress made on several fronts. As noted in the Action Plan and reiterated below, we make several assumptions:

1. Educational Goals will have no or minimal impact on faculty members' teaching. This includes impact on faculty members' academic freedom, teaching workload, and any administrative aspects of teaching. No faculty member will be required to publish course-level Educational Goals (EGs).
2. Although Educational Goals for the program should be reflected at the Graduate and Undergraduate level, they must **not** be seen to supersede any existing Learning Outcomes in our Accredited Graduate Programs. Existing accreditation processes assess these programs.
3. There is no expectation that additional resources might be provided to develop undergraduate 'capstone' courses that could be required for all students, so all assessment of the Educational Goals must be done with existing course evidence (however, see #1 above).
4. As there will be no ongoing additional resources for departments (beyond the first cycle), any evidence collection and associated analysis must be done with existing data (possibly course grades), and at a minimal cost (staff time).
5. Given the cyclical and dynamic nature of the review process outlined in the timetable above, the EGs and tentative assessment plans are always 'in-progress' and should NOT be published beyond the requirements of the University Senate for at least the first complete review cycle. This is primarily an internal process and document. Existing documents already communicate the departmental goals and general learning outcomes (<http://www.psyc.sfu.ca/ugrad/>).

With the resources available, we have done the following to increase all instructors' awareness of the importance of Education Goals (EG):

1. We have provided all instructors (faculty and sessional instructors) with the EG as part of their 'Canvas' Orientation to Teaching in the Department of Psychology Teaching Resources and Policy Course.
2. As of January 2016, the Department collects and archives all course syllabi every semester, providing a data source to track changes in the articulation of EG for regular faculty, term lecturers, and sessional instructors.

To begin assessing the EG, we have used the Student Evaluation of Teaching and Courses (SETC) system to gather student responses to the four Department of Psychology questions (see below), which specifically assess students EG awareness and completion.

- #13. As a result of taking this course, I increased my knowledge and understanding of course content (e.g., psychological concepts, theory, research methods, history).
- #14. As a result of taking this course, I am better able to evaluate claims about psychological issues.
- #15. As a result of taking this course, I increased my understanding of the role of scientific reasoning in psychology (e.g., generating ideas, testing claims, revising theory).
- #16. As a result of taking this course, I am better able to apply psychological knowledge and skills to life outside the classroom.

The SETC team has provided us with evidence that we are meeting our goals. Below is a summary of answers to the Departmental questions, by course level, for the past 6 semesters for questions #13, #14, #15 & #16. While there are significant challenges interpreting these data, it is clear that those students completing SETC believe they have learned core concepts in Psychology (Q#13), that they can better evaluate claims about Psychological issues (Q#14), that they have a better understanding of science in Psychology (Q#15) and that they use what they have learned (Q#16). Table 1 below is sorted by semester, lower division, upper division, graduate, and reports N(max), N(actual), and the combined mean (across courses), using the following values from the questions rated on a 5-point scale (Not at all = 1, Moderately = 3, A lot = 5). As would be expected, there is a visible upward trend from lower division to upper division and to graduate level responses.

Table 1: SETC Scores for Departmental questions, by semester, N, and mean scores by division.

Term	Division	N(max)	N(actual)	Question 13	Question 14	Question 15	Question 16
2016-3	Lower	3258	1556	3.796719432	3.602263376	3.522921532	3.71042677
	Upper	1993	1189	3.986717305	3.817945848	3.684843327	3.80368353
	Graduate	84	53	3.95974026	3.779220779	3.673701299	3.88863636
2017-1	Lower	2833	1475	3.57118	3.600154	3.52208	3.936689
	Upper	2048	1215	3.796061	3.727612	3.713456	4.092128
	Graduate	127	62	3.914652	4.022527	3.930037	4.11685
2017-2	Lower	536	264	3.409813	3.566077	3.534182	3.682938
	Upper	672	327	3.765672	3.787573	3.739267	4.069231
	Graduate	114	20	3.941667	3.572222	3.483333	4.008333
2017-3	Lower	2232	981	3.61529	3.547424	3.440695	3.84384
	Upper	1054	544	3.859318	3.88518	3.837036	4.105891
	Graduate	73	32	4.044444	3.92963	3.972222	4.292593
2018-1	Lower	1957	799*	3.537568	3.462721	3.408333	3.728139
	Upper	1574	859	3.767757	3.771191	3.703423	3.977793
	Graduate**	80	46	4.48254	4.352381	4.379762	4.470635
2018-2	Lower	586	207	3.396119259	3.588221	3.548531	3.713826
	Upper	496	296	4.047687364	4.000496	3.930444	4.302033
	Graduate***						

Notes: *SETC availability dates in conflict with course completion dates – no final exams.

