

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

Members of Senate

From Bruce Clayman

Acting Dean of Graduate Studies

Subject APPLIED CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM

Date December 6, 1977

Upon the advice of a distinguished member of Senate, and because I will be unable to attend the additional meeting of Senate on December 12, 1977, I have compiled a chronology of the events leading to the placement before you of the proposed M.A. and Ph.D. programs in Applied Clinical Psychology. The supporting documentation will be available at that meeting.

The original form of the proposal was received by J. Wheatley in early December, 1976. He replied to M. Bowman with his initial reactions on January 10, 1977, pointing out some weaknesses he identified. He also notified the Faculty of Arts Graduate Studies Committee of their role in the consideration of the program (approval in principle).

In late March, 1977, the Library prepared a report on their ability to support the program. On April 18, 1977, the Senate Committee for the Assessment of New Graduate Programs (Assessment Committee) met with J. Wheatley, as Chairman, to consider the program which had been modified in light of J. Wheatley's comments and the Library's report. The Committee identified a list of 12 concerns, and proposed a meeting between the Library and Psychology representatives to arrive at a determination of minimum additional Library resources.

On April 27, 1977, M. Bowman provided a detailed reply to the concerns raised at the meeting of April 18, 1977.

The Committee next met on May 18, 1977, with me as Chairman, and

concluded that one main area of concern remained: the criteria and mechanisms for the selection of the adjunct instructors for the field practice and for the evaluation of their performance and that of the students. Representatives of the program were invited to the next meeting of the Committee on June 1, 1977. In the interim, I convened an informal meeting of departmental and Library representatives, and arrived at an agreement about the resources to be required.

At the meeting of the Assessment Committee on June 1, 1977, a discussion was held concerning the adjunct instructors and their role in the program. The question of the funds needed to provide satisfactory library resources was answered. It was agreed that the proposal was now in a form appropriate to be sent to external assessors. Five external

assessors were selected -
Dr. V. Douglas, McGill University
Dr. K. Bowers, Waterloo University
Dr. S. Sulzbacher, University of Washington
Dr. P. McLean, B.C. Psychological Association
Dr. P. Davidson, University of British Columbia

During June, the assessors were contacted. Drs. Douglas and Davidson declined; Dr. Douglas because of lack of time, Dr. Davidson because of previous involvement in this program.

By mid August, the three completed assessments were in hand. All three assessors saw a great demand for graduates, and recommended the mounting of the program: all three also had suggestions for improvement:

- a) Bowers' main area of concern was the adjunct instructors and the amount of supervision they were to provide - both amount per week and total duration of the field experience. He also felt firm commitments from external agencies should be provided. He had some specific but minor concerns about several of the course offerings: PSYC 802 and the advanced topics seminars.
- b) Sulzbacher also identified the adjunct instructors as the critical area needing more detail.

- c) McLean also felt greater detail was required in the area of the adjunct instructors' role. He also suggested some minor restructuring of some of the courses, including 802.

On September 8th, the Assessment Committee met to consider the assessors reports. They concluded the only major outstanding problem was the role of the adjunct instructors, so I wrote to M. Bowman asking her to respond to this. Her reply in mid October was an extensively revised proposal which, in addition to many editorial clarifications, contained an 8 page description of the principles and procedures for the selection, performance, and evaluation of the adjunct instructors.

On November 3, 1977, the Assessment Committee approved the program and forwarded it to Senate. At the same time it asked M. Bowman to address one remaining criticism from an assessor: he felt that 7 hours/week of direct supervision were required during the internships (compared with the 2 hour/week minimum specified in the proposal). In early November, 1977, M. Bowman responded to this last point in an entirely adequate manner. Thus the Assessment Committee's task was completed.

The Senate Graduate Studies Committee received the report of the Assessment Committee and acted on it on November 14, by giving it unanimous approval.



Bruce Clayman
Acting Dean of Graduate Studies

BC/lg