

UTQAP Cyclical Review: Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan

1. Review Summary

Programs Reviewed:	Psychology, M.A., Ph.D.
Division Offering Programs:	Faculty of Arts & Science, Department of Psychology
Commissioning Officer:	Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science
Reviewers (Name, Affiliation):	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Professor James M. Olson, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario2. Professor James W. Pennebaker, Regents Centennial Chair of Psychology, Department of Psychology, University of Texas at Austin3. Professor Christopher Sears, Department of Psychology, University of Calgary
Date of Review Visit:	June 14-15, 2018

Previous Review

Date: OCGS Review 2009-10

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Graduate Programs

The reviewers observed the following strengths:

- Highly talented graduate students
- Low numbers of students who withdraw from the PhD program
- Surveys shows that students are generally very satisfied with their courses
- “Apprenticeship” model is working well and is appropriate for the program objectives
- Graduate exams are working well as assessment measures

The reviewers identified the following areas of concern:

- Stipend issues were identified as follows:
 - Some students were living and working below the poverty line
 - Students must take on additional teaching work to meet basic needs, which negatively impacts productivity and research engagement
 - Low stipends affect the competitiveness of the department to attract top quality students

The reviewers made the following recommendations:

- Increase the graduate stipend level

Faculty/Research

The reviewers observed the following strengths:

- Excellent reputation as world-class researchers
- Publication record of faculty from all three campuses is comparable to other top Psychology departments
- Faculty provide high quality supervision and teaching to graduate students

Administration

The reviewers observed the following strengths:

- Library resources are beyond adequate
- Newly created graduate Chair (“fourth Chair”) is working well and should receive full support from the Chairs and relevant Deans at all three campuses

The reviewers made the following recommendations:

- Consider options for hosting events on UTSC and UTM campus, as well as communication technologies that would allow UTSC and UTM students to electronically attend events at St. George campus

Current Review: Documentation and Consultation

Documentation Provided to Reviewers

Terms of Reference; Self-Study; Appendices, Faculty CVs.

Consultation Process

The reviewers met with the Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science; Vice-Dean, Academic Planning and Strategic Initiatives; Graduate Chair; Graduate Director; Perception, Cognition and Cognitive Neuroscience area STG faculty; Social, Personality and Abnormal area STG faculty; Biology and Behaviour area STG faculty; Developmental area STG faculty; Tenure-track STG faculty; Chairs of STG cognate departments: Department of Geography and Planning, Tri-campus Graduate Chair, Department of Psychology, & Department of Cell and Systems Biology; STG Psychology undergraduate Chair and Acting Chair; UTM Psychology Graduate Chair; UTM faculty members; UTSC Psychology Graduate Chair and Incoming Chair; UTSC faculty members; UTST status-only faculty; STG administrative staff; and STG graduate students.

Current Review: Findings and Recommendations

1. Graduate Program

The reviewers observed the following strengths:

- Objectives
 - Graduate programs fit well with the University mission and department's academic plan
- Admissions requirements
 - Similar to other psychology programs in Ontario, making the programs competitive with direct peers
 - Standards are sufficiently rigorous meaning students enter with appropriate skills to complete the programs
- Curriculum and program delivery
 - Effectively meets program learning outcomes and degree level expectations
 - Good communication with students regarding program requirements
 - PhD "Outside Project" is excellent
- Quality indicators – graduate students

- Graduates find good employment in academia and outside of academia
- Very good time to completion for master's and doctoral students

The reviewers identified the following areas of concern:

- Admissions requirements
 - Faculty are competing against each other for students because multiple faculty are permitted to make offers to the same student
 - Difficult for faculty to recruit and admit international students due to quota limits
 - Faculty in the Biology and Behaviour area are concerned that they may be losing some students to the Department of Cell & Systems Biology (CSB) because of:
 - the lower program requirements for the MSc at CSB
 - CSB does not require applicants to complete the GRE
 - CSB has greater financial support for their students
- Curriculum and program delivery
 - Inadequate number of courses offered each year:
 - students have very little selection in some topic areas
 - difficult for department to structure program because faculty only teach every a graduate course every four years; when they do get to teach they want to offer a course in their own area, rather than teach required courses
 - students cannot plan their program from year to year because courses are only announced annually
 - most courses are offered at the St. George campus, even if the instructor is from UTM or UTSC
 - While “Outside Project” is an excellent initiative, it has become resource and time intensive to offer
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - Not all graduate students teach a course during their program, most St. George TA positions are marking roles and do not involve teaching
 - Need for more exposure to non-academic careers
 - Students who are not interested in academic careers report feeling marginalized and unsupported
- Student funding
 - Financial support was identified in the last review as perhaps the most important issue facing the department, and while funding levels have improved, funding levels are still of concern
 - Students report that funding has a serious impact on morale and stress
 - Some students take out large loans, and even take on “secret jobs” because they are warned not to take on extra paid work

