**Online Assessment Tracking Database** 

Sam Houston State University (SHSU) 2014 - 2015

Psychology And Philosophy, Department Of

Goal	Faculty Scholarship 🔎	
	Faculty generate and disseminate scholarship	
Objective (P)	Scholarship Portfolios 🔎	
	Faculty will be effective scholars as evidenced by the portfolio documenting their scholarship on an annual basis	
KPI		
Performance Indicator	Review Of Faculty Scholarship 🔎	
	For the Psychology Program: Evaluation of faculty scholarship portfolios according to the Program guidelines for Scholarly & Artistic Endeavors. Factors in this category include: text books written (5 pts); number and assessed quality of publications in externally reviewed journals or funded grants (4 pts); number of presentations at national, international, and regional conferences, or submitted grants, or book chapters (3 pts); conference presentations, book reviews, submitted articles (2 pt); first author (1 pt). Totals were summed and results were put on a scale of 1-5 with 0-5=1; 6-10=2; 11-15=3; 16-20=4; 21+=5. Criterion for an individual faculty member was set at 3. For the Philosophy program, the rubric for Scholarship included: 5 points for Books and funded external grants; 4 points for publications in print and/or funded internal grants; 3 points for submitted grants and/or book chapters; 2 points for conference presentation, book reviews, and submitted articles; 1 point for first author. Totals were summed and results were put on a scale of 0-5 with 0-5=1; 6-10=2; 11-15=3; 15-20=4; 21+=5. Criterion for an individual faculty member was set at 3. In the rubrics for both Psychology and Philosophy, it is noted that if a grant was obtained, the size of the grant was not taken into account in the scoring. This approach was taken to encourage faculty, regardless of years at SHSU or years in rank, to apply for grants, both large and small.	
Result	Faculty Scholarship 🔎	
	With respect to faculty scholarship, in the Psychology program, the mean scholarship ranking according to the aforementioned categories was 3.8 with a range of 1-5. One faculty member scored a 2 and two scored a 1. The individual with the score of 2 was a first-year faculty member who had spent a great deal of time setting up her laboratory. We expect that her efforts will be rewarded with many forthcoming articles. Of the faculty who had scored a "1" one individual was a program coordinator and has elected to give up that post in order to engage in more scholarly work. The other is perenially at the "1" level and has been spoken with several times. This past spring, the program DPTAC voted unanimously to place the person in a remedial program to attempt to "kick start" his career.	
	In the Philosophy program, the mean score on scholarship was 3.5 with a range of 3 to 5.	

Action	Scholarship Portfolios The first action will be to change the criteria for the awarding of points to faculty for research activities. The chair will speak with the department members during the fall 2015 semester to determine what changes should be made and then will implement those changes. Any changes will enable the chair to better discriminate among the faculty who are moderately productive and those who are very productive. The second action will be to continue making available travel funds for all full-time faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate student. Graduate and undergraduate students must be partial authors to receive those funds. New faculty will receive a minimum of \$5,000 start-up funds to begin their research programs at SHSU. The lone faculty member who failed to pass the post-tenure review will be put on remediation with two faculty mentors to help jump start his career.
Goal	Teaching Excellence 🔎
	Faculty demonstrate high level of teaching effectiveness
Objective (P)	Individual Development And Educational Assessment (IDEA) Evaluations P IDEA student evaluations of teaching will indicate that faculty are
	engaging in effective teaching as indicated by their summary scores
KPI Performance Indicator	IDEA Ratings & P
	A summary IDEA score at or above the institution mean is considered to be satisfactory. Consistent with IDEA recommendations, in the past we had used converted averages on IDEA evaluations that are in the gray box (middle 40%) to be considered "effective teaching." A sample copy of the IDEA form is attached to this document. The scores are then compared to national norms. Teaching effectiveness is assessed by looking at Overall adjusted course summary compared to the discipline with a mean of 50. Criterion for effective teaching is that the deparment's average scores will exceed the Discipline mean on the adjusted Summary Evaluation. We also will expect that the 70% of the Department's sections will be at or above the Discipline norm on the IDEA database and at or above the Institution's average.
Result	IDEA Ratings 🔎
	For the Fall 2014 semester, on a 5-point scale, the mean of summary scores for courses taught by full- time faculty was 4.4. More importantly, the percentage of classes above the national norm with respect to the discipline was 86% with only 11 of 77 classes falling below the national norm. The mean on this scale for our faculty was 55.47. For the Spring 2014 semester, on a 5-point scale, the mean of scores for courses taught by full-time faculty was 4.3. The percentage of classes with scores above

the discipline national norm was 82% with only 13 of 71 sections falling below the discipline norm. The mean on this scale for our faculty was 54.77.

