



Depth Psychology Program – Community, Liberation, Indigenous, and Eco-Psychologies Specialization (M.A./Ph.D.) Fact Sheet

Program Learning Outcomes (PLO's)

PLO 1. Critically deconstruct key depth psychological concepts identifying Eurocentric ideologies, and applying relevant concepts to community, cultural, and ecological issues.

PLO 2.1. Critically analyze the historical context of Western psychological theories underlying coloniality.

PLO 2.2. Revise and create theory that supports decoloniality in a transdisciplinary manner.

PLO 2.3. Critically integrate theories from depth psychology and community, liberation, indigenous, and eco-psychologies.

PLO 3.1. Conceive research proposals that deconstruct coloniality and facilitate decoloniality.

PLO 3.2. Complete a literature review relevant to the student's research topic identifying gaps, and critiquing coloniality in the archives.

PLO 3.3.1. Collaboration with co-participants in the selection of research questions, methods, analysis and interpretation of results, and dissemination of findings.

PLO 3.3.2. Critical analysis of research frameworks.

PLO 3.3.3. Application of critical reflexivity to understand systems of coloniality as well as one's own positionality and their impact on theoretical frameworks, research, dissemination of findings, and community engagement.

PLO 3.3.4. Propose analytic strategies that address structures of coloniality (i.e., integrated historic systems of hegemonic power and discriminatory classification imposed through various forms of violence, including white supremacy, patriarchy, heteronormativity, Eurocentrism, ableism, etc.)

PLO 3.3.5. Propose application of research findings to inform systems change through advocacy or policy development.

PLO 4. Demonstrate knowledge on how to apply group approaches to cultural and ecological fieldwork and community work.

PLO 5. Demonstrate proficiency in the use of scholarly and public education communication strategies.



Table 1. Faculty-to-Student Ratio 2022-23

Total FTE Faculty*	5.87
Total FTE Students**	39
Faculty/Student Ratio	1:6.6

* Full-time Equivalent (FTE) was calculated by dividing the total credit hours for the academic year by 18 (the number of credit hours/full-time contract).

** Full-time Equivalent (FTE). Part-time students counted as 0.5 FTE and full-time students counted as 1.0 FTE.

- In the 2022-23 academic year, the faculty-to-student ratio was approximately one faculty member for every seven students in coursework (Table 1).

Table 2. Attrition and Persistence Counts by Entering Year

		Entering Year					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Total
Attrition	AW/AD	3	4	2	5	1	15
	W	7	4	3	10	4	28
	Total Attrition	10	8	5	15	5	43
Retention	Graduated	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Still In Program	4	7	7	9	20	47
	Total Retention	4	7	7	9	20	47
Enrollment	14	15	12	24	25	90	

Table 3. Attrition and Persistence Rates by Entering Year

		Entering Year					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Total
Attrition	AW/AD	21.4%	26.7%	16.7%	20.8%	4.0%	16.7%
	W	50.0%	26.7%	25.0%	41.7%	16.0%	31.1%
	Attrition Rate	71.4%	53.3%	41.7%	62.5%	20.0%	47.8%
Retention	Graduated	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Still In Program	28.6%	46.7%	58.3%	37.5%	80.0%	52.2%
	Retention Rate	28.6%	46.7%	58.3%	37.5%	80.0%	52.2%
Enrollment	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

- As of September 2, 2022, 43 (48%) of the 90 students who started the CLIE program between the academic years 2017-18 and 2021-22 left the program without completing it (Tables 2 & 3). Among students who started in the academic year 2021-22, five out of 25 students (20%) left the program by the end of the second year.
- Four of the 14 students (29%) who started in the 2017-18 academic year are still enrolled, at the beginning of their fifth year.
- Of the 2021-22 cohort (25 students who started two years ago), 20 students (80% of the cohort) were still enrolled.



Table 4. Graduation Rates, Counts, and Time to Ph.D. Completion

Graduation Rates			Time to Completion		
Matriculation Year	Cohort Count	Percentage	Graduation Year	Graduate Count	Years
2015-16	20	20.0%	2020-21	5	7.6
2016-17	27	18.5%	2021-22	6	5.7

- Of the students who started in the 2015-16 academic year, 20.0% graduated, and of those who started in the 2016-17 academic year, 18.5% graduated by the spring of 2023 (Table 4).
- Students who completed the programs in the 2020-21 to 2021-22 academic years took between 6 and 8 years on average to complete their Ph.D. (Table 4).

Table 5: 2021-2022 Course Evaluation Results

% of Maximum Score	Fall 2021 (14 Courses)	Winter 2022 (8 Courses)	Spring 2022 (5 Courses)	Summer 2022 (3 Courses)
The instructor respected the ideas and opinions of others.	90.5%	95.3%	87.5%	100.0%
The instructor was reasonably accessible either in person, by phone, or by e-mail.	87.8%	96.0%	81.0%	75.0%
The instructor is knowledgeable about the topic.	97.3%	98.0%	85.3%	100.0%
The instructor provided clear feedback on assignments or discussions.	86.8%	91.3%	76.0%	75.0%
The instructor was adequately prepared to teach the course.	95.3%	94.3%	81.8%	75.0%
The instructor was skillful at maintaining focus throughout the course.	89.8%	93.3%	79.0%	75.0%
The instructor was passionate about the course and materials.	94.0%	100.0%	89.0%	100.0%
The course encouraged reflection on cross-cultural material, multi-cultural perspectives, global issues, or community issues.	95.8%	94.3%	86.5%	87.5%
The course encouraged me to think creatively or more deeply about the topic.	94.5%	96.0%	83.8%	87.5%
Response Rate	21.1%	18.1%	20.6%	10.7%

- The summer quarter evaluations had both the lowest and highest average scores which ranged between 75% and 100% of the maximum possible scores (Table 5). Of the three courses taught in the summer, only *DPC 783 Fieldwork Practicum: Tending the Soul of the World* received evaluations, and only from three students. This is the quarter with the lowest response rate (11%). Thus, ratings must be interpreted with caution.
- The spring quarter had a couple of average ratings that fell below 80% (based on 27 student evaluations): “The instructor provided clear feedback on assignments or discussions” (76%) and “The instructor was skillful at maintaining focus throughout the course” (79%). All other course evaluations provided in Spring 2022, Fall 2021, and Winter 2022 were high, indicating that the CLIE students who completed the course evaluations were overall satisfied with the program’s delivery of its courses. However, the response rate was low each quarter (between 11% and 21%).



Glossary

Term	Definition
Academic Disqualification (AD)	Academic disqualification refers to a student being disqualified for academic reasons.
Administrative Withdrawal (AW)	An administrative withdrawal occurs after a program time limit has expired, or a student leave of absence has expired, and the student has been inactive for more than a quarter.
Attrition	This category includes students administratively withdrawn or academically disqualified.
Persistence	This category combines students who graduated and those who are still enrolled in the program at a "census date" (specified snapshot date).
Still In Program	This category includes students in the coursework or dissertation phase. Students who are on leave of absence are considered still in the program.
Withdrawal (W)	This status indicates a student's voluntary withdrawal.