

External Review Report

7th Cycle Program Review
Department of Psychology
College of Science and Engineering
San Francisco State University

October 2019

Dr. Benjamin Storm
Department of Psychology
University of California Santa Cruz

Dr. Oriel Strickland
Department of Psychology
Sacramento State University

Table of Contents

Section	Page #
1.0 Overview of the Program (based on self-study and campus visit).....	3
2.0 Program Quality.....	4
2.1 Program Planning.....	4
2.2 Student Learning and Achievement.....	6
2.3 The Curriculum.....	8
2.4 Faculty.....	13
2.5 Resources.....	16
2.6 The Program's Conclusions, Plans, and Goals.....	17
3.0 Commendations of Strengths and Achievements	17
4.0 Recommendations and Strategies for Program Improvement	18

Overview of the Program

The external review team visited the San Francisco State University campus on October 10th and 11th, 2019. As part of that visit, we met with many faculty, students, and staff in the psychology department, as well as Provost Jennifer Summit, Dean of UEAP Lori Beth Way, CoSE Dean Carmen Domingo, CoSE Associate Dean Ron Marzke, APRC Chair Megumi Fuse, and Dean of Graduate Studies Sophie Clavier. We also read closely the comprehensive 140-page self-study produced by the psychology department, which was accompanied by several hundred pages of appendices. Everyone we met during the campus visit was open and collegial and expressed interest in making the external review as productive and illuminating as possible. We sincerely appreciate the warm welcome and efforts by everyone involved.

The psychology department at SFSU serves nearly 1000 undergraduates each year in the major, including many students who are first-generation and underrepresented in higher education. The undergraduate curriculum appears to be strong in terms of both breadth and depth and is based on educational recommendations from the American Psychological Association. We are impressed that the psychology department has responded to the CSU-initiative to improve graduation rates by meeting student demand for coursework and eliminating curricular bottlenecks.

It also administers six graduate programs: Clinical Psychology (M.S.); Developmental Psychology (M.A.); Industrial/Organizational Psychology (M.S.); Mind, Brain, and Behavior (M.A.); School Psychology (M.S.); Social, Personality and Affective Science Psychology (M.A.). As we will discuss in more detail below, many of these programs are thriving in terms of student demand and career outcomes. Moreover, the 24 faculty, who are functionally grouped by the six graduate programs, have been impressively productive in their research, publishing in top

journals and securing external research grants. An impressive feature of the departmental culture is that student participation in research productivity is celebrated. Overall, we concur with the statement from the department self-study that “despite significant resource challenges, the Psychology Department manages its human capital and fiscal resources effectively.”

Quality of the Program

As part of the review, we were asked to consider, in particular, five areas of evaluation: program planning, student learning and achievement, the curriculum, the faculty, and resources. In what lies below, we address each of these issues directly, commenting on the strengths of the department as well as the areas in which things can be improved. As we structured this report, we included potential recommendations for future development within the relevant text of this section. At the end of the report, we addressed more over-arching topics and “big picture” objectives with accompanying strategies that might receive additional attention from the department as they continue to evolve.

Program Planning

The undergraduate and graduate programs are run largely by committees within the department, including an advisory committee, a curriculum committee, an assessment committee, a research culture committee, a constitution revision committee, and a space committee. These committees work with the department chair, undergraduate coordinator, graduate coordinator, and staff, to plan the program and to address challenges as they arise. For example, the department has recently worked to streamline the major to promote student success

and graduation rates, and it has worked to align the curriculum with the learning objectives set forth by the APA as well as with continuous advances in the field of psychology.

One challenge that has arisen in the context of program planning is the need to meet the needs of both the undergraduate curriculum and the graduate curriculum. With only 24 tenured/tenure-track faculty—some of whom are on FERP status and will soon be retiring—the department struggles each year to meet the demands of the undergraduate major as well as the six graduate programs. Based on the faculty teaching matrix, it appears that a few faculty members teach a limited amount of undergraduate classes because they need to cover graduate classes and provide graduate supervision. As a result, the department appears to be somewhat handcuffed in its ability to support the undergraduate program, streamlining the program as best they can and relying on lecturers to meet student demand.