- Students noted that the tuition fees in later years remained the same as in earlier years when they required more faculty support

The reviewers made the following recommendations:

- Admissions requirements
 - Simplify graduate student recruitment processes to avoid competition
 - Explore options to push for expanding number of international graduate students
 - Consider if there can be greater flexibility in requirements to help combat the competition with CSB
 - Reviewers supported the plans to introduce a direct-entry PhD
 - MA admissions are already very competitive and most MA students continue on to the PhD
 - Measures need to be in place so that the department can still address quality issues with students who may not be meeting the expectations of the PhD program; perhaps introduce a terminal master's degree for students who are not able to complete the PhD program
- Curriculum and program delivery
 - Strongly recommend improvements to course offerings:
 - provide faculty more frequent teaching opportunities
 - consider increasing size of graduate courses
 - explore if team teaching is feasible
 - consider moving to 2-3 year course planning cycle to assist students and administration with program planning
 - encourage more graduate course offerings on UTM and UTSC campuses by investing in state-of-the art video-conferencing technologies; this can help alleviate travel burdens on faculty and students
 - Continue to offer the "Outside Project" with new criteria that set project time and scope boundaries
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - Increase in-class teaching opportunities for graduate students, e.g., leading tutorial sections or serving as guest lecturers
 - Expand research, training, and internship opportunities for students to highlight career opportunities outside of academia
 - Consider if the "Outside Project" could be completed in a non-academic setting for students interested in non-academic careers
 - If possible, name a faculty member responsible for monitoring presentations and events on non-academic careers that would be of interest to psychology graduate students
- Student funding
 - Department must seek ways to increase student funding
 - Consider changing policy which prevents supervisors from topping up their students' funding

- Department should request that the University consider tuition fee reductions for students in upper years

2. Faculty/Research

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Overall quality
 - Highly productive faculty in terms of publications, grants, and international recognition
 - Healthy distribution of gender and faculty rank at all three campuses
- Research
 - Diverse range of research topics and methods
 - Faculty using cutting edge research techniques
 - Large research funding acquisitions and successful in being awarded Canada Research Chairs, Early Research Awards, and other faculty prizes
 - Many collaborations among department faculty, and strong interdisciplinary research across the University
 - Faculty provide students with many research collaboration opportunities

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Faculty
 - Current practice only requires faculty to teach one graduate course every four years
 - Junior faculty are at a disadvantage in terms of graduate student recruitment
 - Pre-tenure faculty mentoring often pairs junior faculty with much more senior faculty, which junior faculty felt was not the best match

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Faculty
 - Increase opportunities for graduate teaching, including allowing faculty to teach a graduate course each year or every other year
 - Also encourage graduate students from cognate units and advanced undergraduates to enrol in the department's graduate courses
 - Explore options for pairing junior faculty with mentors who are closer in career stage

3. Administration

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- International comparators

- Programs are seen as among the best in the world

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Relationships
 - Morale is higher among faculty at the St. George campus than at UTM and UTSC
 - Some UTM and UTSC faculty said they felt like “second-class citizens” and some St. George faculty felt they were unfairly blamed for decisions made by central administration
 - The department website does not equally feature all three campuses
- Organizational and financial structure
 - There are several factors causing tension in the tri-campus model, which is seen as “remarkably complicated”:
 - Imbalances of resources, travel times, and teaching demands among faculty and students
 - Organization, function and varying perceptions of the “four chair” model; many UTM and UTSC faculty perceive that St. George does not take the fourth Chair role seriously
 - Implications of the University’s long-term plan to make St. George campus more graduate focussed and UTSC and UTM more undergraduate focussed
 - Each campus department is under the budgetary wing of their respective campus, while the graduate programs have one graduate Chair heading all graduate programs from across three campuses; this divide may be leading to many of the organizational tensions
 - Graduate administrator has heavy workload with over 180 students across three campuses
 - Overall, faculty were satisfied with space, but there were some concerns raised over the time to complete renovations as part of new faculty’s start-up packages, especially at UTSC

