

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

DESIGNATION CODE: 2011-12 CAPR 5
DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2012

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR)
SUBJECT: Five-Year Program Review for Psychology
PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate

ACTION

REQUESTED: Acceptance of the Five-Year Program Review of the Psychology BA and BS programs in the College of Science at California State University East Bay and the recommendation that they both continue without modification. The date of the next Five-Year review is 2015-2016 (CAPR will review it in 2016-17).

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on November 3, 2011, CAPR invited members of the Department of Psychology to orally present the outcome of their five-year review process completed in 2010-11 and submitted to CAPR for review in 2011-12 as prescribed in the Academic Program Review Procedures (08-09 CAPR 23 (revised)). Department of Psychology Chair, Dr. Marvin Lamb, had previously supplied the Senate Office with a full version of the program self-study, five-year plan, external reviewer's report and program response to the external reviewer's report. Prior to this meeting, the CAPR liaison to the Psychology program review, CAPR Chair Michael Lee, examined the five-year review document in detail, applying a review matrix derived from the Academic Program Review Procedures suggested content for five-year review documentation, and using this as a basis for asking questions of the program Chair (see attached Appendix A). At this meeting, Dr. Lamb presented a summary of the Psychology five-year review to CAPR and participated in a question and answer session that resulted in a short follow-up email from Dr. Lamb to the CAPR Chair on November 9, 2011 with some information that CAPR suggested would be useful for its report on the program, and which was not contained in the review documentation. The information provided in this email is integrated into this document.

Overview description of the program

The Psychology program offers both a BA and a BS degree in Psychology and is the largest major in the College of Science. According to fall enrollment data compiled by PEMSA, as of 2009 there were 699 majors who were served by a tenure-track full-time equivalent faculty of 10, generating a full-time equivalent student (FTES) level of 520.6. The proportion of FTES taught by lecturers was 52% in 2009. Student-faculty ratios had reached 35 by 2009, well above the average for the College. The BA degree requires 72 units for graduation, the BS Industrial/Organizational option requires 87 units, and the BS Ergonomics and Human Factors option requires 90-94 units. Thus, with the 72 units of GE, all of the programs fall within the 180 units requirement of the CSU. The majority of students elect to complete the BA program.

Overview of the documents submitted to CAPR

A short summary of the five-year review provided by the Psychology department for its BS and BA degrees precedes the self-study, five-year plan, external reviewer's report and response to the external reviewer's report. The summary, self-study and five-year plan totals 16 pages, not including appendices, seven of which consist of a list of academic publications and grants produced by faculty and students in the department. Thus around 10 pages are devoted to self-study and strategic planning, the five-year plan accounting for two pages of the complete report. The Academic Program Review Procedures detail the expected content for five-year review documentation and Appendix A to this recommendation provides a checklist of the Psychology document against this content list.

Note that the five-year documentation provided by the Department of Psychology comingles the BA and BS program information. This is typical of many departments' approaches to their five-year review since although through this process CAPR approves continuation or discontinuation of programs, not departments, many departments' programs significantly overlap in terms of faculty, resources, recruitment, climate, and the many other program areas required to be reported on as part of the five-year review process. As such, it has not proven possible for CAPR to distinguish between the two programs with respect to their specific health or separate the general department needs for the next five years from any program-specific needs. According to oral comments from the departmental Chair, Dr. Lamb, the BA is the larger of the two programs (around 2/3 of all psychology majors). As reported in the five-year review documentation, the department is working to revise the BA program although specific details on what this will entail is not clear, although its completion seems dependent on the availability of tenure-track faculty that would teach the expected curriculum. A listing of courses for a revised BA was provided in Appendix 7 of the documentation, but no specific narrative was provided. The stated purpose of the revision in section 3.1 of the five-year plan is to keep current with changes in the field and better serve the needs of the current student population. Given the lack of detail, it is suggested that the department develop a narrative and rationale for this revision and link this to tenure-track requests in the coming five years if hiring is critical to its success and to best serve majors seeking careers in this field.

Program's Self-Study (2006/07-2010/11)

Summary of specific areas of the Self-Study

The psychology program self-study begins with a reflection on the previous five-year review indicating that then, as now, the strongest characteristic of the programs offered were the laboratory-based instruction that endows CSU East Bay Psychology graduates with strong scientific reasoning and research skills. Points highlighted in the last review that continue to be an issue in the current self-study are student concerns over the availability of classes needed for the major and the need for adequate numbers of faculty to teach the programs offered; clearly these are related issues. At the time of the last review, the BS option in Industrial/Organizational Psychology had just been revised. This was further modified this fall 2011, reducing the number of units required from 87 to 75.

