DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
Faculty of Arts

_____

Psyc 739.09	Personnel Selection		Winter 2019

Instructor:	Derek Chapman, Ph.D.	**Lecture Location:**	EDC 288
Phone:	403-700-9710	**Lecture Days/Time:**	Thurs 12:30-3:15
Email:	dchapman@ucalgary.ca		
Office:	A224		
Office Hours:	On Request		

Course Description and Goals

This is a senior graduate seminar examining advanced topics in personnel psychology. Core theories and practices of personnel selection will be covered and examined critically.

Course Learning Objectives:
1. To gain an understanding of the core theories and practices of personnel psychology
2. To gain an understanding of the challenges associated with personnel selection including internal factors such as the limitations of human judgment, and external contextual factors such as the legal, ethical, professional, organizational, cultural and technological factors that influence the practice of personnel psychology
3. To learn how to identify and measure job and performance requirements (i.e. criteria)
4. To gain an understanding of the techniques and measures of individual differences that are commonly used in selecting job applicants
5. To understand a variety of decision making methods to choose appropriate personnel
6. To be able to critically evaluate current research in personnel psychology
7. To learn to design research in personnel psychology
8. To learn practical quantitative approaches to selection system evaluation and design

Required Text
Gatewood, Feild and Murray (2016) Human Resource Selection 8th ed.

Evaluation

Class presentations (20%)
Individual research proposal (50%)
Practical Assignments X 3 (30%)
Assignment 1 Legal:
Assignment 2 Validation Data set 1
Assignment 3 Validation Data set 2

Late Assignments will be penalized 10% per day overdue. All assignment to be submitted either in class or by email to the instructor by noon on the due date.

Methodology:
This course will employ a variety of teaching methodologies including, lectures, student presentations, class discussions, and computer analysis of applied data and other experiential learning.

Individual Research Proposal:

Students are required to write an APA style research proposal examining one of the areas covered in the course (to be approved by the instructor). The proposal should be something that could (and perhaps will) be practically conducted and if properly conducted, would add to the body of knowledge of personnel psychology. This proposal would include what would normally be the introduction and method sections of an empirical paper (including lit. review, hypotheses, methods, sample, analyses proposed etc.). The length should be 12-20 pages. A short (one page) description of what you plan to do is due in class on week 6. The final paper is due on the last day of class. A grading rubric will be published on Blackboard.

Practical Assignments:

For the three practical assignments you will be given a series of practical short answer questions to respond to for a fictional client. You will be provided with a data set to analyze to serve as the basis for responding. Basic SPSS skills will be needed to conduct the analyses. The grading rubric will be provided with each assignment.

Class Presentations

Each topic will have a discussion leader assigned. In addition to the readings assigned, the discussion leader is responsible for seeking out additional information related to the topic area. This should include presenting a summary of one or two recent studies that relate to the topic area, a group exercise designed to demonstrate a concept, or anything you feel might be relevant to the topic material. These presentations should not normally exceed 30 minutes. The discussion leader should submit a brief outline (to the instructor) of what they would like to present, at least by the Friday of the week before they are due to lead the discussion. A grading rubric will be published on Blackboard.

Grading Scale

A+	96-100%	B+	80-84%	C+	67-71%	D+	54-58%
A	90-95%	B	76-79%	C	63-66%	D	50-53%
A-	85-89%	B-	72-75%	C-	59-62%	F	0-49%

As stated in the University Calendar, it is at the instructor's discretion to round off either upward or downward to determine a final grade when the average of term work and final examinations is between two letter grades.

To determine final letter grades, final percentage grades will be rounded up or down to the nearest whole percentage (e.g., 89.5% will be rounded up to 90% = A but 89.4% will be rounded down to 89% = A-). Grades are rounded at the end of the course rather than for each graded item.

