

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.

Attached Files

 [LevyCurricMatrix](#)

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 and discussions with individual instructors about specific courses and whether those courses met the criteria 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.

Attached Files

 [LevyCurricMatrix](#)

Results Description:

Seventy-six percent of the sections met the criteria set signified as "Current Perspectives" by the Levy Curriculum Matrix. These courses were exclusively content courses as methods courses such as Statistics and Research Methods did not lend themselves to the matrix. In addition, various courses such as Psychopharmacology and Adjustment also were weak in some areas of the curriculum matrix and thus were not counted as meeting the minimum requirements.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Action: 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 2.94 with a range of 1-5. Three faculty scored a 1 on this measure.

In the Psychology program, data show that productivity decreased this year but that may be because we currently have three new faculty in the program and each is building his or her lab.

In the Philosophy program, the mean score on scholarship was 3.75 with a range of 2 to 5. One individual received a score of "2." This individual had taken on two new administrative roles and much of his time was spent engaged in those roles.

All members of the Psychology and Philosophy programs met with the chair and those scoring a "2" or lower were asked to be more diligent about scholarly pursuits.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Actions: Faculty Scholarship

Action Description:

Actions for the upcoming year will include:

Providing up to \$1800 in 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;

Encouraging all faculty to be involved in their areas of expertise.

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 discipline 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 department's average scores will exceed the IDEA norms on the adjusted Summary Evaluation. We also will expect that the 70% of the Department's sections will be at or above the discipline norms on the IDEA database. Recently, the format of the IDEA forms has changed. In the new format we will look at the overall summary score (adjusted average compared to the IDEA data base) and the ratings of summative questions. In both categories, any score above 50 would be considered exceeding the average of all courses in the IDEA data base.

Attached Files

[☐_WILSON_C\(021576\)_\(47735\)](#)

[☐IDEA2016A](#)

Results Description:

Considering the Course Summary scores, 74.28% of our sections met or exceeded the discipline average. The range of these scores was 19-66 with a mean of 53.49.

With respect to the Ratings of the Summative Questions, 74.28% of our sections met or exceeded the discipline average. The range of these scores was 12-66 with a mean of 51.37.

We met criterion of 70% of our sections meeting or exceeding the discipline means. The chair is, though, concerned that the faculty only had a mean of 53.49 and 51.37 on Summary and Ratings of Summative Questions.

The chair inspected the data and found that six sections really undermined our total scores. Two faculty members accounted for one section each. This is defensible in that each had very strong scores on his/her other sections. Four poor performance sections were due to one faculty member.

In addition, for the Fall 2016 semester, on a scale of 1-5, Psychology faculty had a mean of 4.48 with respect to Excellent Course and a mean of 4.54 on Excellent Teacher on the IDEA forms. Philosophy faculty scored 4.69 on Excellent Course and 4.74 on Excellent Teacher.

In the Spring 2017 semester, on a scale of 1-5, Psychology faculty had a mean of 4.30 on Excellent Course and a mean of 4.49 on Excellent Teacher. Philosophy faculty had a 3.96 and 4.20 on Excellent Course and Excellent Teacher, respectively.

Comparing the "Unit" IDEA scores with those of all courses in the national data base, the Department of Philosophy and Psychology exceeded the norms, for fall 2016 with scores of 53, 51, 51, and 52 for Progress on Relevant Objectives, Excellence of Teacher, Excellence of Course, and Summary Evaluation, respectively. Such was the case for the spring 2017 semester with scores of 52, 52, 51, and 52, respectively.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Actions: IDEA Scores

Action Description:

Actions for the current academic year will include:

Having new faculty 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;

Examining IDEA scores after the fall semester;

Having faculty not performing well meet with the chair to determine strategies to improve teaching performance.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Teaching Portfolios

Performance Objective Description:

Faculty will engage in effective teaching as evidenced by a portfolio documenting their teaching activities on an annual basis.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Teaching Portfolio Review

KPI Description:

Evaluation of faculty teaching was based upon two factors: the student evaluation on the IDEA forms and the Chair's evaluation of faculty teaching. The students' evaluation consisted of the composite score on the IDEA evaluation that took into consideration: 1. progress on relevant objectives; 2. excellent course and; 3. excellent teacher. Scores were on a scale of 1-5.

In the Psychology Program, the mean rating was 4.53 with a range of 3.75-4.95.

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.

The mean for the Chair's evaluation of effective teaching was 4.75 with a range of 3.88 to 5.00.

I especially am pleased with younger, tenure-track faculty as their means for Students' evaluation and Chair's evaluation were 4.95 and 4.96, respectively. They all are bright, enthusiastic instructors and are very devoted to the educational process (either that or the malaise has not yet set in).

As for the Philosophy program, the mean of the Students' evaluation was 4.66 with a range of 3.76-4.85 and the mean of the Chair's evaluation was 4.65 with a range of 3.86-4.98. These scores are better than those of years past and show a progression of hiring truly competent individuals in their respective areas.

Thus, all members undergoing evaluation for the assessment standards reached criterion.