The next seven pages of the self-study is a list of faculty publications and grants and student accomplishments since 2005 (it is suggested that in future five-year reviews, this kind of information be placed in an appendix and a brief summary provided e.g. total number of publications, proportion of peer-reviewed, total value of grants secured, number of student scholarships and awards, etc.). This is followed by a review of curriculum and student learning. There is a limited comparison of the CSU East Bay programs with 10 other CSU campuses. This is in the form of two short prose paragraphs with no tabulated data, which makes it difficult to get a side-by-side comparison of similarities and differences. No comparisons are made with programs offered in the UC system or with nationally recognized programs outside California. The main conclusion from this review is that our programs would appear

more rigorous than other CSU's in terms of the laboratory experience required of majors but, in part because of the smaller number of faculty at CSUEB (although no supporting data is provided on the size of our faculty and number of majors compared to the 10 compared programs), we offer a smaller selection of electives in specialized areas.

The department's learning outcomes assessment plan is presented in Appendix 3 of the document and summarized in the self-study. There is a single assessment plan for all three programs/options. It is comprised of a pre/post test, a senior self-assessment survey, a faculty self-assessment and an alumni self-assessment survey. These are designed to evaluate program performance and provide the basis to institute change. The pre/post test captures actual outcomes in 10 specific areas and is based on the American Psychological Association's "Guidelines for Learning Outcomes for the Undergraduate Psychology Major". It is first administered in PSYC 2020 and again in a PSYC 480X research laboratory class. The self-study indicates that data was collected using these instruments in the last five-year review period and will be repeated during the next five-year review period. However, no data is provided on a) when these instruments were administered, b) to how many students, c) if the data was analyzed, d) what conclusions were reached, and e) what changes to instruction resulted. It is stated that students showed statistically significant improvement in nine of the 10 areas, the exception being the use of the APA referencing format. CAPR should expect that these results will be more comprehensively reported in future annual reports prior to the next five-year review. The other, self-assessment instruments have been administered in the last review period because summary results are provided. However, no detail is provided on when, how frequently, or to how many respondents. The senior survey is apparently administered in each of the laboratory capstone courses PSYC 480X. The survey suggests that students are predominantly satisfied with the quality of their education but a significant proportion would like more frequent course offerings and at a more convenient array of times. The faculty self-assessment is new, developed for use in 2010/11 and requiring faculty to record their observations on their students' experience and performance and a list of recommended changes. It is not clear if this is completed for every course offering and by all faculty, tenure-track and lecturer. It is reported that 70% of the self-assessments resulted in at least one change to the course being self-assessed by the faculty concerned.

Later in the five-year plan, the program raises the issue of offering G.E. courses although here in the self-study it does not detail those G.E. courses, or provide summary data for their student learning outcomes (programs offering G.E. courses are each supposed to be responsible for capturing G.E. learning outcome data). It does not discuss course offerings at the Concord Campus or online (when questioned on this, Dr. Lamb indicated that program faculty do not yet offer online courses). With respect to multi-cultural learning, the program indicated that it supported a culturally diverse student body through participation in the McNair Scholars program (although no numbers were provided for the last five years) and through the Psychology and Psi Chi student clubs. The program also indicates it addresses cultural diversity through its curriculum, detailing selected course titles in which socio-cultural factors are addressed or in which integrated and holistic cultural viewpoints are included.

The academic performance review statistics are summarized for the fall quarters from 2005-2009 showing a significant rise in majors (+60%) and FTES (+40%) and, because of limited faculty resources, a corresponding rise in SFR (+35%). The average psychology class section size also grew by 22% and is over 60% higher than the average in the College of Science. The self-study indicates that the department is active in recruitment and advising events on and off campus but no specific data is provided.

With respect to faculty, it is reported that six tenure-track hiring requests were submitted in the review period, four were filled (although one of these faculty sadly died in 2011) and one granted but rescinded due to the budget crisis, although it is pending for 2011/12. According to data provided by the department, but not reflected on in the self-study, the department had 10 full-time faculty in 2009. There are 11 faculty currently listed on the department web-page, 7 full professors, 1 associate professor, and 3

assistant professors although one of the full professors is currently the Associate Dean. The fall 2009 data lists 13 part-time lecturers giving a total FTEF of 15 (9 tenure-track and 6 lecturer).

