



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	COS
Department	Psychology
Program Unit	
Reporting for Academic Year	2012-2013
Department Chair	Marvin Lamb
Date Submitted	8/12/2013

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

Tenure-track faculty was our greatest need at our last 5-Year Review and it continues to be our greatest need. We would like to seek two faculty positions each year until our need is met. In addition to simple permission to hire, we need to make our positions more attractive. Our salary schedule is not competitive, the high cost of housing in the Bay Area discourages many applicants, and our start-up funding for setting up research laboratories is not competitive. Anything that the university can do to alleviate those problems will make it easier to hire successfully.

The elimination of restrictions for extra-quarter for pay would benefit students, current faculty, and would help to attract job candidates.

An easily accessible history of course enrollment data (as was previously available on Data Warehouse) would drastically improve curriculum and schedule planning.

The ability to enforce course prerequisites during registration (as was previously possible) would increase FTES because students register for classes who do not have the prerequisites making it look as though courses are full which are in fact not.

Consulting faculty and staff before implementing changes in procedures might prevent situations that inappropriately, inefficiently, and unfairly shift workload to Department faculty and staff.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

We conducted a successful search for a Biological Psychologist who will start Fall 2013. We are conducting a search for an Industrial/Biological position in 2013/2014.

C. Program Changes and Needs

Additional faculty is still our greatest need. We have approximately 800 students on wait-lists each quarter. There are also not enough faculty for important committee service.

The inability to enforce prerequisites during registration continues to be a problem.

Ever increasing demands on faculty and staff (such as this report and collection and analysis of assessment data) without additional resources continues to diminish productivity and morale.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

Psychology Student Learning Outcomes

Students graduating with a B.A. or B.S. in Psychology from Cal State East Bay will be able to:

SLO1. think scientifically and employ sound scientific methodology, ILO1,3,5.

SLO2. speak and write clearly about the content and theory of the field of psychology, ILO2,6.

SLO3. apply psychological principles and prepare for careers, ILO3,4,5,6.

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

SLO 1,2,3

C. Summary of Assessment Process

The Department's Outcomes Assessment plan employs four assessment tools; an Alumni Survey, a Pre-Post Test, a Senior Survey, and a Faculty Self-Assessment. The four methods provide independent but converging sources of evidence upon which to evaluate our performance and institute change where indicated.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Below are results from the pre-post test. Data from other assessment tools have not been analyzed yet due to excessive workload and few faculty.

Data from the pre-post test are given below. All areas showed significant improvement except for Identify Hypothesis.

	PSYC 4804	PSYC 2020	Difference
APA Reference Format	2.00	1.18	0.82
Identify Hypothesis	3.61	3.42	0.19
Identify Researcher's Rationale	2.39	1.42	0.97
Identify Sampling Procedures	3.72	2.68	1.04
Identify the Important Variables	2.00	0.68	1.32
Reliability & Validity of the Measures	0.72	0.03	0.70
Identify Data Analysis/Summary Techniques (Statistics)	2.56	1.50	1.06
Appropriateness of Data Analysis Results to Hypothesis	3.67	3.00	0.67
Critique of Entire Research Report	1.56	0.61	0.95
Conduct Literature Search	3.50	1.34	2.16
Total Score	25.72	15.87	9.85
Note 1: Scaling System is 0 to 4 points for each item			
Note 2: All differences except Identify Hypothesis are statistically significant at alpha = .05			

3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

California State University, East Bay
APR Summary Data
Fall 2008 - 2012

Psychology	Fall Quarter				
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	664	692	614	734	830
2. Postbaccalaureate	6	7	4	1	1
3. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
4. Total Number of Majors	670	699	618	735	831
B. Degrees Awarded					
College Years					
	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12
1. Undergraduate	123	145	121	134	153
2. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Total	123	145	121	134	153
C. Faculty					
Fall Quarter					
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	10	10	10	9	9
2. Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	10	10	10	9	9
3b. % Tenure Track	45.5%	43.5%	55.6%	40.9%	45.0%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	0	0	1	2	3
5. Part-Time	12	13	7	11	8
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	12	13	8	13	11
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	54.5%	56.5%	44.4%	59.1%	55.0%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	22	23	18	22	20
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	9.0	9.0	7.3	7.3	6.0
9. Lecturer FTEF	7.3	6.0	4.7	7.4	7.9
10. Total Instructional FTEF	16.3	15.0	12.0	14.7	13.9
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	205.0	249.9	196.8	205.1	171.5
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	42.5%	48.0%	49.6%	40.1%	33.7%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	277.7	270.7	199.6	306.5	337.1
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	57.5%	52.0%	50.4%	59.9%	66.3%
13. Total FTES taught	482.7	520.6	396.4	511.6	508.6
14. Total SCU taught	7240.0	7809.0	5946.0	7674.0	7629.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	22.8	27.8	27.1	28.0	28.6
2. Lecturer	38.1	45.1	42.2	41.4	42.5
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	29.7	34.7	33.1	34.7	36.5
4. Lower Division	48.4	54.2	77.8	47.2	50.7

5. Upper Division	23.8	28.4	26.0	31.1	32.2
6. Graduate
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	56.0	53.0	46.0	54.0	50.0
2. Average Section Size	33.9	38.6	38.4	39.2	41.3
3. Average Section Size for LD	51.3	59.6	79.2	51.0	53.5
4. Average Section Size for UD	28.8	32.6	32.4	36.2	37.9
5. Average Section Size for GD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	4	5	3	4	3
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	23	24	25	21	17
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	8	6	2	6	7
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	21	18	16	23	23
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0

Source and definitions available at:

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/apr/summary/definitions.pdf>