One method the psychology department has employed to deal with being under-resourced is to undergo the rather difficult process of applying for impaction status. This process is difficult in several regards. It is challenging and time-consuming, may not be well-received by other campus groups, and many faculty members within the department would prefer to be able to provide full access to students who meet the criteria for acceptance to the university. Be that as it may, given the evidence pertaining to the department's capacity to meet student demand for the undergraduate major, the Chancellor's Office of the CSU has granted impaction status to the SFSU campus. We initiated numerous conversations to gain a full perspective on the current views regarding impaction, and potential future directions. The conclusion drawn from these discussions and from the self-study is that impaction removal would only be possible with increased resources. These ideas will be addressed in more detail in the recommendations section.

We agree with the majority of faculty members who stated that—with more resources—there would be freedom to think more broadly about how the program could be designed to meet the needs of students and offer an even stronger undergraduate curriculum. More can be done, for example, to comprehensively assess the learning and achievement of students to inform and make decisions about program planning.

Finally, when making hiring requests, we would encourage the faculty to think more holistically about the future of the department and the needs of the undergraduate curriculum, as well as the specific resource demands of each graduate concentration. As we will discuss in more detail below, given the scarcity of available resources today (and likely in the future), it will be critical for the department to think about how new faculty can support the numerous ways to enhance the quality of the major and department. Proposals for new hires should be forward-looking and provide compelling opportunities to enhance the undergraduate curriculum, if not directly, then indirectly by freeing up other faculty and resources in the department.

Student Learning and Achievement

The program learning outcomes developed by the department are appropriate for the discipline, and they provide a strong starting point for developing the undergraduate and graduate curricula. The major area for improvement, when it comes to student learning and achievement, is that of assessment. Unlike some other science majors, Psychology as a field does not have a nationally-based knowledge examination. Thus, comprehensive assessment of student learning requires a careful mapping of knowledge at the course level (student learning objectives) to program learning objectives. In the current self-study, assessment relied heavily on data from student and alumni surveys, with students reporting a high level of competence in the

learning outcomes. Unfortunately, such exit surveys can be difficult to interpret, as students are often unable to know or communicate whether and in what ways their learning might have been inadequate. Going forward it would be desirable for the department to develop new ways to assess the learning of its students in ways that go beyond self-report and exit surveys. The psychology department is encouraged to expand its assessment approaches in the future. Specifically, this could include clear links between specified program goals and student learning outcomes that already occur within the classroom.

One area of student learning that may be suffering is that of writing in the discipline. In our interviews, several faculty members mentioned a decline in the writing ability of undergraduates. Though it is unclear to what this trend can be attributed—let alone whether it is a real trend to begin with—clearly this is an issue that needs to be addressed by collecting data and then using that data to inform subsequent program planning, such as by offering more writing opportunities for students earlier in the curriculum (than the GVAR, which is often taken later in the curriculum). As of now, however, with a limited number of faculty, it is difficult for tenured and tenure-track faculty to offer the kind of small undergraduate classes that allow for comprehensive writing assignments and meaningful feedback from instructors.

Even though it difficult to interpret, it is noteworthy that exit data from graduating students, along with graduation and retention rates, paint a very strong picture of undergraduate success. That is, students in the psychology major appear to be quite successful. Moreover, the department provides some impactful opportunities outside of the classroom, such as through honors projects, research assistantships, service learning, internships, and study abroad programs. It is our opinion that with more resources, and more faculty, they would be able to provide more of these types of valuable experiences to an even larger proportion of the

undergraduate population. Right now, for example, only 21% of undergraduates work in a research lab during their time at SFSU. This type of experience is critical to the mission of the major and in exposing undergraduates to the science and practices underlying psychology. We feel that this is a real opportunity for the department. Many of the faculty are highly productive and well-known in their fields of research, which is something the department can leverage to provide a deeper and more meaningful undergraduate experience. It is also likely that students would benefit from a more developed capstone/culminating experience, such as a senior seminar provided by tenured/tenure-track faculty. Given the current level of faculty and resources, however, we do not see how developing such an experience would be possible (in fact, it might result in a course bottleneck that the faculty have worked diligently to reduce).