With respect to resources, the department has an operating budget that is one-third of what it was at the time of the last five-year review even though the number of majors is 60% higher. The summer quarter is taught predominantly by lecturers and all faculty duties such as advising are covered by the Chair. It is commented that enrollment levels have been negatively affected due to the lack of adequately sized classrooms that don't match the caps set on classes offered. This is a somewhat confusing statement given that a) the programs' average section size is well above the College of Science as a whole and b) the SFR is already high and rising for the department as a whole. FTES rose from 450 in 2005 to 521 in 2009 yet the self-study claims it has been negatively affected by several factors. This suggests that the programs could have had even higher FTES growth than this although given the observation that the increasing SFR noted earlier "is forcing changes in instruction that make achieving student learning outcomes more difficult," it doesn't sound like an even larger FTES would be a good thing for the department. No specific information was given on the forced changes in instruction that are said to be endangering student outcomes.

On a final note, the self-study also mentions how changes to university procedures (e.g. PeopleSoft, waitlists, lack of enforced pre-requisites in the registration process, etc.) are increasing faculty and staff workload. The self-study indicates that neither the BA and BS degrees nor both BS options require more than 180 total units (including GE) to graduate.

Summary of supporting data

The Psychology programs' review documentation provides six supporting appendices. They include the documentation supporting the revision of the BS degree option in Industrial/Organizational Psychology that was implemented Fall 2011, a series of check sheets for each of the three degree programs/options and the minor, the Department of Psychology assessment plan and current instruments, the academic performance review statistics (although not the statistics on enrollment by gender and ethnicity), a selection of information and advising materials, requests submitted for tenure-track hires over the five-year review period from 2005-2011, and a tentative plan for the revision of the BA degree.

External Reviewer's Comments & The Department's Response

In the five-year review process, programs prepare their self-study and their five-year plan (draft) and submit these to their external reviewer prior to their visit to campus. The program then gets the chance to finalize their five-year plan based on comments made by the external reviewer and the response of their Dean to their document and the external review report. It is thus summarized in this CAPR recommendation prior to its analysis of the final five-year strategic plan. The external review of the CSU East Bay Psychology program was conducted by Dr. Virginia A. Marchman, Research Associate in the Department of Psychology at Stanford University. She visited the campus on April 11, 2011 and met with the Dean of the College of Science, the Chair, five faculty, eight students (majors), and two staff members.

According to Dr. Marchman, the Psychology program curriculum is very strong with significant credit given to offering small-sized laboratory courses as a superior element compared to programs elsewhere. That said, she raised the concern that the quality of these experiences might be being compromised by the apparent increasing tendency for non-majors to be enrolled in these classes, some of which lack the necessary pre-requisites. Her limited canvassing of student opinions suggested high overall student satisfaction with instruction and advising. The importance of continuing outreach to students and effective web-based communication was stressed. Dr. Marchman found the faculty to be offering exceptionally

solid undergraduate training, but raised the alarm concerning the insufficient number of faculty to meet the ongoing and future needs of the department and university, and the issue of the lack of faculty to teach key courses. She raised the concern that extensive reliance on lecturers would further marginalize students from diverse backgrounds who are most in need. However, she did not explain who she specifically included in this group or how and why they would be at risk; this was not addressed by the program in its study or plan. She also raised the concern that changes to university infrastructure, specifically the closing of computer labs, are impeding faculty teaching and scholarly activities and adversely impacting students from diverse backgrounds. Again, this issue was not addressed by the program in its self-study. It seems from this comment that by “students from diverse backgrounds”, Dr. Marchman was referring to students from lower income groups that have fewer financial resources and are thus affected by the digital divide. The program did not provide any demographic assessment of the students served by the program in their self-study or of the departmental climate with which to judge these responses. The CAPR liaison noted that the Psychology majors were 75% female and overall had a racial/ethnic breakdown of approximately 17% Asian, 18% Black, 21% Hispanic and 24% White according to fall 2009 data. In her recommendations, Dr. Marchman suggests that the department work with the university to find new ways to offer computer support to its majors and that faculty should place specific focus on supporting and interacting with the students from diverse backgrounds most impacted by recent reductions in resources.