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Relationships
 - Increase communication and transparency regarding decision-making
 - The central administration should make the UTM campus shuttle free for faculty and establish a similar shuttle to UTSC
- Organizational and financial structure
 - Rethink the structure and function of the tri-campus model. The reviewers present two options to consider:
 - Keep the four Chair model but rename the graduate lead “Coordinator of the Graduate Program” and provide detailed position descriptions for personnel from across all campuses

- Return to the previous structure where the St. George graduate Chair is also the Chair of the graduate programs at all three campuses
 - Establish a half-time administrator position to support the department
- Long-range planning and overall assessment
 - While the department has been quite successful in grant acquisition, the reviewers recommended additional efforts be explored including:
 - An aggressive funding program that might include external advisory committee of graduates, local business people, and other community and university donors
 - Exploring partnership options with businesses, agencies, start-ups, etc.
 - The support of an administrator could assist with funding opportunities



2. Administrative Response & Implementation Plan

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCE

March 6, 2019

Professor Susan McCahan
Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
University of Toronto

Re: UTQAP cyclical review of Department of Psychology Graduate Programs

Dear Professor McCahan,

Along with the faculty, staff and students of the Department of Psychology, I am pleased with the external reviewers' assessment of the Department's graduate programs: Psychology, M.A., Ph.D. The reviewers complimented the Department, noting that the "*graduate program has an outstanding reputation both within North America and around the world.*"

The quality of this program notwithstanding, as per your letter dated January 22, 2019, the review report raises a number of issues and challenges. I am writing to address the areas of the review report that you identify as key. The response to these items and implementation plan are separated into immediate (six months), medium (one to two years), and longer (three to five years) terms, where appropriate, along with who (Chair, Department, Dean) will take the lead in each area. The Dean's office has discussed the reviewers' comments through consultation with the Graduate Chair of Psychology, as well as the Vice-Deans Graduate at the UTM and UTSC campuses, to develop the following implementation plan incorporating the reviewers' recommendations.

In responding to the reviewers' report, it may be helpful to provide some context regarding the administrative structure of the Psychology Graduate unit. In most tri-campus graduate units, the position of Graduate Chair is held by the Chair of the Undergraduate St. George unit; in contrast, the position of Graduate Chair in Psychology is typically held by a faculty member from one of the three campuses who is *not* also a Chair of an undergraduate program. Thus, in Psychology, there are four chairs: the undergraduate Chairs at each of the UTSG, UTM, and UTSC campuses, with responsibility for faculty, research, and their respective undergraduate programs, as well as a Graduate Chair with responsibility for the tri-campus graduate program only. In their report, the reviewers raised issues that fall within the purview of the UTSG, UTM and UTSC undergraduate Chairs (including faculty workload and lab renovations). These issues are addressed in the reviews of the undergraduate units. In addition, this administrative response has been shared and discussed among the Vice-Deans Graduate at the three campuses to ensure that the decanal administrations at all three campuses are aware of those issues that fall outside of the Graduate Chair's responsibilities.

The reviewers were concerned about the current approach to graduate student recruitment, which can result in faculty competing with each other for students, and which limits the amount of support faculty can offer to students.

Implementation Plan

Immediate (six months) term response: The Program has now taken several steps to improve graduate student recruitment. In October 2018, the Graduate Chair and Graduate Director conducted an online survey of the graduate faculty to identify concerns with the recruitment process. Based on this feedback, changes to recruitment have already been made. For graduate student recruitment days (which were January 24th and 25th, 2019), the unit developed a location visiting schedule to ensure an equivalent amount of time was available for applicants to visit the locations where their faculty hosts were based (i.e., UTM, UTSC, UTSG, and affiliated hospitals and institutions). The unit also created area-wide events for recruits to be able to meet multiple faculty members and students at one time. Initial feedback from faculty and recruits about this new schedule and events has been positive; the unit is now in the process of conducting a follow-up feedback survey, administered to graduate faculty in February 2019.