Finally, we were truly impressed by the overall strength and competitiveness of the graduate programs. As detailed in the self-study, students trained in the graduate program have gone on to highly successful careers, and they have been accepted into highly competitive Ph.D. programs. We did not have a chance to meet many of the graduate students, but those with whom we did meet (mostly clinical) appeared to be very happy with the learning experience provided by the program and the opportunities it provided for supporting their achievement and career advancement. The clinical students emphasized the mentorship environment of their program, including the ready accessibility of faculty members and the opportunity for real-world clinical experiences.

The Curriculum

Undergraduate. The psychology major requires six core courses, six area courses, and three elective courses. Given the wide variety of course offerings, and efforts made by the

department to streamline the major, undergraduate students appear to be receiving a rigorous, high-quality education. The external review team is impressed that the curriculum includes two core classes that serve as ‘bookends’ for the undergraduate experience: an introduction to the major and the profession, and a senior-level course about future directions for psychology majors. We also approve of the curricular pairing of the required methods and statistics classes, which encourage sequential learning of related material and help to ensure student success.

That said, there are areas that could be improved. As mentioned earlier, due to limitations related to impaction (that is, too few tenure-track faculty members to meet the existing student demand for the major), many undergraduate classes are taught by non-Ph.D. lecturers and graduate student assistants. Although we have no reason to doubt the quality of the educational experiences provided by the lecturers and graduate students, it seems rather unfortunate that students are potentially limited in their exposure to tenure/tenure-track faculty.

The department has done a good job of responding to the challenges created by having so many majors and so few faculty members, planning course offerings to allow students to enroll in the courses they need and to graduate on time. Indeed, the four-year graduation rate in psychology is significantly better than many other majors on campus. One challenge that remains is that of Psychology 305. The GVAR course is critical for the major, as it provides students with training in discipline-specific writing in the context of a faculty member’s area of expertise. As we understand it, some students take the GVAR class early in the major, whereas others take it just before they are about to graduate. It would seem most effective, however, for students to take this class earlier on to better prepare them for the more rigorous writing expectations of content classes later in the major. Alternatively, the course could be rethought to serve more as a culminating course experience (i.e., a senior seminar). This approach would be particularly

useful if additional training in discipline-specific writing was provided earlier in the curriculum as well, such as in association with the research methods class. Given the importance of writing as a learning outcome, this area is one that the department should consider closely as it continues to revise and advance its curriculum.

The main challenge to the undergraduate curriculum is that there are not enough faculty. Impaction has helped, but the ratio of students to tenure/tenure-track faculty remains high, thus preventing the department from offering the breadth and depth of curriculum that they would be able to offer otherwise. Moreover, although students mostly graduate on time, they do not always seem to be able to take the classes they hope to take. In addition to hiring more faculty, we encourage the department to continue to pursue the development of online and hybrid courses, and to find ways to offer the most critical sections given the teaching spaces that are available. Indeed, the department self-study contains this same recommendation, and this was echoed in various conversations with faculty members during the campus visit.

Based on numerous conversations about impaction, we believe that the department should not consider impaction as an “on”/ “off” status (at this time), but instead think carefully about what would be needed to gradually increase enrollment to serve a greater proportion of the undergraduate population. This would be fairly easy to accomplish using annual cutoff scores for admission to the major. Clearly, this is another issue that is closely linked to faculty hiring. There is great student demand for the psychology major, and we would encourage the department to work closely with the administration to best meet the goals of raising faculty and serving more students. We believe that the goals of the department and the administration can align to grow the department, increase the number of psychology majors, provide a stronger educational experience for students, and a more balanced and appropriate workload for faculty.