One point raised by Dr. Marchman was the lack of tenure-track faculty presence during the summer quarter. She suggested spreading full-time faculty over all four quarters. When questioned on this by CAPR, Dr. Lamb thought that without the College or Provost creating an opportunity for a summer quarter for extra pay, this situation will not change in the coming years, leaving only the administrative resource of the Chair during the summer to serve students, all courses continuing to be taught by lecturers. She also raised the issue of the lack of adequate administrative support for the program, the insufficient training received by support staff to implement university requirements, and the difficulty of coping with system-wide changes that affect departments, for example, the lack of pre-requisite enforcement in course registration by students. She suggested that work-study students be assigned to the Psychology office to help with these requirements. She seemed in general agreement with the department’s student learning outcomes assessment approach although suggested it be tailored to assess each of the degree programs/options offered.

A topic raised by Dr. Marchman that was not addressed in the program’s self-study or five-year plan was the potential of offering a graduate program to provide increased opportunities for faculty to have highly-trained students with whom to conduct research. However, in the program self-study there was a seven page bibliography of research articles produced by program faculty that suggests research is not hampered by having only undergraduates in the department. As indicated by the external reviewer’s discussions with students, there are many opportunities for student research at present and 19 articles and presentations listed in the self-study involved student participation.

The Psychology department made no amendments to its five-year plan based on the external reviewer’s report or the Dean of the College of Science’s response, although it did indicate that it had carefully reviewed the suggestions and recommendation made. It concluded from the responses received that its self-study and five-year plan were sufficiently thorough and appropriate.

Program’s Five-Year Strategic Plan 2011-2016

The five-year plan for the psychology program comprises two pages, not including appendices. It thus provides little concrete for CAPR to report on. The following is a summary of the points made concerning strategic planning:

- The department is working on a revision of the BA program to better serve the student population; no timeline, responsible individuals, or other details are provided.
- The department will seek additional tenure-track hires to raise the proportion of tenure-track taught FTES from less than 50% to 75% in the next five years.
- The department will seek start-up funds corresponding to each new hire to permit it to develop the necessary research laboratory resources to support their pedagogy.

Given the lack of detail in the five-year plan and the clear importance to the program of securing new hires, the Psychology Chair was asked to supply CAPR with some additional detail, particularly concerning future resource needs. The following detail was provided by email:

Hiring plan for 2011/12-2016/17 (assuming one hire per year – note that in the five-year plan it was indicated by the department that it would need two new hires per year until the need is met. In that case, the five hires listed below for 2012/13-2016/17 would be sought between 2012/13 and 2014/2015).

2011/12 - Biopsychology (Physiological or Comparative) (in progress)
 2012/13 - Biopsychology (in the area not covered by the 2011/12 search)
 2013/14 - Industrial Psychology
 2014/15 - Clinical Psychology
 2015/16 - Human Factors Psychology
 2016/17 - Health Psychology

According to Dr. Lamb, each hire will need an estimated start-up funding support of \$20,000-\$100,000 to set up their research laboratories (\$50,000-\$100,000 for the biopsychology positions and \$20,000-\$60,000 for the other positions) along with release time (note that the Dean of the College of Science has agreed to provide 8 WTU of release time for each of the first two years for new tenure-track faculty and the expectation is that this level of support will be available throughout the next five years if the program is to attract suitable candidates). It is not clear whether these funds would be eligible to come from the A2E2 fees. In his email, Dr. Lamb also mentioned that consumable materials and software/equipment updates and licensing to support the program's laboratory courses are about \$5,850 per year.

CAPR Analysis Of The Program's Five-Year Review

It is clear from the rising enrollment rates that the psychology program is serving a growing demand within the CSUEB student body; the number of majors has been rising even though the faculty resources devoted to their instruction have diminished and class sizes and SFR levels have increased. Self-reporting by students indicates that the majority are finding work in fields related to psychology and the program was praised by its external reviewer for its laboratory based instruction which is judged to be superior to other psychology programs elsewhere. However, it is difficult for CAPR to provide a detailed set of concrete recommendations for the program other than that it should undoubtedly be granted continuation by the Academic Senate. The five-year plan component of the review documentation comprised two pages of text and contained little concrete information as to what the program believes should be done in the next five years, by whom, when, and at what cost. However, from the documentation provided, from discussions with Dr. Lamb at CAPR, and from his subsequent email, the following points are offered that can be the basis for future annual reporting until the next review. Hopefully these will be helpful in the drafting of a memorandum of understanding with the Provost's office for the coming five years in terms of resource needs/allocations and objectives for the program.

