

Psychology and Philosophy, Department of
Assessment Plan Summary

Psychology and Philosophy, Department of

Curriculum

Goal Description:

Faculty assess the extent to which the curriculum covers a broad base of the field of psychology

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Curriculum Evaluation

Performance Objective Description:

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

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Curriculum Matrix

KPI Description:

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.

Results Description:

The chair reviewed the content of the syllabi for courses in the department and found that 78% of those courses meet the standards of "Current Perspectives" of the Levy Curriculum Matrix.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Levi Curriculum Matrix

Action Description:

The department chair will continue to encourage faculty developing new courses to include as many standards of the Levi Curriculum Matrix as possible. Also, the chair will continue to review syllabi to make sure that a large percentage of courses offered encompass those aspects of the Matrix.

Faculty Scholarship

Goal Description:

Faculty generate and disseminate scholarship

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Scholarship Portfolios

Performance Objective Description:

Faculty will be effective scholars as evidenced by the portfolio documenting their scholarship on an annual basis

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Review Of Faculty Scholarship

KPI Description:

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.

Results Description:

With respect to faculty scholarship, in the Psychology program, the mean scholarship ranking according to the aforementioned categories was 3.4 with a range of 1-5. One faculty member scored a 2 and three scored a 1. Of the faculty members who scored a "1," one individual recently returned from an administrative position and is re-developing her research program and a second is chair of the University IRB which takes an enormous amount of time. The third 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. He, apparently, has submitted an article for publication and we anxiously await the result.

In the Philosophy program, the mean score on scholarship was 4.0 with a range of 2 to 5. One individual received a score of "2." This individual had taken on a new administrative role and much of his time was spent engaged in that role.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Actions-Faculty Scholarship

Action Description:

Actions for the upcoming year will include providing travel monies for each faculty member to attend conferences, providing adequate laboratory space for each faculty, assigning mentors to new faculty, directing undergraduate students to partake in faculty research as research assistants, and generally encouraging all faculty to be involved in their areas of expertise.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Faculty Scholarship

Action Description:

Actions for the upcoming year will include providing travel monies for each faculty member to attend conferences, providing adequate laboratory space for each faculty, assigning mentors to new faculty, directing undergraduate students to partake in faculty research as research assistants, and generally encouraging all faculty to be involved in their areas of expertise.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Scholarship Portfolios

Action Description:

Actions for the upcoming year will include providing travel monies for each faculty member to attend conferences, providing adequate laboratory space for each faculty, assigning mentors to new faculty, directing undergraduate students to partake in faculty research as research assistants, and generally encouraging all faculty to be involved in their areas of expertise.

In addition, faculty members will be given prototypes as to how to put together their FES forms to ensure that information in the portfolios can be easily accessed.

Teaching Excellence

Goal Description:

Faculty demonstrate high level of teaching effectiveness

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Individual Development And Educational Assessment (IDEA) Evaluations

Performance Objective Description:

IDEA student evaluations of teaching will indicate that faculty are engaging in effective teaching as indicated by their summary scores

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

IDEA Ratings

KPI Description:

A summary IDEA score at or above the IDEA database national norm 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 departement's average scores will exceed the national norms on the adjusted Summary Evaluation. We also will expect that the 70% of the Department's sections will be at or above the those norms on the IDEA database and at or above the Institution's average.

Results Description:

For the past assessment cycle the mean, on a 5-point scale, with respect to Summary IDEA evaluations was 4.35, basically the same as the previous assessment year.

For the Fall 2015 semester, the IDEA mean summary score, on a 5-point scale, was 4.4. More importantly, the percentage of classes above the national norm with respect to the IDEA database was 78%. The mean on this scale for our faculty was 55.02.

For the Spring 2015 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 national norm with respect to the IDEA database average was 76%. The mean on this scale for our faculty was 53.85.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

IDEA Scores
Action Description:

Actions for the current academic year will include encouraging faculty to visit with experts on the IDEA process in the department and through the PACE center to get a better grasp of what is actually being measured by the instrument. IDEA scores will be examined after the fall semester and faculty not performing well will meet with the chair to determine strategies to improve teaching performance.

Undergraduate Student Perception Of Psychology Learning

Goal Description:

Undergraduates students will be satisfied with learning oportunties.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Undergraduate Student Perception Of Psychology Offerings
Performance Objective Description:

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.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Senior Survey
KPI Description:

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.

Results Description:

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 Senior 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 fall 2015 semester, 80.38% of students involved in Psychology 3101 successfully passed the "Application of a Scientific Knowledge" assignments. In the spring 2016 semester, 82.19 met criterion. For "Communicating Scientific Knowledge," 72.41% and 74.31% were successful in the fall 2015 and spring 2016 semesters, respectively.

Actions for the current academic year will include attempting to increase the return rate of the surveys by extending the amount of time that seniors have to complete the survey. Also, we will look at specific questions within the survey and address why we may have scored lower on those issues.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Senior Survey
Action Description:

Actions for the current academic year will include attempting to increase the return rate of the surveys by extending the amount of time that seniors have to complete the survey. Also, we will look at specific questions within the survey and address why we may have scored lower on those issues.

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement

Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify):

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 2016.

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.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

Scholarship 1. All faculty received laboratory space as they wished;

2. Consistently over the course of the academic year, graduate assistants will be made available to faculty for research. Additionally, undergraduate students also were made available at RAs;

3. Faculty received \$1800 in travel monies this past academic year; 4.

For the incoming four new faculty members, tart-up funds have been made available;

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 met with the chair to discuss changes in duties and, in one case, a remediation program.

Teaching Portfolios 1. All faculty met with the chair concerning teaching; those with low IDEA scores had 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 were held to the same criteria as full-time faculty and were given a semester to raise unacceptable scores to levels that are acceptable;

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

Curriculum 1. Proposed courses went through the departmental curriculum committee and all adhered to the Levi Curriculum Matrix. All met the criterion.

2. Special topics courses were 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 included: 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, had to address the aforementioned issues if they are not obvious in the faculty/student contract. This happened in one case, the faculty member couldn't justify pedagogical value, and the course was not offered. 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.

Plan for Continuous Improvement

Closing Summary:

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 up to \$1800 in funds to travel to conferences, regardless of whether they are presenting; 3. faculty who are required to be licensed will 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 the four in-coming faculty members, funds have been set aside for second-year tenure-track faculty who will be in their final year for the spending of start-up funds; 5. all tenure-track faculty will meet with the chair to discuss his or her progress toward tenure, all tenure-track faculty will have his or her progress assessed yearly by the program DPTAC and be given a written assessment of that progress; 6. 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 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; 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 2016.

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 appears to be increasing although it is still low. Special efforts will be made to ensure that a better return rate occurs this 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.

RELATED ITEMS