In addition, the Graduate Director contacted faculty members when many of them were interested in the same student; although this was deemed necessary for only two of the 69 students of interest to the faculty, members discussed their level of interest in those students. Increased communication has helped to identify areas of common interest among faculty and allow new opportunities for possible co-supervision. With these initial changes to recruitment, the process felt more collegial both behind the scenes and at the area-wide events. The Program will continue to discuss recruitment at the upcoming Graduate Psychology faculty retreat.

The reviewers also commented on the possibility of increasing flexibility in the funding “top-ups” that faculty can offer to students, primarily through tri-campus research grants. This will be a topic of discussion at the next meeting of the Psychology Graduate Committee in May 2019. The Graduate Committee consists of one faculty representative from each of the three campuses plus one status-only representative; the Psychology Undergraduate Chairs at each of the three campuses; two graduate student representatives; the Graduate Administrator; the Graduate Director; and the Graduate Chair. Currently, faculty are required to contribute \$7000 toward their graduate student’s funding package, unless that student has won a scholarship (e.g., SSHRC or NSERC CGS-D). At present, the faculty contribution is capped at \$7000 annually for students who do not hold a scholarship. In terms of recruitment situations where multiple faculty are interested in the same applicant, this cap on faculty contributions was put in place to prevent faculty with large grants from outbidding those with less funding. As for graduate students already enrolled in the Program, the cap was introduced in order to reduce inequities in funding across students. With respect to top-ups for recruitment, the Graduate Program offers one-time only Admissions Awards to applicants who have competing offers from other schools. Those are paid for by graduate program funds or by funds from Arts & Science, rather than by faculty. With respect to top-ups for already enrolled graduate students, the faculty contribution cap will be revisited at the next Graduate Committee meeting in May 2019. The reviewers noted that most programs have cases where students differ in their amount of support, and that this does not introduce significant dissatisfaction within the graduate student population.

As is the case for most graduate programs at the University of Toronto, there is a desire among faculty to be able to admit more international students. The Faculty of Arts and Science, which is

the administrative and budgetary home of the tri-campus Psychology Graduate Program, recently increased Psychology's international doctoral student quota by 2 spots. However, the total number of international doctoral students is still low (Psychology's quota is 21.5 spots spread across the 4 years of the PhD). In order to stay within their quota, the unit has set up a committee of faculty representatives that ranks the international applicants to determine which faculty will be permitted to make an offer. As well, faculty who admitted an international student in any given year are not allowed to admit another international student in the following year. This process and policy is documented and communicated to faculty every year to ensure they understand how the few international quota spots that are available are allocated. The unit has also created a mechanism for faculty to admit international students outside of the quota, should they have the funding to do so.

Medium (one to two years) term response: The Graduate Chair and Graduate Director will continue to regularly consult with faculty about graduate student recruitment through attending faculty meetings and through conducting surveys. Feedback obtained through these mechanisms will then be considered when planning recruitment activities. As well, following this year's faculty retreat, where recruitment will be discussed, a recruitment planning document will be developed that can be used for future recruitment seasons.

Longer (three to five years) term response: As noted above, continued consultation with faculty will be implemented each year. It is expected that recruitment activities will likely be revised as suggested changes are implemented and tested. The Graduate Committee will also discuss issues such as admissions and funding top-ups and monitor the effects of any changes in policy that might result.

The reviewers suggested ways to improve graduate course selection and possibly allow a more structured program, including having faculty teach more frequently at the graduate level, and offering and supporting enrolment in graduate courses on all three campuses.

Implementation Plan

Immediate (six months) term response: A four-year teaching schedule was created several years ago. However, the four-year cycle for some faculty members was disrupted due to factors such as leaves (e.g., sabbaticals, parental, administrative secondment) and retirements. In addition, several new faculty were hired at each of the three campuses, and the number of status-only faculty has also increased. This has resulted in a need to re-work the teaching schedule. The previous Graduate Chair began that effort in August 2018 and distributed that preliminary schedule to students prior to registration in September. The current Graduate Chair and Graduate Director will continue to work with faculty to develop a more comprehensive and clearer four-year schedule in Spring, 2019. The unit will then distribute that teaching schedule to graduate students so that they can better plan their course schedules.