a. Program

A number of issues related to instruction and curriculum were raised in the self-study, plan and external review. In addition, CAPR raised some issues concerning student learning outcomes assessment which relies, to a large degree, on self-assessment rather than on observed outcomes. CAPR therefore proposes the following recommendations for the coming five-years:

- the Psychology department should follow through on its stated goal to revise the BA program based on a clear set of criteria. In doing so, the program should clearly articulate the changes that have occurred in the field of psychology that necessitate a curricular revision and how this revision will better serve the needs of the student body,
- the Psychology department should assess the effect of increasing numbers of non-majors taking courses in its programs on the quality of instruction and the effect of increasing class size and presence of non-majors on student experience and achievement of course learning outcomes by both majors and non-majors, and make program adjustments as necessary
- the Psychology department should further develop its assessment plan to include more outcomes based assessment in addition to the self-assessment undertaken by students, and it should tailor the assessment instruments to the different programs (i.e. the three different majors/options offered), reporting back on any changes in the annual program reports to CAPR

b. Resources

The main concern for the coming five-years is to address the need for additional tenure-track faculty, particularly in the areas needed to support a revised BA curriculum and maintain the BS option in Ergonomics and Human factors. The goal of the Psychology department is to reach a tenure-track to lecturer FTES ratio of 75:25 and to address the program quality issues caused by a rising SFR. CAPR therefore proposes the following recommendations for the coming five-years:

- the Psychology department should seek the tenure-track faculty needed to deliver the current and planned curriculum in the BA and BS programs and listed in the hiring plan provided to CAPR (as shown above), and report back on progress in recruiting for these positions in the annual program reports to this committee,
- the Psychology department should make explicit, with each tenure-track request, the corresponding need for start-up funds to support each hire's laboratory and research activities, recognizing that these laboratory experiences are the defining feature of the programs and key to student success and should report on their success in securing this funding in the annual program reports.
- the Psychology department should petition the Provost's Office for the necessary funds to support laboratory courses from the annual A2E2 revenues and report back to CAPR on the status of this funding in the annual program reports.

This document and the recommendation to approve the psychology BA and BS programs for continuation without modification was approved unanimously by CAPR at its February 2, 2012 meeting.

CAPR Recommendation For Continuation Of The Program

Acceptance of the Five-Year Program Review of the Psychology BA and BS programs in the College of Science at California State University East Bay and the recommendation that it continue without modification. The date of the next Five-Year review is 2015-2016 (CAPR will review it in 2016-17).

APPENDIX A – PSYCHOLOGY FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW MATRIX DEVELOPED FROM 08-09 CAPR 23 (REVISED)

2. Self-Study		
2.1. Summary of Previous Review and 5-Year Plan	Yes/No	Comments
Does the self-study provide a summary of the previous five-year plan	Y	Doesn't really summarize the prior five-year plan, mostly the outside review.
Does the self-study provide details on progress in - implementing the previous Plan, - what remains to be completed, - other achievements (i.e. not specifically part of the previous plan)	N	Not really – mentions faculty hires as main issue.
2.2. Curriculum and Student Learning	Yes/No	Comments
Does the self-study include details on - student learning outcomes (SLO) assessment plan, - SLO assessment plan implementation - a summary of assessment summary results - a summary of measures identified to improve the program based on assessment	Y	Provided mostly in the form of appendices. Has some reflection on changes suggested by assessment. Provides some information from alumni survey – some 50% were in psychology-related careers – is that considered good? How does it compare to national statistics/other programs? Seems there is one instrument that is a test while the others are self-assessment. Pre-post seems geared to Goal 1 – scientific thinking and methodology, self-assessments Goal 3 applying psychology and preparing for career – So what gets to Goal 2 – mastering content and theory? Can these last two be left to self-assessment? Does this need to be modified?
Does the self-study describe - the program's course offerings, - how the course offerings compare to comparable CSU programs, - how the course offerings compare to nationally recognized programs	Y	Doesn't provide much detail on the program – a BA, a BS with 2 options and a Minor. No data on how many students take each. There are profiles for each in appendix, but no discussion. Somewhat – lacks comparison to UC/nationally recognized programs only to selected CSU
If the program offers G.E. courses, does the self-study specifically provide summary data for student learning outcomes for these courses.	N	Makes no reference to the GE component of the program – how many courses, which courses, whether they are subject to assessment at all.
Does the self-study discuss course offerings at the Concord (and Oakland) campus and online	N	Not mentioned
Does the self-study discuss issues concerning multi-cultural learning	Y	Mentions participation on McNair program but doesn't provide any specific details. Indicates have a multi-cultural psychology club but doesn't provide any specifics. No data on student demographics.