Graduate. The quality and variety of graduate programs offered at SFSU are truly impressive. The programs enroll approximately 50 students combined per year, spread roughly evenly across the six concentrations. Some of the graduate programs are highly competitive, with fewer than 10% of applicants in the clinical and I/O concentrations, for example, being offered admission. During our visit, students were glowing in their praise of the clinical program, uniformly referring to it as the best possible place for them to receive the training they are seeking. Whereas students in the Clinical, School, and I/O concentrations typically go on to work as clinicians, counselors, and consultants, students in the Mind Brain and Behavior, Social Personality and Affective Science, and Developmental concentrations often go on to apply to Ph.D. programs. The level of success and the outcomes of students in these programs is highly impressive, with many students from underrepresented backgrounds going on to successful careers, meaningful positions in the community, and highly competitive Ph.D. programs.

It is not surprising that underlying the success of the graduate programs is the hard work and dedication of the faculty. The faculty have put a lot of effort into developing the curriculum and providing the type of training necessary for graduate students to succeed. This effort, however, may have come at the cost of coverage of the undergraduate curriculum. There are a few faculty, for example, who, in order to offer the graduate classes needed and provide adequate supervision, have been unable to teach many undergraduate classes over the past two years. The department has worked to align the graduate curriculum in such a way to more efficiently cover the needs of the different concentrations, and to some success, but it seems like more could be done.

Moreover, difficult decisions may need to be made, in the context of the number of faculty and resources available, as to whether the department can continue to support six

graduate concentrations. Certain concentrations are thriving more than others, and it may make sense to allocate new faculty hires and resources towards supporting those concentrations in the future. In particular, we see the clinical, I/O, Mind Brain and Behavior, and Social, Personality, and Affective Science concentrations as being particularly strong and poised to become even stronger with additional resources. Such a reorganization could be accomplished, furthermore, with the goal of creating more effective synergies with the undergraduate curriculum, and with the goal of creating a more balanced and equitable distribution of workload across the faculty in the different concentrations. To be sure, we were also very impressed by the School and Developmental concentrations, but given certain challenges and or the number of faculty currently in the concentrations, difficult decisions may need to be made.

The external review team was particularly perplexed, despite carefully reading the hiring documents contained in the self-study, by the lack of hiring prioritization for the clinical concentration. To give some context to this concentration, it is important to note that it has higher workload demands than the other concentrations because of the required sixty units of graduate level coursework and 3000 hours of clinical supervision (that is, required in order for students to take the MFT professional licensing examination). In the last round of hiring requests, a clinical position was included in the requests as part of the “Diversity, Context, & Application” cluster, but apparently it was ranked below the developmental position which received approval for a hire, whereas the clinical position did not. This does not make much sense given that two of the five current clinical faculty have been on FERP status for 2-3 years. This situation puts the future of the program in a precarious position.

Currently, eighty percent of the required graduate classes are taught by the clinical faculty, but the ability to maintain this level of education and supervision could drop

precipitously when the current FERP faculty members leave. Thus, to properly support the clinical program, the department would need to prioritize faculty hires and other resources to this program. The external review team noted there is an existing graduate program in counseling (in HHS), and received clarification that these programs are distinct in many important regards. For instance, the counseling program tends to focus on shorter-term concerns and problems through guidance (e.g., career counseling, college counseling) while the clinical program focuses on a range of clinical disorders and problems (e.g., depression, anxiety, psychosis), and thus often is focused on longer term psychotherapy, using psychodynamic, interpersonal, and community approaches. Another possible avenue for exploration is whether there could be a collaboration with Student Health Services to secure a faculty line in conjunction with mental health services provided to the S.F. State University general student population. Whatever the direction, the psychology department should have a formal meeting to discuss and develop plans to address the future of the clinical program in terms of educating future counseling professionals.