Action	<b>IDEA Ratings</b> The department faculty did very well with respect to IDEA ratings this past academic year. We still fell short in a few sections and the chair currently is reviewing those courses, considering the type of course it is, the instructor, the time, etc. If our success continues, we will raise the performance criterion to 75% starting in the spring 2016 semester.
Objective (P)	Teaching Portfolios 🔎
	Faculty will engage in effective teaching as evidenced by a portfolio documenting their teaching activities on an annual basis
KPI Performance Indicator	Teaching Portfolio Review 🔎
	Evaluation of faculty teaching portfolios according to the Department Chair Guidelines for Teaching Evaluations. Factors in this indicator include: student evaluations (excellent teacher = .8), faculty track (teaching or research), number of sections, number of students in each section, etc. (=.2) The goal is that faculty score a minimum of 3 on a scale of 1-5.
Result	<b>Teaching Portfolio</b> <i>P</i> Based upon the aforementioned guidelines, the scores for the Chair's Evaluation of Excellence in Teaching had a range of 3.88 to 5.00 with a mean of 4.55. The is fairly close to the the IDEA form's Excellent Teacher category which had a range of 3.70 to 4.93 and a mean of 4.68. Thus, all faculty reached criterion. Breaking down the data between the Psychology and the Philosophy programs, Psychology faculty had a mean of 4.56 and Philosophy had a mean of 4.49, a difference not statistically significant.
Action	<b>Teaching Portfolio</b> It has been expressed that a minimum criterion for the Chair's Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness being set at 3 is very low. Next year, the Chair will use two criteria, both the IDEA Excellent Teacher category and the Chair's Evaluation and the minimum acceptable score will be set at 4 instead of 3 for each.
Goal	Curriculum Faculty assess the extent to which the curriculum covers a broad base of the field of psychology
Objective (P)	Curriculum Evaluation 🔎

Courses in the Psychology Program will be evaluated in terms of the breadth of topics covered in the field.

KPI Performance Indicator	Curriculum Matrix 🖋 🔎
	Courses were compared to the matrix designed by Levy et al. & published in Teaching of Psychology (1999). The chair made the comparisons based upon the syllabi for each course. In addition, the chair asked individual faculty about specific courses and whether those courses met criterion for the Levy et al. matrix. 50% of courses in the psychology curriculum were expected to require knowledge of the "Current Perspectives" section of the Levy Curriculum Matrix.
Result	Curriculum Matrix 🔎
	The chair reviewed the content of the syllabi for courses in the department and found that 76% of thoses courses meet the standards of "Current Perspectives" of the Levy Curriculum Matrix.
Action	Curriculum Matrix 🔎
	The chair will continue to review syllabi and will encourage the development of new courses, e.g., a course in the Development of Aging. Other courses, already in the curriculum, may be removed depending upon interest and depending up need.
Goal	Undergraduate Student Perception Of Psychology Learning Undergraduates students will be satisfied with learning opportunties.
Objective (P)	Undergraduate Student Perception Of Psychology Offerings 🎤
	Students will indicate an appreciation for the diversity of fields within psychology and their realization that elementary statistics has enabled them to improve critical thinking to evaluate ideas and arguments in problem-solving.
KPI Performance Indicator	Senior Survey 🖉 🔎
	The Psychology Senior Survey is given to graduating seniors. The goal for ratings is at least 75% for a Challenging Program and a High Quality Program, as indicated by a 4 or a 5 on a 5-point likert scale.
	In addition, we sought to measure the ability to apply and communicate scientific knowledge and generate scientific knowledge. These two factors were assessed by looking at performance on several assignments during the academic semesters in Psychology 3101, Elementary Statistics Laboratory, and by analyzing performance on a 3301/3101 essay exam. Both documents are attached. Criterion was set at 70% passing (a minimum of 70% correct) for each factor.