2.3. Students, Advising, and Retention	Yes/No	Comments
Does the self-study contain Academic Performance Review Statistics from Planning and Institutional Research in the form of a table showing the following: Student Demographics, Student Level, Faculty and Academic Allocation, Course Data (see 10-11 CAPR 14)	Y/N	Not on student demographics. Is just basic table on head counts of enrolment and faculty. Much higher SFR for lecturer than TT 45.1 v 27.8. 2:1 class size for Lower Div v Upper Div classes. Lecturer = 50-60% FTEF.
Does the self-study provide a summary of issues related to: - climate - advising, - scheduling, - recruitment	N	Is only a minor discussion of these issues in relation to student recruitment. Doesn't have any specific record of actual participation – clearly numbers have been going up so this isn't an issue.
Does the self-study include an analysis of the data provided by PEMSA with respect to changing patterns of: - enrollment (FTES & majors) trends (note is now headcount not FTES), - SFR, - % of courses/FTES taught by regular faculty, (note no longer provides FTES) - any other relevant information	Y	Indication is that the SFR, section size, etc. are high relative to the rest of C of S. FTES is growing. No of sections has fluctuated by 10% and section size spiked last year (doesn't use the data very closely). Points out longer term trend which is that tenure track are down 4 from 1999 but majors are up 60% along with FTES (+40%)
Does the self-study include a discussion of the impact of the observed patterns and trends in the above statistics on the program and its quality	N	Not really – it is discussed a little elsewhere but not here in the self-study. The five year plan refers to upper division GE classes and problems caused by conflicting needs between majors and non-majors.
2.4. Faculty	Yes/No	Comments
Is there a list and descriptions of tenure track positions requested since the last review?	Y	Six requests made
Does the self-study report progress in achieving these tenure track requests	Y	States that four were filled. Not clear which other was not filled in addition to biopsychologist. One passed away. Two resigned (as listed elsewhere). Referred to hiring plan from 1999-2000 review – does the program currently have such a plan? – not included in the documentation.

2.5. Resources	Yes/No	Comments
Is there a discussion of library resources with respect to the program	N	
Is there a discussion of information/Instructional Technology issues with respect to the program	Vague	There is reference to “soon we will not have the resources to run our laboratory courses”. But no specific details (note that these are referred to as being the salient strength of the program and the reason why students come – thus the self-study and plan should probably have had a detailed listing of the pressures/needs)
Is there a discussion of Assistive Technology with respect to the program	N	
Is there a discussion of any other resource needs relevant to the program	Y	<p>A good chunk of the discussion is oriented towards ways in which university procedures and systems have changed that impacts program performance. This is not really the same as resource issues per se. A couple of confusing aspects, in part perhaps because is anecdotal rather than data-driven</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raises the issue of lack of classrooms – does this mean that students are turned away from courses because of room sizes that could have enrolled more? 2. Raises the issue of pre-req weeding out post-registration – that students enroll in the class that don’t have the pre-reqs and by the time they are dropped, their spots don’t fill – how significant a problem is that? Any data? <p>Big issue is one of not having tenure-track faculty on the summer teaching roster i.e. there is no faculty presence over the summer the than the Chair</p>
2.6. Units Requirement	Yes/No	Comments
Does the self-study state that 180 units are required for the major to graduate (including GE units) and if more than 180 units are required, is a justification given	Y	

