



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

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

PLO 1.1. 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.



Data Tables

Table 1. Faculty-to-Student Ratio 2025-26

Full-time Faculty FTE*	2.0	Full-time Faculty Count	3.0
Adjunct Faculty FTE*	1.6	Adjunct Faculty Count	14.0
Student FTE**	20.0		
Faculty/Student Ratio	1 : 5.6		

* 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 2025-26 academic year, the faculty-to-student ratio was approximately one faculty member for every five or six students in coursework (Table 1).

Table 2. Attrition and Persistence Counts by Matriculation Year

		Matriculation Year (Academic Year)							Overall
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	
Attrition	AW/AD	6	6	7	9	3	3		34
	W	4	3	12	5	5	3	2	34
	Total	10	9	19	14	8	6	2	68
Persistence	Graduated	1							1
	Still In Program	4	3	5	10	6	6	11	45
	Total	5	3	5	10	6	6	11	46
Enrollment		15	12	24	24	14	12	13	114

Table 3. Attrition and Persistence Rates by Matriculation Year

		Matriculation Year (Academic Year)							Overall
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	
Attrition	AW/AD	60%	67%	37%	64%	38%	50%	0%	50%
	W	40%	33%	63%	36%	63%	50%	100%	50%
	Total	67%	75%	79%	58%	57%	50%	15%	60%
Persistence	Graduated	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
	Still In Program	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%
	Total	33%	25%	21%	42%	43%	50%	85%	40%
Enrollment		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- As of February 2026, 45 students remained enrolled in the program and one student had graduated, representing 40 percent of students who matriculated between academic years 2018-19 and 2024-25 (Tables 2 and 3).
- Persistence rates were highest among the most recently admitted cohorts, with 85 percent of students from the 2024-25 cohort remaining enrolled.



Table 4. Graduates by Demographic Characteristic

		Graduation Year			Total
		2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	
Gender	Female	60%	100%	67%	70%
	Male	40%	0%	0%	20%
	Unknown	0%	0%	33%	10%
Ethnicity	American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Asian	20%	0%	0%	10%
	Black or African American	40%	50%	0%	30%
	Hispanic	20%	0%	0%	10%
	Two or more	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Undeclared	0%	50%	67%	30%
	White	20%	0%	33%	20%
Graduated		100%	100%	100%	100%

- Among CLIE graduates from academic years 2022-23 through 2024-25, 70 percent identified as female, 20 percent identified as male, and 10 percent did not report gender (Table 4).
- Graduate demographics varied across racial and ethnic groups, with the largest proportions identifying as Black or African American (30 percent), White (20 percent), or Hispanic (10 percent).
- Thirty percent chose not to identify a race or ethnicity.

Table 5. Median Time-to-Degree Completion (Years)

Degree	Graduation Year			Overall
	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	
CLIE MA Years*	3.1	2.6	2.4	2.6
CLIE PhD Years	8.6	8.0	11.0	8.9
Institute All Doctoral Years	6.4	6.3	7.3	6.6
CLIE MA Count	8	17	8	33
CLIE PhD Count	5	2	3	10
Institute All Doctoral Count	50	55	61	166

* CLIE MA 100% time-to-degree length is published as 24 months (2.0 years), PhD 100% time-to-degree length is published as 63 months (5.25 years). MA 150% time-to-degree length is 36.0 months and PhD 150% time-to-degree length is 94.5 months (7.85 years).

- Students who completed the CLIE M.A. degree did so in a median of 2.6 years, while students who completed the CLIE Ph.D. degree did so in a median of 8.9 years.
- The median time-to-degree for CLIE Ph.D. graduates exceeded the Institute-wide doctoral median of 6.6 years.



Table 6. 2024-2025 Course Evaluation Results

Survey Statement	Average Rating (Four-point scale converted to rate, where 4.0 = 100%)				
	Fall 2024	Winter 2025	Spring 2025	Summer 2025	Overall
The instructor respected the ideas and opinions of others.	92%	95%	92%	100%	93%
The instructor was reasonably accessible either in person, by phone, or by e-mail.	86%	98%	90%	100%	91%
The instructor is knowledgeable about the topic.	99%	99%	100%	100%	99%
The instructor provided clear feedback on assignments or discussions.	93%	96%	94%	100%	95%
The instructor was adequately prepared to teach the course.	98%	95%	98%	100%	97%
The instructor was skillful at maintaining focus throughout the course.	98%	95%	91%	100%	95%
The instructor was passionate about the course and materials.	98%	99%	99%	100%	99%
The course encouraged reflection on cross-cultural material, multi-cultural perspectives, global issues, or community issues.	94%	98%	98%	100%	97%
The course encouraged me to think creatively or more deeply about the topic.	96%	97%	98%	100%	97%
Courses	12	8	11	2	33
Enrolled	97	83	100	12	292
Respondents	26	16	11	2	55
Response Rate	27%	19%	11%	17%	19%

- Ratings across survey statements ranged from 86 to 99 percent in Fall 2024, 95 to 99 percent in Winter 2025, 90 percent to 100 percent in Spring 2025, and 100 percent across all survey statements in Summer 2025 (Table 6).
- Overall ratings ranged from 91 to 99 percent. The highest overall-rated survey statements were “The instructor is knowledgeable about the topic” and “The instructor was passionate about the course and materials,” both with overall ratings of 99 percent.



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 who withdrew, were administratively withdrawn, or were 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.