**YEAR 2**

**ACADEMIC YEAR 2013-14**

Program Review and Planning Year 2 form is an evaluation of the progress on last year’s goals (Year 1 PRP) and is also planning of goals and activities for the current year (2013-2014).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Discipline: Psychology** | **Date 12/20/2013**  |
| **Instructional Discipline Reviewed (Each discipline is required to complete a Program Review.)** | **Add Date (00/00/2014)** |

**Purpose of Program Review and Planning:**

The institution assesses progress toward achieving stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an on-going and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data (ACCJC/WASC, Standard I, B.3.).

**DEFINITION**

Program Review and Planning is the means by which faculty, staff, and/or administrators complete a self-evaluation of an academic discipline, program, or service.  The self-evaluation includes an analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data on how the academic discipline, program, or service is supporting the mission and strategic planning of Palomar College in meeting the educational and career interests of students.  Through the review of and reflection on key program elements, such as program data and student learning outcomes, Program Review and Planning defines the curriculum changes, staffing levels, activities, and/or strategies necessary to continue to improve the academic discipline, program, or service in support of student success.  The Program Review and Planning process also ensures short-term and long-term planning and identification of the resources necessary to implement identified goals and priorities.

[**Palomar College Mission**](http://www.palomar.edu/about/goals.aspx)

Our mission is to provide an engaging teaching and learning environment for students of diverse origins, experiences, needs, abilities, and goals. As a comprehensive community college, we support and encourage students who are pursuing transfer-readiness, general education, basic skills, career and technical training, aesthetic and cultural enrichment, and lifelong education. We are committed to helping our students achieve the learning outcomes necessary to contribute as individuals and global citizens living responsibly, effectively, and creatively in an interdependent and ever-changing world.

|  |
| --- |
| **Program/Discipline Mission** |
| **List everyone who participated in completing this Year 2 Program Review and Planning Document.****Katherine Townsend-Merino, Fredric E. Rose, Roger Morrissette, Kathy Young, Judy Wilson, Netta Schroer** |
| **State your program’s or discipline’s mission statement. If you don’t have one, create one.****The mission of the psychology program is to offer students lifelong education and general education classes, and to prepare students for transfer to four-year programs in psychology (AA-T degree) by educating them in the fundamental concepts, knowledge, and skills of psychology.** |
| **Explain how your program’s or discipline’s mission is aligned with the Palomar College Mission Statement.****The mission of the psychology program is in direct alignment with the college mission of transfer, general education, and lifelong education. While our AA-T is designed specifically to promote seamless transfer for students majoring in psychology, we are fully aware of and supportive of our role as providers of rich and meaningful general education and lifelong learning opportunities for all students.** |

**STEP I. Review and Evaluation of Year 1
In this section, evaluate the program plans you described in last year’s Program Review and Planning Document.
Refer to “STEP II: PLANNING” in your 2012-13 YEAR 1 PRP document at:** <http://www.palomar.edu/irp/PRPCollection.htm>.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Progress on Current Plans. For each planning area below, summarize your program plans as documented in the Year 1 form (last year’s form) and evaluate your progress on completing them.**

**Curriculum (Step II.A. of Year 1 PRP)**1. **Summarize the plans you made regarding curriculum? (Consider how SLO assessment results influenced curriculum planning.)**

**The full-time psychology faculty met May 2012 to discuss plans for our discipline. That meeting was quite productive and was helpful in, among other things, allowing us to understand better how we approach our own individual areas of specialization within our discipline. There was substantial interest in considering an innovative redesign of our entry level and most popular class, Introduction to Psychology (Psyc 100). We examined data regarding the impact of preparedness on success in this course. For example, an analysis of 5 years of data from ALL of our Introduction to Psychology courses revealed that: 72% of those students who place into English 100 pass our course; 58% of those students who place into English 50 pass our course; 47% of those students who place into English 10 pass our course. We believed these data would stimulate discussion regarding the value of establishing prerequisites for Psychology 100.** **We also did a complete curriculum review (in Curricunet) and updated our CORs based on the feedback from C-ID reviewers to align our courses so that they will be transferable for our students and to support our AA-T. Due to curriculum transfer review, we found that our 1-unit Data Analysis course (205L) we developed for our students who transfer to SDSU is no longer accepted, since their lab course is now 2 units, so we removed Psych 205L from the Spring 2013 schedule. We had already stopped scheduling 205L due to low student need and a call to reduce course offerings; we will let it phase out of catalog offerings. Our retention rates across all classes are very good (over 90%) but our student success rates could improve - particularly the student success rate for online students (63%). We will continue ongoing discussions about measures to increase retention, particularly in online classes.****Our curricular planning did not focus on SLOAC to drive our changes. Rather our aim was to have a fully compliant and approved AA-T.**1. **How did you implement and evaluate those curriculum changes?**