** 3 courses were cross-listed with upper division course sections – unknown numbers.

*** No SETC data available.

We also track student success with course completion rates as originally articulated in the Action Plan. SFU's Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) office provides summary data showing that 95%+ students completed their 100/200-level courses, 98%+ students complete their 300/400-level courses, and that 100% of Graduate Students complete their courses over the past three years. A more fine-grained analysis at the individual course-level might be possible as the IRP data do not include WD, WE, or N grades; however, that sort of resource intensive analysis is not available at this time.

As noted in the Action Plan, some of the EG "are more appropriately assessed after graduation or recognized as a product of life-long learning (formal or extracurricular)." One proxy measure of those EG are data provided by the BC Provincial Government through the BC Student Outcomes Office (<http://outcomes.bcstats.gov.bc.ca/Default/Home.aspx>) and their Baccalaureate Graduates Survey (BGS). This survey is conducted 2 years (planned also for 5 years) after graduation for all post-secondary students in the province, broken down by institution and discipline. The most recent 2-year report (2017) for Psychology students graduating from SFU in 2015 will be a useful benchmark (the 2016 survey of 2014 graduates show very similar results).

Parts of the BGS Question 14 ("How helpful was institution/program in developing the following skills?" from *Very helpful* to *Not at all helpful*) are proxy assessments of Psychology's EG "Goal Two: Scientific reasoning, research, and critical thinking:" 93% of students (N = 167 of a Survey Cohort of 397 or 42% return rate) responded *Very helpful* or *Helpful* to the prompt "Analyse and think critically." Similarly, 87% of students responded with *Very helpful* or *Helpful* to the prompt "Conduct research." Two additional prompts are relevant for Psychology's EG "Goal Four: Communication and interpersonal skills." To prompts "Write clearly and concisely" and "Verbally express opinions or ideas clearly and concisely," 85% and 76% of students respectively responded that the institution/programs were *Very helpful* or *Helpful*.

The BGS provides some insights about our graduates' needs by comparing responses given by those employed and no longer in school (N = 137) to questions about preparation (question 14) and skills actually used (question 26). Respondents were asked "How helpful was institution/program in developing the following skills?" (question 14) and "How useful are the following skills or abilities in your main job" (question 26; rated from *Very useful* to *Not at all useful*). Discrepancies in how individuals responded to these questions could provide a powerful rationale for developing skills and abilities while in university, which could be communicated by instructors. For example, aspects of Psychology's EG "Goal Three: Ethical and social responsibility to others" is reflected by the prompt about whether the program prepared them to "work effectively with others" (question 14). Only 67% of students indicated that the psychology program was *Very helpful* or *Helpful* in preparing them for this skill compared to 91% who indicated that this same skill is *Very useful* or *Somewhat useful* in their main job (question 26).

Similarly, aspects of Goal Three and Goal Four (...Interpersonal Skills) could be assessed by the question (26) prompt “Ability to resolve issues or problems.” Only 64% of graduates indicated that the program was *Very helpful or Helpful* in preparing them to resolve issues or problems, while 93% of graduates indicated that this same skill was *Very useful or Somewhat useful* in their main job (question 26).

Challenges:

1. Using the SETC questions to assess EG is limited. Completion rates are typically lower than desired, but are in line with completion rates for the BGS.
2. Although a review of the submitted course syllabi would allow the department to better assess our efforts to communicate the importance including EG to our instructors, the staff time and expertise has not been available to undertake such a project.
3. Limited resources (as noted in the assumptions above) prevent us from offering a ‘capstone’ course for the 380+ Majors completing their degrees each year (capstone projects are the standard, most reliable and robust way of assessing program-level learning outcomes or educational goals). To illustrate the magnitude of creating a capstone experience for our students, we estimate 25 students per capstone course (or group) per instructor; the necessary 15 sections per year would require the addition of a least four full-time faculty members (for comprehensive capstone course experiences similar to the Semester in Dialogue courses in which student numbers are usually capped at 20).

Future Directions:

1. We will continue to use the SETC questions to assess student opinion about their learning.
2. We will continue to examine the BGS reports for insights.
3. If the proposed new staff position (Psychology, Communication and Outreach Coordinator) is approved, part of the new role will include conducting voluntary ‘graduation interviews’ with a random selection of Majors. These interviews could include specific questions to assess some of the skills in our EG that are missed by either the SETC or BGS assessments.