3. Five-Year Plan		
Overall, is it clear that for each action item discussed in this plan for the next 5 years that for each aspect – curriculum, students, faculty and other resources, the plan clearly details:	Yes/No	Comments
1) specific actions/changes, 2) a clear timeline for those actions/changes 3) the person(s) in charge/responsible for those actions/changes, 4) the estimated cost for those actions/changes	N	Not really – the five-year plan lacks specificity in terms of concrete lists of actions.
3.1. Curriculum	Yes/No	Comments
Does the five-year plan detail the needed changes for the next five years that address the recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, from external reviewer(s), and from assessment with respect to the following: - Concord and the Oakland campus) offerings - online offerings - G.E., offerings - multicultural learning	N	Doesn't really offer any specific detail on this other than there is a revision of the BA curriculum planned – a listing of courses is provided but no narrative is offered. No timeline is provided nor is the statement that “the revision is hampered by lack of faculty” explained – what key areas of an effective new BA is impacted? Moreover, nowhere in the documentation is information on how many students will be affected by this i.e. how many take the BA.
3.2. Students	Yes/No	Comments
Does the five-year plan envision changes in trends for the next five years, based on recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, from external reviewer(s), and from assessment, with respect to the following issues:	Y	A very limited amount of information.
Number of majors	Y	Confusing – trend has been upward (+26% from Fall 2006-2009 – 4 years) – said don't expect trend to change so does that mean stay at 699 or increase by another 170-200 over next five years?
Total enrollments	Y	Mentions new upper division GE but does not mention this in self-study even though here it says has caused problems – what are conflicting needs and why weren't these mentioned in the self-study? Doesn't provide assessment of how expect total enrolments to change.
Student characteristics	N	Says doesn't expect characteristics to change but have not provided in self-study any data or reflection on those characteristics – male, female, ethnicity or break down by degree
Student career opportunities	N	Again, doesn't expect change in career goals but has provided no information in self-study (is dealt with a little bit/buried in assessment appendix) on career trajectories and the changing nature of field of psychology.
Program-level student learning outcomes	N	No mention here on expected changes to learning outcomes – can we assume that the PLOs will remain the same for the next 5 years?
Outreach plans	N	No real information on plans other than indicating will participate in outreach.

Advising and retention strategies	N	Not mentioned. Elsewhere in self-study was mentioned that summer advising is an issue and this must be addressed (but how is not listed).
Class scheduling	N	Self-study under resources mentioned that scheduling was a problem because of lack of course enrollment data in a data warehouse type facility – question, does the department not manage/keep track of its own enrollment data? It’s available each quarter/past quarters through MyCSUEB.
New or changes to programs	N	No specific details provided.
Resources to support student learning	N	No details provided.
Any other issues not listed above		
3.3. Faculty	Yes/No	Comments
Does the five-year plan envision changes in changes for the next five years in faculty resources that address recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, from external reviewer(s), and from assessment	Y	Indicates that will need new hires, that expects separations, but no details are provided. Indicates that wants to get to 75% - with there being 10 faculty now and them teaching around 50% of FTES then does that mean a minimum of 5 new tenure track faculty? Are there also goals to reduce SFR (which is 35 overall) necessitating more? What are the priorities in terms of specialty and the timeline? How many biopsychologists are needed? One ergonomics only? What preferred sequence?
Does the plan list and justify anticipated new tenure-track applications	N	No detail provided - needs a hiring plan similar to that referred to in 1999-2000 plan along with an assessment of impact on course offerings, the degree programs, etc.
Does the plan detail the following aspects with respect to faculty resources; - climate issues, - leadership-faculty communication - workload and PT&R challenges - advising plans	N	None of these issues are covered in the plan. Nor were they covered in the self-study to any great degree. Mentions in next section (resources – should be here in faculty - that need “2 hires per year until our need is met” – what is that need? Is that 2 hires per year for five years to get to 20 full-time – separations? How many separations are predicted?)
3.4. Other Resources	Yes/No	Comments
Does the five-year plan discuss envisioned changes and resource needs for the next five years, addressing recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, including lessons from assessment, including:	Y	But in no detail. There is nothing in this plan that CAPR can draw attention to in terms of what, when, person responsible, cost.
Staff	N	Indicates needs a higher operating budget. How much? For what?
Equipment	N	Mentions need for start-up funds to help new faculty develop labs – what resources needed? With the expected hiring, what labs need expanding/upgrading and how?
Library	N	
Travel funds	N	
Information/instructional technology; assistive technology	N	
Any other resource needs not listed above	Y	Calls for university-wide changes with respect to data management. But is not specific as to what is needed and for what purpose. In terms of past enrollment data, is that something that needs to come from PEMSA? Or, given that all this is available through MyCSUEB, for example, is it just that an internal data management procedure needs to be implemented?

Observations from External Reviewer Report

A. *Small-sized lab courses seem to be a key aspect of the program success/quality.*

Should this then have more narrative in the program.

What are the threats to these? Number of majors rising and TT same? How about space, equipment, software, etc. Are they taught mostly by the TT and hence that's why SFR is smaller? How small is small-sized?

B. *Makes reference to Industrial-Organizational (I/O) as being an important BS Option* – how many students elect this out of the 699 majors?