Faculty

It is important to recognize the amazing research productivity of faculty in psychology at SFSU. They are publishing in top journals (often with student co-authors), securing external grants, and actively serving their professional disciplines. These accomplishments enhance the educational experience of undergraduates and help to recruit and foster the success of graduate students. In reading the self-study, and in our conversations with faculty, however, it is clear that more faculty are needed. It is possible that reorganizing the graduate curriculum could free up faculty to teach more undergraduate courses, but even then the number of faculty would likely be inadequate to meet the needs of the curriculum without relying upon a large number of lecturers

and graduate student assistants. Many of the current faculty feel overwhelmed with teaching, advising, supervision, and research obligations, and without an infusion of additional faculty, we worry about the potential of faculty burnout, particularly given the extremely high cost of living in the bay area, which can make the work/life balance even more difficult than it would be otherwise.

Based on our conversations with faculty, we wonder if part of the problem is the consequence of a misalignment between incentives and practices within the concentrations, department, and university. In tenure and promotion reviews, for example, research productivity is very important, but faculty must also meet the supervision needs of graduate students and provide quality education and service to the undergraduate students at SFSU, and committee service to the institution. In the self-study document, the department notes that “The Department’s criteria are intended to be broad enough to encompass faculty from the various sub-disciplines within the department and flexible enough to allow for different paths of professional growth. Indeed, given the diversity of our discipline, the Psychology Department not only expects its faculty to be following differing career lines and exhibiting varied profiles of achievement, but actively encourages diversity in career development.”

Given the mission of the university as a baccalaureate-serving institution, the department may want to reconsider their criteria for promotion and tenure to give more weight to teaching and service. Moreover, we encourage the faculty to formally consider “contributions to diversity” within the tenure and promotion process. Regardless of the specific criteria that are used, more needs to be done to more clearly communicate the criteria to the faculty, and faculty across the department should be judged in the context of the responsibilities that they are asked to take on, which often differs across the six concentrations.

In this context, we have some concerns about the support given to junior faculty. At present, the department is quite top-heavy, with 64% of the faculty being full professors, and 84% of the faculty being tenured. Moreover, it is noteworthy that most of the full professors are men, and that two women of color were recently denied tenure. We do not know the circumstances of the latter cases, but we are concerned by them, especially in the context of what appears to be a system that may systematically disadvantage junior faculty, or at the very least not provide them with the mentoring and support that enables them to succeed. We cannot speak directly to these cases, but we encourage the department to opine carefully on how to improve its practices to ensure a more equitable and supporting environment for junior faculty. Such efforts will need to be proactive and to put safeguards in place to protect junior faculty. For example, the concentration coordinators have significant power in determining which courses are offered by which faculty, and due to ongoing traditions with senior faculty teaching certain courses, certain opportunities may not be given to more junior faculty.

Moreover, junior faculty may be asked to fulfill service obligations or mentor students in ways that do not support their research endeavors. We are not saying that this is always the case, or that senior faculty are knowingly or explicitly doing this, simply that proactive efforts need to be put in place to help junior faculty be successful. We applaud the department's intention to establish a formal mentoring program, with new faculty paired with one or two more senior faculty from a different concentration. Finally, as noted by the department in their self-review, more is needed in the way of transparency. Again, we commend the department for documenting teaching assignments through the teaching matrix and for documenting current service roles fulfilled by faculty members. More transparency will be helpful though to identify potential

imbalances and inequities and allow the department to enact changes that will ensure an equitable distribution of resources.

Resources

The resources and staff available are currently insufficient to support the needs of the psychology department, let alone the goal of lifting impaction and or growing the opportunities provided by the department. Space is an issue, as documented in the department self-study. With regard to research and graduate training, it seems like more could be done to distribute existing space more effectively. Such efforts may involve a more centralized model instead of relying on tradition or concentration faculty to decide who gets what lab space. With regard to undergraduate education, more access to large classrooms is needed. This would allow the department to offer larger sections of certain classes and thus freeing faculty to teach other needed classes in the curriculum.