Important dates

Date		Readings
R Jan10	Lecture begins. **Organizational Meeting Overview of the Course**	
R Jan 17	**Overview and Legal issues.**	Ryan' A.M. and Ployhart' R.E.(2014) A Century of Selection. ***Annual Review of Psychology*** Vol. 65: 693-717 Gatewood, Feild, & Barrick Ch.1 & Ch. 4
F Jan 18	Last day to add or swap full courses Last day for change of registration from audit to credit or credit to audit.	
R Jan 24	Measurement and Reliability	Gatewood Feild & Barrick, Ch. 6, and 7, Lebreton, Sherer & James (2014) Corrections for Criterion Reliability in Validity Generalization: A False Prophet in a Land of Suspended Judgment, Industrial & Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 7(4) 478-553. INCLUDES RESPONSE ARTICLES!
R Jan 31	Validation of selection measures	Gatewood Feild & Barrick, Ch. 8 Van Iddekinge, C., & Ployhart, R.. (2008). Developments in the criterion-related Validation of selection procedures: a critical review and recommendations for practice. Personnel Psychology, 61(4), 871-925. Murphy, K.R., Shiarella, A.H. (1997). Implications of the multidimensional nature of job performance for the validity of selection tests: Multivariate frameworks for studying test validity. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 823-854

		Practical assignment 1 due (Legal). Suggested further reading: Hoffman, C. C., & McPhail, S. M. (1998). Exploring options for supporting test use in situations precluding local validation. Personnel Psychology, 51, 987-1003.
R Feb 7	Decision making- cutoffs, strategies for hiring decisions	Gatewood, Feild & Barrick Ch. 15
R Feb 14	Establishing the Criterion	Gatewood, Feild, & Barrick, Ch 2 & 3 *Jundt, D. K., Shoss M. K., and Huang J. L. (2015) Individual adaptive performance in organizations: A review, J. Organiz. Behav., 36, S53–S71* Speer, A. B. (2018). Quantifying with words: An investigation of the validity of narrative-derived performance scores. *Personnel Psychology*, *71*(3), 299-333. Practical assignment 2 is due (Validity Dataset 1) Initial proposal summary for research project is due. Suggested Readings: Hoffman, B., & Woehr, D. (2009). Disentangling the meaning of multisource performance rating source and dimension factors. *Personnel psychology, 62(4),* 735-765. Lievens, F., Sanches, J.I, & DeCorte, W. (2004) Easing The Inferential Leap InCompetency Modeling: The Effects Of Task-Related Information and Subject Matter Expertise. Personnel Psychology, 57, 881-904. Campion, M. A., Fink, A. A., Ruggeberg, B. J., Carr, L., Phillips, G. M. And Odman, R. B. (2011), Doing Competencies Well: Best Practices In Competency Modeling. Personnel Psychology, 64: 225–262

		Dierdorff, E., & Morgeson, F.(2009). Effects of descriptor specificity and observability on incumbent work analysis ratings. *Personnel Psychology, 62(3)*, 601-628.
		Morgeson, F.P., Delaney-Klinger, K. Mayfield, M.S., Ferrara, P. & Campion, M.A. Self-Presentation Processes in Job Analysis: A Field Experiment Investigating Inflation in Abilities, Tasks, and Competencies. *Journal of Applied Psychology. 4* 674-
		Morgenson, F. P. & Campion, M. A. (1997). Social and cognitive sources of potential inaccuracy in job analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 627-655.
		Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E, (1993). A theory of performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 35-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
		Motowidlo, S.J., Borman, W.C. & Schmit, M.J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance, 10,* 71-83.
		Cronshaw, S.F. (1998). Job analysis: Changing nature of work. Canadian Psychology, 39, 5-13.
		Binning & Barrett (1989). Validity of personnel decisions: A conceptual analysis of the inferential and evidential bases. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 478-494.
		Ployhart, R.E. & Hakel, D. (1998). The Substantive Nature of Performance Variability: Predicting Interindividual Differences in Intraindividual Performance. Personnel Psychology, 51, pp.
Feb 17-23	Reading Days. No lectures.	
R Feb 28	Applicant Screening (WAB's, resumes, T&E, biodata etc.)	Gatewood, Feild & Barrick , Part 3 prelude, Ch. 9, Tesluk, P. E. Jacobs, R. R. (1998) Toward an integrated model of work experience. *Personnel Psychology, 51*, 321-355. Derous, E., Ryan, A. M. and Serlie, A. W. (2015), Double Jeopardy Upon Resumé Screening: When Achmed Is Less Employable Than Aïsha. Personnel Psychology, 68: 659–696. Suggested Readings:

		Mount, M.K., (2000). Incremental validity of empirically keyed biodata scales over GMA and the five factor personality constructs. *Personnel Psychology, 53*, pg. 299-324.
R Mar 7	Selection Interviews	Gatewood, Field & Barrick, Ch. 10

Barrick, Murray R.; Shaffer, Jonathan A.; DeGrassi, Sandra W (2009). What You See May Not Be What You Get: Relationships Among Self-Presentation Tactics and Ratings of Interview and Job Performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94, 6, 1394-1411

Huffcutt, A.I,. Van Iddekinge, C. H, Roth, P. L. (2011). Understanding applicant behavior in employment interviews: A theoretical model of interviewee performance. Human Resource Management Review Volume 21, Issue 4, , Pages 353–367

Assignment 3 due (Validity Dataset 2)

Suggested Readings:

Chapman, D.S. & Zweig, D.I. (2005) Developing a Nomological Net for Interview Structure: Antecedents and Consequences of the Structured Selection Interview. *Personnel Psychology.*

Melchers, K. G., Lienhardt, N., Von Aarburg, M. And Kleinmann, M. (2011), Is More Structure Really Better? A Comparison Of Frame-Of-Reference Training And Descriptively Anchored Rating Scales To Improve Interviewers' Rating Quality. Personnel Psychology, 64: 53–87.

Berry, C., Sackett, P., & Landers, R.. (2007). Revisiting interview-cognitive ability relationships: attending to specific range restriction mechanisms in meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 60(4), 837-874.

Campion, M.A., Palmer, D.K., & Campion, J.E. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 655-702.

Huffcutt, A. I, Conway, J. M, Roth, P. L., & Stone, N. J. (2001). Identification and meta-analytic assessment of psychological constructs measured in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 897-913. |

		Cortina J. M., Goldstein, N.B., Payne, S.C., Davison, H.K., Gilliland,S.W. (2000). The incremental validity of interview scores over and above cognitive ability and conscientiousness scores. *Personnel Psychology, 53*, 325-351. Mauer, S.D. (2002). A Practitioner-Based Analysis of Interviewer Job Expertise and Scale Format As Contextual Factors in Job Interviews. Personnel Psychology, 55, 307-327. R. W. Eder & M. M. Harris (Eds.) 1999. <u>The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice (2nd Edition)</u>. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Dipboye, R.L. Gaugler, B.B. (1993). Cognitive and behavioral processes in the selection interview. In N. Schmitt & W.C. Borman (Eds.) Personnel Selection in Organizations. San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass. pp. 135-170. Graves, L. M. (1993). Sources of individual differences in interviewer effectiveness: A model and implications for future research. <u>Journal of Organizational Behavior</u>, <u>14</u>, 349-370.
R Mar 14	Selection: Ability Testing	Gatewood, Feild & Barrick Ch. 11 Bobko, P., Roth, P.L., & Potosky, D. (1999). Derivation and implications of a meta-analytic matrix incorporating cognitive ability, alternative predictors, and job performance. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 561-589. Gonzalez-Mule, Erik; Mount, Michael K.; Oh, In-Sue . (2014) A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between General Mental Ability and Nontask Performance. Journal of Applied Psychology. 99(6):1222-1243, Suggested Readings: Ferris, G. L., Witt, L. A; Hochwarter, W. A. (2001). Interaction of social skill and general mental ability on job performance and salary. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86, 1075-1082. Schmidt, F.L. & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 124, 262-274.