C. *It indicates that I/O meets accreditation standards* – is this degree accredited nationally? If so, who's standards? Are there plans to seek accreditation?

D. *Indicates that the program has made an effort to increase the number of course offerings that serve the culturally diverse body?* What does this mean? That the program has added new courses that reflect cultural diversity with respect to the discipline of psychology? That it has added more sections so as to enroll a larger diversity of students?

E. *Students remarked that lab classes sometimes enrolled students unprepared for the material* – is that born out by grades/assessment/faculty experience? Does that relate to the lack of pre-requisite enforcement (are their pre-reqs for the labs?), a lack of adequate preparation by students, or a lack of advising such that labs are taken too soon before other courses that should be completed but are not pre-reqs per se.

F. *The reviewer refers to the "analysis of the short and long-term impact of limited faculty presented in the self study as "thorough and well-thought out.* However, no clear plan for hiring is given or a clear indication of what areas of the program are most heavily affected, which programs and options are impacted, which curricular areas are most heavily affected by a) the TT v lecturer concern b) the specialties of existing TT faculty. No discussion is provided concerning the difficulty/ease of attracting qualified adjunct or the nature of current adjunct staff (are they entitled lecturers, the lecturer time base, etc.).

G. *The reviewer refers to "closing of computer labs" as a problem,* but this is not mentioned in the self-study or five-year plan as an issue. In fact, very little in terms of specifics are provided re; equipment, space, software, library or other resources. Without specific information on this issue, then there is little CAPR can do to draw attention to these areas of resource needs for strategic planning. What labs? How are they used? Which students use them? How have students been forced to change because of changed computing resources?

H. *The reviewer suggested tailoring assessment to each program i.e. to the BA and to the two BS options* Why? Do their differences vary sufficiently that a single 3 outcome program does not adequately capture outcomes relevant to the learning required for those degrees? Does the program intend to address this in the coming five years in terms of assessing assessment procedures? This wasn't mentioned in the five-year plan or response to the outside review.

I. *The reviewer calls for a hiring plan, for hires to be requested on the basis of it, and for this plan to be revised with respect to changing faculty (separations).* But there is no hiring plan in the five-year planning document.

J. *The reviewer suggests that the program recruit for positions it doesn't intend to fill in a given year.* That recommendation seems confusing? How does the program react to that?

K. *The reviewer raised the subject of full-time faculty teaching summer quarter.* No plan was offered with respect to course scheduling across four quarters to ensure faculty are present on campus for each (summers too). This was raised as an issue in the self-study and in the outside review but is not dealt with in the plan (revised).

L. One point that occurred to the CAPR liaison, what is the relationship between the psychology I/O option and the Industrial Engineering program? No mention was provided as to which other programs are served by psychology – how many other degrees include psychology classes as requirements or electives.

WRITTEN RESPONSE OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAIR TO CAPR QUESTIONS:

1. *It was pointed out by CAPR that the outside reviewer wrote that the B.S. I/O degree option would meet the standards for accreditation.* The Chair was unable to determine which accreditation body would do this.

2. *CAPR requested additional information on the costs associated with our laboratory courses.* The cost of consumable materials and software/equipment updates and licensing is about \$5,850 per year.

3. *CAPR requested additional information regarding the Department's plan for hiring tenure-track faculty.* The greatest need is in the general area of biopsychology. The psychology program has recently lost two faculty members in this area, one a physiological psychologist and the other a comparative psychologist. The program is currently engaged in a search to fill one of these positions (we will hire the strongest candidate in either area). The next position the Department would seek to fill is a biopsychologist in the other area. The hiring needs for the next five years, in the order psychology would hope to fill them, are:

Current Search:

Biopsychology (Physiological or Comparative)

Future Searches in order of need:

Biopsychology (in the area not covered by the above hire)

Industrial Psychology

Clinical Psychology

Human Factors Psychology

Health Psychology

The program needs certain resources in order to attract top candidates and provide them with a reasonable opportunity to establish themselves as successful scholars and teachers. First it would need to provide adequate start-up funds (\$50-\$100K for the biopsychology positions and \$20-\$60K for the other positions). Second it will need to provide release time. According to the program, the Dean of the COS has agreed to provide 8 WTU of release time for each of the first two years for new tenure-track faculty (i.e. 16 WTU over two years). Psychology expects/hopes these resources will indeed be made available for those new hires.