Medium (one to two years) term response: In order for tri-campus Psychology faculty members to teach a graduate course, they must be released from teaching an undergraduate course at their home campus. Thus, it is ultimately up to the Psychology Undergraduate Chairs at the three campuses to permit faculty to teach graduate courses more frequently; this is an issue addressed in the approved workload policy for Psychology faculty at each campus. It should be

noted that allowing more frequent graduate teaching would likely result in increased sessional teaching at the undergraduate level, which may be undesirable given undergraduate enrolment pressures and the desire to ensure that sufficient courses are taught by faculty with continuing appointments. In addition, although faculty might in some cases prefer to teach more graduate relative to undergraduate courses, there are sufficient faculty members available to teach each year under the current system; that is, with 94 faculty members available for graduate teaching across the three campuses and affiliated institutions, there is currently no shortage of graduate course offerings.

To increase flexibility in graduate teaching, the unit has begun to examine the possibility of introducing courses that are team-taught and spread across two semesters. For example, in 2018-19, two faculty are co-teaching a coding course on Python and R. The course is spread across the two semesters, with bi-weekly classes. The two faculty must teach the course two years in a row to obtain release from teaching one undergraduate course. Offering more courses in a format such as this, particularly for skills-based courses, would likely increase the frequency of some course offerings.

The reviewers suggested that the program should facilitate enrollments in graduate courses offered on all three campuses. Although the majority of courses are offered at St. George, the Graduate Chair is open to the possibility of graduate courses at UTM and UTSC. Indeed, in 2019, two graduate courses are being offered at UTM. The Graduate Chair and Graduate Director will review the student evaluations for those courses and consult with the instructors to identify ways to improve the experience.

Longer (three to five years) term response: The Graduate Director will continue to monitor the teaching schedule and to re-organize where necessary to ensure balanced offerings across areas and years. The Graduate Chair will continue to meet with the three campus chairs to discuss teaching releases for offering skills-based courses as well as quantitative courses.

Given the changing post-graduation landscape, the reviewers suggested support for alternative career paths and teaching opportunities for graduate students.

Implementation Plan

Immediate (six months) term response: All first year PhD students take PSY3001: Professional Development. This course includes a unit on alternative career paths, often involving guest speakers who are graduates from the program and have pursued non-academic careers. The program will work with the instructor(s) to ensure that additional time is devoted to different career paths.

Students receive regular announcements by email of the available resources and events that may be of interest to them. For example, the Rotman Research Institute at Baycrest Hospital offers professional development sessions that are open to all graduate students. The Program will continue to advertise these events. As well, some of the research groups in the Graduate Program (e.g., Social/Personality) routinely offer professional development sessions as part of their weekly talk series. Some of these sessions have been devoted to career planning, including bringing in alumni who have gone on to non-academic jobs.

In response to student concerns in this area, the Psychology Graduate Student Association (PGSA), working in concert with the Associate Graduate Director, will be hosting a non-academic career night in March 2019. At this event, current graduate students will be able to meet with people in industry as well as with alumni to learn more about employment options. If this event is successful, the Program will support this initiative as an annual event.

The Program is committed to providing teaching opportunities to students, where feasible. Students interested in teaching can sign up for a training course for teaching in Psychology at the university level. This course (or a similar training course) is required background for students wishing to teach. Students may then apply to teach courses posted to Unit 1 at any of the three campuses. As well, as part of their TA-ships, graduate students can approach course instructors to see if they can give one of the lectures, so as to gain more experience. The Graduate Program will work to more clearly communicate to students how they can gain more teaching experience, both as a TA and as a course instructor.

As well, the Graduate Committee, which includes the three campus Chairs, will discuss ways to facilitate graduate teaching at each campus. It is likely that the number of postings to Unit 1 varies across the three campuses. It may be the case that different strategies will need to be implemented at each site in order to maximize teaching opportunities for graduate students.

