



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

College	Science
Department	Psychology
Program Unit	
Reporting for Academic Year	14/15
Department Chair	Marvin Lamb
Date Submitted	7/27/15

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 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.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

We conducted a successful search for a Industrial/Organizational/Social Psychologist who will start in Fall 2015. We will be conducting a search for a Clinical position in 2015/2016.

C. Program Changes and Needs

Additional faculty is still our greatest need. We have approximately 1000 students on wait-lists each quarter. There is also not enough faculty for important committee service.

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. This year we used the self-assessment was performed.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

PLO 1: Think scientifically and employ sound scientific methodology.

Students demonstrate capable scientific skills. They are able to evaluate scientific literature and develop research ideas, especially when expectations are clearly presented. However, they have difficulty conducting statistical analyses and reporting the results. A review of statistical techniques would be helpful. Students are able to handle technically challenging material (e.g., physiology), but handle it better if they are warned ahead of time that it will be included in the class.

PLO 2: Speak and write clearly about the content and theory of the field of psychology.

Students are able to present complex ideas drawn from psychology research if expectations are communicated clearly. Expectations should be discussed multiple times in class. Also, papers that are written in several sub-stages lead to clearer demonstrations of students skills. Students are often confused about how to follow APA style. Clearer expectations of which rules are strict and which are flexible would help.

PLO 3: Apply psychological principles and prepare for careers.

Students are able to apply class content towards designing experiments. There is a tradeoff between student-designed studies on the one hand, and instructor-designed studies on the other. The former leads to more student engagement and better assessment of application skills, but the latter leads to higher quality studies, more consistent levels of difficulty, and more realistic

research experiences. Finally, students can be more readily engaged in class topics when connections between class topics and career-related topics are discussed (e.g., how a class topic might inform clinical treatments).

General observations.

Small classes create opportunities for individual attention, which helps all students, but especially helps students who are less prepared but motivated. A well organized class with clear expectations and goals helps students to succeed. Regular check-ins also help. Difficult topics don't interfere with motivation, though it will help to warn students at the beginning of the term. Mandatory attendance presents a trade-off: More students have the opportunity to learn, but the presence of students who don't want to attend can create distracting behavior. Students request lecture notes before lectures. Surveys of students seem to be a useful tool for assessing student progress and interest, and adjusting the class content accordingly.

3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page

California State University, East Bay

APR Summary Data

Fall 2010 - 2014

Psychology					
	Fall Quarter				
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	614	734	830	870	916
2. Postbaccalaureate	4	1	1	1	0
3. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
4. Total Number of Majors	618	735	831	871	916
	College Years				
	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14
B. Degrees Awarded					
1. Undergraduate	121	134	153	190	176
2. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Total	121	134	153	190	176
	Fall Quarter				
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	10	9	9	9	9
2. Part-Time	0	0	0	0	1
3a. Total Tenure Track	10	9	9	9	10
3b. % Tenure Track	55.6%	40.9%	45.0%	42.9%	45.5%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	1	2	3	1	1
5. Part-Time	7	11	8	11	11
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	8	13	11	12	12
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	44.4%	59.1%	55.0%	57.1%	54.5%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	18	22	20	21	22
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	7.3	7.3	6.0	7.7	7.5

9. Lecturer FTEF	4.7	7.4	7.9	7.0	6.2
10. Total Instructional FTEF	12.0	14.7	13.9	14.7	13.7
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	196.8	205.1	171.5	187.7	188.3
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	49.6%	40.1%	33.7%	36.4%	40.6%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	199.6	306.5	337.1	328.6	275.6
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	50.4%	59.9%	66.3%	63.6%	59.4%
13. Total FTES taught	396.4	511.6	508.6	516.3	463.9
14. Total SCU taught	5946.0	7674.0	7629.0	7745.0	6958.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	27.1	28.0	28.6	24.3	25.0
2. Lecturer	42.2	41.4	42.5	46.9	44.4
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	33.1	34.7	36.5	35.0	33.8
4. Lower Division	77.8	47.2	50.7	60.9	71.2
5. Upper Division	26.0	31.1	32.2	29.2	28.9
6. Graduate
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	46.0	54.0	50.0	48.0	46.0
2. Average Section Size	38.4	39.2	41.3	41.4	38.5
3. Average Section Size for LD	79.2	51.0	53.5	59.1	59.3
4. Average Section Size for UD	32.4	36.2	37.9	37.3	35.4
5. Average Section Size for GD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	3	4	3	2	0
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	25	21	17	20	21
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	2	6	7	7	6
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	16	23	23	19	19
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>