The staff is struggling to support the department, due in part to frequent turnover and poor institutional memory. The department includes a peer-advising system, which seems useful in a lot of ways, but would benefit immensely from the hiring of a full-time staff position to specifically serve as undergraduate advisor. When faculty were asked about the barriers to lifting impaction, a common refrain was that they would be inundated by undergraduate students seeking support and advising. If the department is to grow, and in a way that continues to support student success, then clearly more support staff will be necessary to make that happen. During our visit, the department staff mentioned problems keeping up with inconsistent (and frequently changing) processes, and the need for easily accessible documentation. We are impressed by the

psychology department's staff efforts to accomplish these goals and recommend additional resources to help ensure their success.

The Program's Conclusions, Plans, and Goals

The self-study includes a thorough examination with clear avenues for future development. The external review team agrees with many of the program's conclusions, plans, and goals. In addition to the information presented thus far, we have drawn upon the department's ideas in writing the remainder of the report, commending the department for its successes, and providing avenues for future improvement. More specifically, we wholeheartedly agree that there are numerous strengths surrounding undergraduate degree completion and outcomes (primarily measured through student and alumni surveys). For many of the graduate degree programs, there is similar evidence of meeting a strong student demand, yielding impressive outcomes in terms of student achievement, and meeting a greater demand for professionals in the greater San Francisco area. We also concur with the department's conclusions that the existing culture for research has yielded major successes, including projects, presentations, and publications, including student researchers. The external review team has incorporated the program's conclusions, plans, and goals within our recommendations and strategies for program improvement. In particular, we focused on the strategies identified as "top priorities" by the department in its self-study.

Commendations of Strengths and Achievements

As described throughout this report, the psychology department is to be commended for numerous strengths and achievements that speak to the program quality, in terms of program

planning, the curriculum, faculty members, and student achievement at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. It is particularly impressive that the faculty have been so prolific in their research endeavors while simultaneously supporting such a large undergraduate major and six distinct graduate concentrations.

At the undergraduate level, institutional data shows a large number, and percentage, of majors who successfully complete their degrees. This speaks to the work the psychology department has invested in their curriculum and reduction in bottleneck courses. We are impressed by the structure of the undergraduate curriculum, with its core coursework consisting of general psychology principles, a pairing of methods and statistics, and the bookend approach starting with the introduction to the major and the profession and concluding with future directions for psychology majors. The additional required areas (plus elective category) correspond to the recommendations for BA education published by the American Psychological Association. Data presented from student and alumni surveys demonstrates that forty percent of graduates are employed in a relevant field, and almost a quarter go on to additional graduate education. These surveys also demonstrate the perceived value and utility that students place on their undergraduate experiences.

Recommendations and Strategies for Program Improvement

Also as described throughout this report, the psychology department faces numerous challenges and areas for potential program improvement. The external review team was very impressed with the department's self-study in terms of identifying potential strategies for program improvement. In the following section, we propose a series of broad objectives with lists of specific strategies for each. We developed these objectives and strategies by starting with

the data obtained during our campus visit, including interviews and group meetings with faculty members, undergraduate students, graduate students, psychology department office staff, and key figures in the SFSU administration. We then re-visited the department self-study to refine our recommendations and provide additional details that have already been endorsed by the department in its self-study document. The external review team would like to acknowledge that some of these strategies already have been initiated by the department, and others that we suggest might be neither feasible nor desirable upon further consideration. It is our hope that there are some novel ideas in this section that will prove useful in the department's continued quest for excellence.