		Ree, M. J., Earles, J. A., & Teachout, M. S. (1994). Predicting job performance: Not much more than g. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 518-524
R Mar 21	Personality/ Faking	Gatewood, Feild & Barrick Ch. 12
		Fine, S. & Merav, P. (2015) Faking Fast and Slow: Within-Person Response Time Latencies for Measuring Faking in Personnel Testing. Journal of Business and Psychology. DOI 10.1007/s10869-015-9398-5 (Available online)
		Joseph, D. L.Jin, J. , Newman, D. A. , O'Boyle, E. H. (2015) Why Does Self-Reported Emotional Intelligence Predict Job Performance? A Meta-Analytic Investigation of Mixed EI. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 100(2):298-342
		Suggested Readings:
		Ones, D., Dilchert, S., Viswesvaran, C., & Judge, T.. (2007). In support of personality assessment in organizational settings. *Personnel Psychology, 60*(4), 995-1027.
		Morgeson, F., Campion, M., Dipboye, R., Hollenbeck, J., Murphy, K., & Schmitt, N.. (2007). Are we getting fooled again? Coming to terms with limitations in the use of personality tests for personnel selection. *Personnel Psychology, 60*(4), 1029-1049.
		Tett, R., & Christiansen, N.. (2007). Personality tests at the crossroads: a response to morgeson, campion, dipboye, hollenbeck, murphy, and schmitt (2007). *Personnel Psychology, 60*(4), 967-993.
		Tett, Robert P. Freund, Kurt A., Christiansen, Neil D., Fox, Kevin E., Coaster, J (2012). Faking on self-report emotional intelligence and personality tests: Effects of faking opportunity, cognitive ability, and job type. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53,2 195-201.
		Barrick, M.R., Stewart, G.L., Neubert, M.J. & Mount, M.K. (1998). Relating member ability and personality to work-team processes and team effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 377-391.
		Judge, T., & Erez, A.. (2007). Interaction and intersection: the constellation of emotional stability and extraversion in predicting performance. *Personnel Psychology, 60*(3 Judge, T.A., Higgins, C.A., Thoreson, C.J. & Barrick, M.R. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 621-652.

		Sackett, P. R., Gruys, M. L. & Ellingson, J. E. (1998). Ability-personality interactions when predicting job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 545-556.

Ployhart, R. E., Lim, B. C., & Chan, K. Y. (2001). Exploring relations between typical and maximum performance ratings and the five factor model of personality. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 809-843.

Viswesvaran, C. & Ones, D.S. (1999). Meta-analyses of fakability estimates: implications for personality measurement. *Educational Psychology Measurement, 59*, 197-210.

Zickar, M.J. Robie, C.(1999). Modeling faking good on personality items: An item-level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 551-563. |
| R Mar 28 | Honesty/Integrity testing | Gatewood, Feild & Barrick Ch. 14.

Wanek, J.E. (1999) Integrity and honesty testing: What do we know? How do we use it? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 7*, 183-195.

Hogan, J., Brinkmeyer, K. (1997). Bridging the gap between overt and personality-based integrity tests. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 587-599. |
| R Apr 4 | Assessment Centers and simulations | Gatewood, Feild & Barrick Ch. 13.

Lievens, Filip; Schollaert, Eveline, Keen,Gert, (2015) The Interplay of Elicitation and Evaluation of Trait-Expressive Behavior: Evidence in Assessment Center Exercises. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 100(4):1169-1188.

Ingold, P. V., Kleinmann, M. , König, C. J. and Melchers, K. G. (2016), Transparency of Assessment Centers: Lower Criterion-related Validity but Greater Opportunity to Perform?. Personnel Psychology, 69: 467-497. doi:10.1111/peps.12105

Hoffman, Brian J.; Kennedy, Colby L.; LoPilato, Alexander C.; Monahan, Elizabeth L.; Lance, Charles E. (2015) A Review of the Content, Criterion-Related, and Construct-Related Validity of |

Assessment Center Exercises. Journal of Applied Psychology. 100(4):1143-1168.

Suggested further readings:
Slaughter, J. E., Christian, M. S., Podsakoff, N. P., Sinar, E. F. and Lievens, F. (2014), On the Limitations of Using Situational Judgment Tests to Measure Interpersonal Skills: The Moderating Influence of Employee Anger. Personnel Psychology, 67: 847–885

Gibbons & Rupp (2009). Dimension consistency as an individual difference: A new (old) perspective on the assessment center construct validity debate. Journal of Management, ol.35(5), pp. 1154-1180.

Arthur W., Day, E.A., McNelly, T.L. & Edens, P.S. (2003) A meta-analysis of the criterion-related validity of assessment center dimensions. Personnel Psychology, 56, 125-155.

Lievens, F., & Conway, J. M. (2001). Dimension and exercise variance in assessment center scores: A large-scale evaluation of multitrait-multimethod studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 1202-1222.