Result

#### Undergraduate Perception P

Analyzing the senior surveys, on a 5-point Likert scale, 86.36% of our graduates rated their experience with the psychology major as challenging, 4 or 5 on the scale. 86.36% of our students rated the quality of the psychology major as of "high quality." One point, it wasn't exactly the same 86.36%. One of the issues with the Seniour Survey is that it would be nice to correlate our results with grade point average or SAT scores, etc. Unfortunately, the survey is given anonymously, as it should be and we have no way of making this comparison. In the next cycle, we shall ask each student to enter his or her grade point average, both overall and in psychology. Of course, this would be optional.

With respect to generating and communicating scientific knowledge, in the falll 2014 semester, 79.37% of students involed in Psychology 3101 successfully passed the "Application of a Scientific Knowledge" assignments. In the spring 2015 semester, 85.12 met criterion. For "Communicating Scientific Knowledge," 72.03% and 84.76% were successful in the fall 2014 and spring 2015 semesters, respectively.

## Action Perception--Senior Survey And Communication Of Scientific Knowledge P

The data from the Senior Survey look pretty good with our reaching our goal on both rigor of the program and quality of the program. In the next cycle we will have a short "demographic" section which will ask the student's age, grade point average, etc. to determine any relationships between success in the program and perception of rigor. With respect to generating and communicating scientific knowledge, we met criterion. In the upcoming academic year, we are raising our criterion of success to 80% correct, as opposed to the 70% used this past academic year.

#### Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

Scholarship Portfolios:

1. all tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the department will be afforded laboratory space available to them to conduct research;

2. all faculty members will be given \$1800 in funds to travel to conferences, regardless of whether they are presenting;

3. faculty who are required to be licensed with have the portion of the license necessary to perform their jobs paid for by the Department;

4. start-up funds have been set aside for in-coming faculty members;

5. all tenure-track faculty will meet with the chair once each semester to discuss his or her progress toward tenure.

6. all faculty not meeting scholarship criterion will meet with the chair each spring to discuss possible strategies to help them meet criterion.

Teaching portfolios:

The chair will review the teaching evaluations for each course for each faculty member for each semester.

1. Those folling in the bottom 30% of the IDEA forms will meet with the chair and be warned that the department and college consider a t-score of 50 and above to be acceptable. Tenure-

track faculty will be told that the probability for being awarded tenure is extremely low with low IDEA scores;

2. adjunct faculty falling in the bottom 30% will be given one semester to improve the scores or their contracts will not be renewed;

3. all faculty with low scores will be advised to go to the PACE Center to discuss issues involved in teaching and strategies for overcoming obstacles;

4. as always, all faculty are encouraged to attend the CHSS Teaching Conference in August 2014.

#### Curriculum:

1. any and all new courses will go through the departmental curriculum committee for adherence to the Levi Matrix;

2. courses taught under the rubric "special topics" will be reviewed by the chair for content and the manner in which the course will be taught.

#### Senior survey:

The return on the Senior survey was abysmally poor this past academic. The was entirely the fault of the chair who e-mailed the survey to graduating seniors. In the upcoming academic year, surveys will be distributed to seniors during class times after which they will be collected by faculty and turned into the chair.

# Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.

Scholarship Portfolios

1. all tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the department will be afforded laboratory space available to them to conduct research--All faculty were given laboratory space in which to conduct research. To the chair's knowledge, all but one member of the tenured/tenure-track faculty used that space to their advantage. The one who did not published nothing, presented nothing, and appeared oblivious to the scholarship requirement. That person underwent post-tenure review and was placed on a remediation program. Hopefully, under that program, the productivity will change. We are not changing this approach as the department chair wishes to give each faculty member every opportunity to be productive and, thus, the onus of success rests on the shoulders of the faculty.

2. all faculty members will be given \$1800 in funds to travel to conferences, regardless of whether they are presenting--The amount of \$1800 appeared to be sufficient for most faculty. Again, we are not changing this approach as both those that are productive get to present their research and those who are not productive have the opportunity to attend conferences and glean knowledge as to what others in the field are doing.

3. faculty who are required to be licensed with have the portion of the license necessary to perform their jobs paid for by the Department--This is a nice benefit for those needing to be licensed and the faculty appreciate it. It also has made hiring high-quality faculty much easier. 4. start-up funds have been set aside for in-coming faculty members;

5. all tenure-track faculty will meet with the chair once each semester to discuss his or her progress toward tenure.

6. all faculty not meeting scholarship criterion will meet with the chair each spring to discuss possible strategies to help them meet criterion--Those not meeting criterion met with the chair in March or April. In one case the faculty member appeared unaffected. In another case, the strategy was to remove some administrative duties from the faculty member and free up time for scholarship for her.