Results Description:

Evaluation of faculty teaching was based upon two factors: the student evaluation on the IDEA forms and the Chair's evaluation of faculty teaching. The students' evaluation consisted of the composite score on the IDEA evaluation that took into consideration: 1. progress on relevant objectives; 2. excellent course and; 3. excellent teacher. Scores were on a scale of 1-5.

In the Psychology Program, the mean rating was 4.53 with a range of 3.75-4.95.

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.

The mean for the Chair's evaluation of effective teaching was 4.75 with a range of 3.88 to 5.00.

Thus, all members of the department reached criterion. I especially am pleased with younger, tenure-track faculty as their means for Students' evaluation and Chair's evaluation were 4.95 and 4.96, respectively. They all are bright, enthusiastic instructors and are very devoted to the educational process (either that or the malaise has not yet set in).

As for the Philosophy program, the mean of the Students' evaluation was 4.66 with a range of 3.76-4.85 and the mean of the Chair's evaluation was 4.65 with a range of 3.86-4.98. These scores are better than those of years past and show a progression of hiring truly competent individuals in their respective areas.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Actions: Teaching Portfolios

Action Description:

Actions will include:

Assigning a mentor to all new faculty members;

Stressing the importance of frequently assessing best practices in teaching individual subjects;

Having students give feedback during the course of the semester.

Undergraduate Student Perception Of Psychology Learning

Goal Description:

Undergraduates students will be satisfied with learning opportunities.

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.

Attached Files

[!\[\]\(9352cdb2fdfaf3ccfd4037374b35da5d_img.jpg\) SeniorSurvey](#)

Results Description:

Analyzing the senior surveys, on a 5-point Likert scale, 92.67% of our students rated the quality of the psychology major as of "high quality," a 4 or 5 on the scale. Only 25.00% of our graduates rated their experience with the psychology major as challenging. 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. The result that only 25% of our majors viewed the program as challenging is really a surprise. This result could be that we aren't that challenging enough, perhaps our method of teaching makes the material easy to assimilate, perhaps a low return rate skewed the data. We do know that this is not typical and we are considering all possibilities.

With respect to generating and communicating scientific knowledge, in the fall 2016 semester, 84.24% of students involved in Psychology 3101 successfully passed the "Application of a Scientific Knowledge" assignments. In the spring 2017 semester, 84.34% met criterion. For "Communicating Scientific Knowledge," 71.30% and 70.90% were successful in the fall 2016 and spring 2017 semesters, respectively.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Actions: 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 tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the department will be afforded laboratory space available to them to conduct research. *Laboratory space was provided for all T/T-T faculty requesting space. All Psychology faculty requested space and one Philosophy faculty had requested space.*
2. all faculty members will be given up to \$1800 in funds to travel to conferences, regardless of whether they are presenting. *Funds were distributed equitably to all T-T-T faculty in both Psychology and Philosophy. A few faculty in the Psychology program did not request funds and those monies were put back into the O/M budget.*
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. *The Department was able to afford those faculty requiring licensure with funds; This was the case for all faculty in the Clinical Ph.D. and MA programs and for those in the School Psychology program.*
4. start-up funds have been set aside for the four in-coming faculty members (two for Psychology and two for Philosophy), 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. *Funds were set aside for all new (first- and second-year) tenure-track faculty and encumbered and spent as needed.*
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. *It was the case that all faculty filing FES forms with the chair met with the chair during early March of 2017 to discuss progress and strategies for bettering themselves.*
6. faculty not meeting scholarship criterion will meet with the chair each spring to discuss possible strategies to help them meet criterion. *Please see Number 5 above.*

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

1. Those falling in the below a 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5) of the IDEA forms will meet with the chair and will be given strategies that should increase their effectiveness in the classroom. Tenure-track faculty will be told that the probability for being awarded tenure is extremely low with low IDEA scores. *There was no need to take these steps this academic year.*
2. adjunct faculty falling below a 2.5 (on a scale of 1-5) will be given one semester to improve the scores or their contracts will not be renewed. *This past semester, one such adjunct was terminated because of low teaching evaluations.*
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. *Again, this was not an issue and for the one faculty member with low scores, the issue was handled "in house."*
4. as always, all faculty are encouraged to attend the CHSS Teaching Conference in August 2017.

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" have been reviewed and will continue to 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.*

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

In the upcoming academic year:

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 (two for Psychology and two for Philosophy), 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.

With respect to scholarship, of the three faculty members who scored a "1" on Scholarship Ranking, two individuals currently are serving in administrative positions and one has been put on a remediation program in order to help "kick-start" his career.

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

1. Those falling in the below a 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5) of the IDEA forms will meet with the chair and will be given strategies that should increase their effectiveness in the classroom. Tenure-track faculty will be told that the probability for being awarded tenure is extremely low with low IDEA scores;

2. adjunct faculty falling below a 2.5 (on a scale of 1-5) will be given one semester to improve the scores or their contracts will not be renewed. This past semester, one such adjunct was terminated because of low teaching evaluations;

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 2017.

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.

Plan for continuous improvement

Closing Summary:

First and foremost, the Department will search for a new chair as the current chair is retiring from the University at the end of the fall semester.

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.