Lance, C.R., Lambert, T.A., Gewin, A.G., Lievens, F., & Conway, J.M. (2004) Revised Estimates of Dimension and Exercise Variance Components in Assessment Center Postexercise Dimension Ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 377-

Howard, A. (1997). A reassessment of assessment centers: Challenges for the 21st century. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 12*, 13-52.

Brummel, Rupp & Spain (2009). Constructing parallel simulation exercises for assessment centers and other forms of behavioral assessment. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol.62, pp. 135-170.

Hoffman, C.C. & Thornton, G.C. III. (1997). Examining selection utility where competing predictors differ in adverse impact. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 455-470.

Hennessy, J. Mabey, B. & Warr, P. (1998). Assessment centre observation procedures: An experimental comparison of traditional, checklist and coding methods. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment, 6*, 222-231.

Goffin, R.D. Rothstein, M. G. Johnston, N.G.

		(1996). Personality testing and the assessment center: Incremental validity for managerial selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 746-756.
R Apr 11	Technology use in Personnel Selection	O'Neil, Hambley, L, & (2014) Cyberslacking, engagement, and personality in distributed work environments. *Computers in Human Behavior.* Volume 40, 152–160 Roulin, N. (2014), The Influence of Employers' Use of Social Networking Websites in Selection, Online Self-promotion, and Personality on the Likelihood of *Faux Pas* Postings. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 22: 80–87. doi: 10.1111/ijsa.12058 Chapman, D.S. & Chow, S. Gamification in Personnel Selection (still in submission stage). Roulin N, Levashina J. (2018) LinkedIn as a new selection method: Psychometric properties and assessment approach. *Personnel Psychology*.;1–25. https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/10.1111/peps.12296 *Suggested Readings:* Lievens, F, & Burke, E. (2011). Dealing with threats inherent in unproctored internet testing of cognitive ability: Results from a large-scale operational test program. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84, 817-824. Tippins, N.T. (2009). Internet Alternatives to Proctered Internet Testing: Where are we now? *Industrial & Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice. 2, 1,* pages 2-76 (includes all of the response articles to this focal article). Potosky, D & Bobko, P. (2004) Selection Testing Via The Internet: Practical Considerations And Exploratory Empirical Findings. Personnel Psychology. 57, pg. 1003-1035. Chapman, D. & Rowe, P. (2001) "The impact of videoconference technology on interviewer evaluations of job applicants: A field experiment." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74, 279-298.*

		Chapman, D. & Webster, J. (2001) "Rater correction processes in applicant selection using videoconference technology: The role of attributions." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* Mead, A.D., & Drasgow, F. (1993). Equivalence of computerized and paper-and-pencil cognitive ability tests: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 114,* 449-458
F Apr 12	Winter Term Lectures End. Last day to withdraw with permission from Fall Term half courses.	

Reappraisal of Grades

A student who feels that a piece of graded term work (e.g., term paper, essay, test) has been unfairly graded, may have the work re-graded as follows. The student shall discuss the work with the instructor within 15 days of being notified about the mark or of the item's return to the class; no reappraisal of term work is permitted after the 15 days. If not satisfied, the student shall immediately take the matter to the Head of the department offering the course, who will arrange for a reassessment of the work within the next 15 days. The reappraisal of term work may cause the grade to be raised, lowered, or to remain the same. If the student is not satisfied with the decision and wishes to appeal, the student shall address a letter of appeal to the Dean of the faculty offering the course within 15 days of the unfavourable decision. In the letter, the student must clearly and fully state the decision being appealed, the grounds for appeal, and the remedies being sought, along with any special circumstances that warrant an appeal of the reappraisal. The student should include as much written documentation as possible.

Plagiarism and Other Academic Misconduct
Intellectual honesty is the cornerstone of the development and acquisition of knowledge and requires that the contribution of others be acknowledged. Consequently, plagiarism or cheating on any assignment

is regarded as an extremely serious academic offense. Plagiarism involves submitting or presenting work in a course as if it were the student's own work done expressly for that particular course when, in fact, it is not. Students should examine sections of the University Calendar that present a Statement of Intellectual honesty and definitions and penalties associated with Plagiarism/Cheating/Other Academic Misconduct.