#### Teaching portfolios:

The chair will review the teaching evaluations for each course for each faculty member for each semester.

1. Those falling in the bottom 30% of the IDEA forms will meet with the chair and be warned that the department and college consider a t-score of 50 and above to be acceptable. Tenure-track faculty will be told that the probability for being awarded tenure is extremely low with low IDEA scores--All faculty members met with the chair to discuss teaching performance. Prior, there had been three faculty members who had consistently poor performance. This past academic year, one did not receive tenure and will be leaving the university at the end of the

summer 2015 semester; one had a heart attack and died; and one chose to pursue other interests for his life's work.

2. adjunct faculty falling in the bottom 30% will be given one semester to improve the scores or their contracts will not be renewed--We had one adjunct faculty member who performed at this level. She met with the chair and discussed ways of increasing her scores. Let it be known that this was her first semester teaching and we have the expectation that she will be an asset to our program. So, the chair isn't that worried but will keep an eye on her performance.

3. all faculty with low scores will be advised to go to the PACE Center to discuss issues involved in teaching and strategies for overcoming obstacles--We have continued to advise faculty to go to the PACE Center and it appears to be beneficial, based upon scores this past academic year.

4. as always, all faculty are encouraged to attend the CHSS Teaching Conference in August 2014--The faculty have been encouraged to do this and all new faculty are told that it is required during their first year.

#### Curriculum:

1. any and all new courses will go through the departmental curriculum committee for adherence to the Levi Matrix--There were no issues with this during the past academic year as no new courses were submitted to the curriculum committee.

2. courses taught under the rubric "special topics" will be reviewed by the chair for content and the manner in which the course will be taught--The chair actually denied a graduate special topics course this past academic year as it did not appear to reach the rigor required by doctoral courses. Actually, it did appear that little work would go into the course and the faculty member would merely be observing and giving feedback to doctoral students giving one lecture each for an entire semester. Thus, it was not permitted. The faculty member is leaving the university at the end of the summer 2015 term. In the upcoming academic year, criteria for independent study courses will consider: pedagogical value of the course; how the course supplements the student's current educational background; and how the course supplements the student, will have to address the aforementioned issues if they are not obvious in the faculty/student contract.

Senior survey:

The return on the Senior survey was abysmally poor this past academic. This was entirely the fault of the chair who e-mailed the survey to graduating seniors. In the upcoming academic year, surveys will be distributed to seniors during class times after which they will be collected by faculty and turned into the chair--The new procedure seems to have worked with a fairly good return rate. This procedure will be used in the upcoming academic year.

### Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2014 - 2015 Cycle Findings.

Scholarship Portfolios

1. All faculty will continue to receive laboratory space;

2. When possible, graduate assistants will be made available to faculty for research;

3. Faculty will continue to receive travel funds at approximately \$1600 to \$1800 depending upon the budgets;

4. Start-up funds have been made available for incoming faculty members;

5. Based upon a meeting with departmental faculty, the scholarship criteria will be adjusted to let the chair better discriminate among the faculty;

6. Those not meeting criteria will meet with the chair to discuss changes in duties and, if necessary, a remediation program.

#### Teaching Portfolios

1. All faculty will meet with the chair concerning teaching; those with low IDEA scores will have the situation investigated by looking at the type of course, the frequency with which the faculty member has taught the course, and whether the course is required or not;

2. Adjunct faculty will be held to the same criteria as full-time faculty and will be given a semester to raise unacceptable scores to levels that are acceptable;

3. All faculty will be advised to attend the CHSS teaching conference held in August of 2015.

Curriculum

1. Proposed courses will go through the departmental curriculum committee and will be expected to adhere to the Levi Curriculum Matrix. Those that do not will be returned to the proposers for further development;

2. Special topics courses will be scrutinized by the chair and by the coordinator of the appropriate program to determine if offering the course is in the best interests of the student, of the program and of the department. As mentioned above, specific criteria will include: pedagogical value of the course; how the course supplements the student's current educational background; and how the course supplements the student's goals for the future with respect to his or her major. The faculty member, along with the student, will have to address the aforementioned issues if they are not obvious in the faculty/student contract.

#### Senior Survey

Results from the senior survey were very encouraging. The Department will continue to use the procedure employed this past academic year to ensure a viable return rate.

.....