Objective: Increase student access to the major and student advising, given appropriate faculty resources

- Think about ways to allow more students access to the major, and consider the administration as a partner in these efforts. There are ways to simultaneously grow the department, address faculty workload, and improve the educational experience of additional undergraduates.
- Work with the administration to make a plan for increasing undergraduate students admitted to the major as a function of additional faculty hires.
- Formalize the input collected via the peer advising center (p. 15 from self-study, "the Psychology Department utilizes its Peer Advising Program to gather daily feedback from students regarding curriculum concerns").
- Improve online advising for students seeking access to tenure-track faculty members.
- Continue to improve training for new faculty members about student advising.

- Explore the addition of a full-time undergraduate advisor.
- Work with the CoSE Student Success Center to expand and coordinate advising efforts.

Objective: Improve assessment of student learning and achievement

- Develop better means of assessing student learning and program learning outcomes, decreasing reliance on self-report and exit surveys.
- Change the assessment committee from “ad hoc” to a regular, standing meeting with clear deliverables. On many campuses, this committee has one of the highest degrees of workload.
- Per the bullet point above, redesign the department’s assessment matrix to include specific course assignments (student learning outcomes) to address each of the psychology departments program learning outcomes.
- Emphasize long-term educational and career outcomes in alumni surveys. Formalize the communication of data from alumni surveys in department meetings.
- Implement annual review of undergraduate exit survey data within department meetings.
- Develop a formal evaluation of outcomes pertaining to Psyc 303 and Psyc 690 to assess the ‘bookend’ approach to the undergraduate major.
- Think about new ways to evaluate writing and disciplinary communication within the curriculum. Perhaps introduce a writing course early in the major and then one during the culminating experience (e.g., senior seminar in a particular topic area). Such a senior seminar could also be used as a mechanism for assessing program learning outcomes. Explore whether the early writing experience could be covered by GTAs as a lab in conjunction with the research methods course.

- Similar to the strategy described above, develop and initiate a formal Culminating Experience for all undergraduate students. Consider and evaluate the potential for an option of research experiences, community service learning, and/or internships.

Objective: Improve departmental culture regarding transparency in decision-making and distribution of outcomes

- Formalize service expectations. At the time of this report, much of departmental governance was provided on an “ad hoc” basis. Formalize regular committee meetings and establish expectations for faculty service (e.g., publication of names per committee has already been accomplished; consider adding a weighting for workload expectations).
- As pointed out in the department self-study document, quantify and incentivize service activities and expectations.
- Establish guidelines for publishing and communicating financial support for faculty development opportunities.
- Choose concentration coordinators through consultation of the department chair, associate chair, and advisory committee, or another process deemed to fully represent the department’s interests, as well as the interests of individual faculty within each concentration.
- Address possible gender/race/ethnicity inequity in hiring, mentoring, evaluation, resource allocation. Consider adding “contributions to diversity” as a formal factor in tenure and promotion.
- Increase the regularity of faculty and staff debriefing sessions around important policy decisions.

- Establish a budget committee to review departmental expenditures, and bring relevant policy recommendations to the department.
- Include office staff in hiring decisions pertinent to office business.
- Create online access to policy documents for assessment, budget, RTP, hiring, and other important committees.

Objective: Identify student needs and improve faculty balance in the graduate concentrations

- Consider reorganizing the graduate programs to have fewer areas of concentration.
- Better align the goals of the graduate programs with the goals of the undergraduate program.
- Re-visit hiring priorities and decision-making, with clear links to support for programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels.
- Improve transparency in the decision-making for a needs-based balance across the graduate concentrations.

Objective: Improve mentorship and provision of feedback to junior faculty

- Consider tenure and promotion in context of each faculty member's position. There are varying demands on different faculty in different concentrations.
- Formalize the onboarding procedure, and subsequent mentoring relationships.
- Consider diversity as a goal for hiring with a target for alignment with the demographic distribution of students and the existing pool of Ph.D. level psychologists.
- Establish safeguards to protect junior faculty. Resources should not be distributed by tradition or by concentration coordinators, and expectations should be context-specific and communicated explicitly to junior faculty.