Medium (one to two years) term response: Over the next two years, the Graduate Program will work to create a list of resources for students regarding alternative career paths. This includes connecting them with resources at the Career Centre, at SGS, and at affiliated institutes such as at Baycrest Hospital. In addition, the Program will work on building connections with Psychology graduate alumni, in order to better understand the pathways that students have taken; by developing these connections, the Program will also create an important resource base for future events that will bring together alumni with students.

The Graduate Chair will also work with the three undergraduate Chairs to facilitate teaching opportunities for graduate students. The Graduate Chair will also work with the Graduate Director and Psychology Graduate Student Association (PGSA) to identify unit-wide graduate activities that are supported by the Faculty of Arts and Science Milestones and Pathways program (<https://teaching.artsci.utoronto.ca/fundingopportunities/mp/>). For example, potential workshop topics might include professional skills such as academic and non-academic writing, or preparing for entering the non-academic job market.

Longer (three to five years) term response: Longer term, the Program will examine ways to use the Outside Project (a required component in the PhD program in which students engage in research with a graduate faculty member other than their primary supervisor) as another opportunity for introducing graduate students to non-academic career paths. Such changes will likely require program modifications as well as the development of a network to facilitate connections for students. We will also investigate internship opportunities that are available through programs such as MITACS. As for graduate teaching opportunities, the unit will endeavor to track graduate teaching across the three campuses and better connect students with instructors to increase opportunities for guest lectureships.

The reviewers support the idea of moving towards a direct-entry PhD program, in part because this might facilitate more offers to the best students from around the world. However, they flag the need to retain options for students who do not continue beyond the master's level.

Implementation Plan

Immediate (six months) term response: In Fall 2018, following the reviewers' visit, the current Graduate Chair commenced an extensive consultation process regarding the option of a direct-entry PhD program. This has included meetings with faculty and graduate students at each of the three campuses as well as meetings with status-only faculty and their students. The Graduate Chair and Graduate Director have also met with the Vice-Dean Graduate in Arts and Science. It became clear that at this stage that clarification is required on key points. One concern is that a direct-entry PhD program would result in domestic students no longer being eligible for Master's-level federal scholarships. Currently, students in their MA year can apply for MA-level federal scholarships. However, a switch to a direct-entry PhD program would mean that students in their first year of the program would be PhD 1 students and likely ineligible for MA-level awards. A significant number of Psychology MA-level students win these scholarships, so becoming ineligible for those awards would be a disadvantage. In addition, students in the direct-entry option would not be eligible for an automatic transfer to the MA if they wished to withdraw from the PhD; SGS approval is required. Further, U of T does not have a "terminal Master's"; that is, a student who completes some of the PhD program cannot be granted a Master's degree upon exit. It is also important to note that students in a direct-entry program have to complete a substantial portion of the Master's degree requirements, as per SGS regulations, so it is not necessarily a route through which students could reduce time-to-completion. In sum, given these concerns and outstanding questions, the Program is not pursuing a direct-entry PhD option in the immediate future.

Medium (one to two years) term response: The Program will continue investigating the direct-entry PhD program option through consulting with units who already have such programs and by continuing to discuss this potential program change with Psychology graduate faculty and graduate students.

Longer (three to five years) term response: Pending the outcome of consultations noted above, the Program may seek to pursue a modification to a direct-entry PhD program.

The reviewers observed the need for better support of pre-tenure faculty through changes to mentoring and timely start-up renovations.

Implementation Plan

Immediate (six months) term response: The tri-campus Graduate Psychology Program's budgetary and administrative home is within the Faculty of Arts and Science at St. George campus. Faculty are appointed at their home campus (UTM, UTSC, STG) and then appointed to the tri-campus Graduate Program. This means that faculty's start-up arrangements, undergraduate teaching load, and faculty mentorship are handled by the Chair at the campus where their primary appointment is held. While these matters are outside the jurisdiction of the

Graduate Program, the Graduate Chair will highlight these concerns to the campus Chairs at the regularly scheduled Chairs meetings that are held each semester.

Because these issues fall outside of the responsibilities of the Graduate Chair, the UTSG Vice-Dean, Graduate, has brought these concerns to the attention of the Vice-Deans Graduate at UTM and UTSC.