Academic Accommodation

The student accommodation policy can be found at: ucalgary.ca/access/accommodations/policy. Students needing an Accommodation because of a Disability or medical condition should communicate this need to Student Accessibility Services in accordance with the Procedure for Accommodations for Students with Disabilities ucalgary.ca/policies/files/policies/student-accommodation-policy. Students needing an Accommodation based on a Protected Ground other than Disability, should communicate this need, preferably in writing, to the instructor.

Absence From A Test/Exam

Makeup tests/exams are **NOT** an option without the approval of the instructor. A student may be asked to provide supporting documentation for an exemption/special request for a make-up exam https://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/n-1.html. . Students who miss a test/exam have up to 48 hours to contact the instructor to ask for a makeup test/exam. It's the instructor's discretion if they will allow a make-up exam. Students who do not schedule a makeup test/exam with the instructor within this 48-hour period forfeit the right to a makeup test/exam. At the instructor's discretion, a makeup test/exam may differ significantly (in form and/or content) from a regularly scheduled test/exam. Once approved by the instructor a makeup test/exam must be written within 2 weeks of the missed test/exam during exam make-up hours provided by the department http://psychology.ucalgary.ca/undergraduate/exam-and-course-information#mues. If a student cannot write their final exam on the date assigned by the Registrar's Office, they need to apply for a deferred exam https://www.ucalgary.ca/registrar/exams/deferred-exams.

Travel During Exams

Consistent with University regulations, students are expected to be available to write scheduled exams at any time during the official December and April examination periods. Requests to write a make-up exam because of conflicting travel plans (e.g., flight bookings) will NOT be considered by the department. Students are advised to wait until the final examination schedule is posted before making any travel arrangements. If a student cannot write their final exam on the date assigned by the Registrar's Office, they need to apply for a deferred exam https://www.ucalgary.ca/registrar/exams/deferred-exams. Students with an exceptional extenuating circumstance (e.g., a family emergency) should contact the Department of Psychology (psyugrd@ucalgary.ca).

Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act

The FOIP legislation disallows the practice of having student's retrieve tests and assignments from a public place. Therefore, tests and assignments may be returned to students during class/lab, or during

office hours, or will be made available only for viewing during exam review sessions scheduled by the Department. Tests and assignments will be shredded after one year. Instructors should take care to not link students' names with their grades, UCIDs, or other FOIP-sensitive information.

Acknowledgments and Respect for Diversity
Our classrooms view diversity of identity as a strength and resource. Your experiences and different perspectives are encouraged and add to a rich learning environment that fosters critical thought through respectful discussion and inclusion. The Department of Psychology would also like to acknowledge the traditional territories of the people of the Treaty 7 region in southern Alberta. The City of Calgary is also home to Métis Nation of Alberta, Region III.

Wellness and Mental Health Resources
The University of Calgary recognizes the pivotal role that student mental health plays in physical health, social connectedness and academic success, and aspires to create a caring and supportive campus community where individuals can freely talk about mental health and receive supports when needed. We encourage you to explore the excellent mental health resources available throughout the university community, such as counselling, self-help resources, peer support or skills-building available through the SU Wellness Centre (Room 370, MacEwan Student Centre, https://www.ucalgary.ca/wellnesscentre/services/mental-health-services) and the Campus Mental Health Strategy website (http://www.ucalgary.ca/mentalhealth/).

Evacuation Assembly Point
In case of an emergency evacuation during class, students must gather at the designated assembly point nearest to the classroom. The list of assembly points is found at
http://www.ucalgary.ca/emergencyplan/assemblypoints
Please check this website and note the nearest assembly point for this course.

Student Ombudsman's Office
The Office of the Student Ombudsmen provides independent, impartial and confidential support for students who require assistance and advice in addressing issues and concerns related to their academic careers. The office can be reached at 403-220-6420 or ombuds@ucalgary.ca
(http://www.ucalgary.ca/provost/students/ombuds)

Safewalk
The safewalk program provides volunteers to walk students safely to their destination anywhere on campus. This service is free and available 24 hrs/day, 365 days a year.
Call 403-220-5333.

Important Dates
The last day to drop this course with no "W" notation and **still receive a tuition fee refund** is **January 17, 2019**. Last day for registration/change of registration is **January 18, 2019**. The last day to withdraw from this course is **April 12, 2019**.