Medium (one to two years) to longer (three to five years) term response: The Graduate Chair will continue to engage with the three campus Chairs when graduate faculty raise concerns about situations at their home campus.

The reviewers identified “tension between the campuses” and encouraged “frank discussions among faculty and administrators at all three campuses” on a number of issues related to tri-campus faculty and student experience, and program administration and planning.

Implementation Plan

Immediate (six months) term response: The Program has already increased the level of outreach and communication with the three campuses and affiliated hospitals and institutes. In the Fall 2018 term, the Graduate Chair and Graduate Director met with faculty and graduate students at the three campuses and also held a meeting with status-only and cross-appointed faculty and their students. These meetings covered a number of the issues raised above, such as the recruitment and admissions process, international student quotas, teaching, and the direct-entry PhD option that is under consideration. The Graduate Chair plans to continue this outreach annually so as to facilitate discussion of issues when they arise.

The Program held a Graduate faculty retreat in February 2019, and used this opportunity for further discussion of issues that were revealed in the UTQAP review. The Graduate Chair will consult regarding potential changes to address those issues that are under the purview of the Graduate Program.

Medium (one to two years) term response: The Graduate Chair and Graduate Director will continue to hold annual consultations with faculty and students at the various locations. This has not been done regularly in the past, so it is expected that more frequent outreach will help to identify issues when they arise as well as potential solutions. As well, the Program will continue its use of surveys to seek additional feedback on specific matters (e.g., recruitment event feedback, ideas for graduate student workshops) as they arise.

Longer (three to five years) term response: By engaging in more regular consultations with faculty and students at all locations, the Program will be better able to address emerging and ongoing issues as necessary.

The Dean’s office will monitor the implementation of recommendations, with, at minimum, a brief report to the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, midway between the year of the site visit and the year of the next site visit. The year of the next review will be the 2025-2026 academic year.

To conclude, we appreciate that the external reviewers identified the Department of Psychology tri-campus Graduate Programs' strengths and noted a few areas for development. The Graduate Department has already begun to move forward with plans to address the recommendations as presented by the reviewers.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David Cameron". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

David Cameron
Dean and Professor of Political Science

cc.

Alison Chasteen, Graduate Chair, Department of Psychology

Poppy Lockwood, Vice-Dean, Academic Planning and Strategic Initiatives, Faculty of Arts & Science

Daniella Mallinck, Director, Academic Programs, Planning and Quality Assurance, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

Andrea Benoit, Academic Review Officer, Office of the Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science

3. Committee on Academic Policy & Programs (AP&P) Findings

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) concluded that the Decanal response adequately addressed the review recommendations.

4. Institutional Executive Summary

The reviewers praised the communication to students regarding their program requirements and the healthy time-to-completion for both the master's and doctoral degrees. The reviewers commented on the strength of the programs, indicating they are very competitive against their peers and amongst the top psychology programs in the world. The reviewers were also impressed with the employment outcomes of graduates who consistently secure work in academia and other relevant fields. The reviewers recommended that the following issues be addressed: revising the current approach to graduate student recruitment, which can result faculty competing with each other for students, and which limits the amount of support faculty can offer to students; improving graduate course selection and possibly allowing a more structured program, including having faculty teach more frequently at the graduate level, and offering and supporting enrolment in graduate courses on all three campuses; providing support for alternative career paths and teaching opportunities for graduate students; moving towards a direct-entry PhD program, in part because this might facilitate more offers to the best students from around the world; better support of pre-tenure faculty through changes to mentoring and timely start-up renovations; and addressing "tension between the campuses" and encouraging "frank discussions among faculty and administrators at all three campuses" on a number of issues related to tri-campus faculty and student experience, and program administration and planning. The Dean's Administrative Response describes the Faculty, unit and programs' responses to the reviewers' recommendations, including an implementation plan for any changes necessary as a result.

5. Monitoring and Date of Next Review

The Dean's office will monitor the implementation of recommendations, with, at minimum, a brief report to the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, midway between the year of the site visit and the year of the next site visit. The year of the next review will be the 2025-2026 academic year.

6. Distribution

On May 17, 2019, the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan was posted to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs website and the link provided by email to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Secretaries of AP&P, Academic Board and Governing Council, and the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. The Dean provided the link to the Chair of the Department.