**We were able to implement the prerequisite of “eligibility for English 100” to begin Fall 2013. We found considerable roadblocks to successful prerequisite enforcement by the college as there is no adequate verification infrastructure for disciplines other than English and Math. We spent many hours (40 hours just for the coordinator) developing an internal system for doing the prerequisite enforcement, including training of faculty, communicating with students, and checking documentation. We evaluated the process by preparing a survey of all instructors involved and the process went relatively smoothly according to them. The fact that our students do not check the email Palomar provides for them is particularly problematic. We are continuing to do the enforcement work at considerable cost of time and effort. We need the college infrastructure to support prerequisite enforcement by computer, and we advocate for the PRP needs of assessment and evaluation to assist psychology, and other disciplines, with this institutional process. We cannot assess the impact of the prerequisite on student success until after grades are turned in Spring ’14. Then we’ll have a large enough data set to begin a PRELIMINARY examination of the data—one year may not be an adequate sample to assess.****We have not examined Distanced Ed success any further, preferring to focus on fully completing a Program Outcome assessment cycle during the ’13-’14 AY.****We added a new section of Psychology 230 due to student demand and it has filled very quickly.****We DID fully complete an update of our entire curriculum last year and it was all approved by C-ID. This truly is the evaluation of our work—having all the coursework for our AA-T become approved.****Working closely with Sociology, our cross-listed Behavioral Statistics course underwent a substantial curriculum revision by adding in an additional unit to accommodate a lab component to more fully prepare students in computer-based data analysis, especially SPSS. This will additionally help students who transfer in sociology to CSUSM and to SDSU in psychology.****Sociology wanted to de-cross list their Social Psychology from Psychology to allow them greater flexibility for curriculum delivery more consonant with their field. As this is true, and fine with us, we de-cross listed the course.****The AA-T was updated to reflect 1) the change in the statistics course and 2) the addition of Psychology of Women as an optional course to count towards the AA-T.****Class Scheduling (Step II.B. of Year 1 PRP)**1. **Summarize the plans you made regarding class scheduling?**

**We wanted to offer, should the opportunity arrise, certain popular classes more at night and at Escondido. With the recent budget reductions causing class reductions it was impossible to add classes even though we knew they would be filled. Given that classes not linked to a program, certificate, or transfer pattern will probably be cut from the class schedule we planned our psychology curriculum with that in mind. We put special topics on hold for the foreseeable future but we attempted to satisfy the course rotation, balance, and other scheduling criteria that create a comprehensive psychology program.**1. **How did you implement and evaluate those class scheduling changes?**

**Classes are offered to ensure a balance of courses at a variety of times and locations to satisfy Psych AA-T program, transfer, and certificate needs of students.****Class scheduling changes are analyzed primarily based on student enrollment, demand data, and fill rates provided by Institutional Research.****Data provided by IR typically goes back only 3 years, but, in cases where adding intercession courses were considered, data were culled from previous years (2008 and 2009) when such class schedules were available to assist in course scheduling priorities.****In anticipation of the English 50 prerequisite implementation, sections of Psych 100 were reduced and replaced by other high demand Psychology courses. Moreover, additional courses were not added until enrollment stabilization had been assured. Weekly specialized analyses by IR (Dick Borden specifically) looking at fill rates compared to previous years, was provided upon implementation of the prerequisites for Psych 100 for Fall 2013 after enrollment began.** **The specific schedule adjustments of Fall 2013 was considered successful because, by comparison to all other disciplines in the BS department, NONE of the classes we offered was cut for low enrollment.****Faculty Hiring (Step II.C. of Year 1 PRP)**1. **What faculty needs did you articulate for this discipline?**

**Psychology made a persuasive argument for more full-time faculty: We noted that we had 6 full-time instructors, our total FTEF=14.53 but a Full-time FTEF of just 4.20; 71% of our classes were taught by part-time instructors; our enrollment load was over 100%, our WSCH=8,355 - the objective data certainly were supportive of this argument.**1. **What is the current status of the plan you articulated?**

**We did receive permission for a new FT position to begin Fall ’13 during Spring ‘13. We worked furiously to make sure we could actually complete the process, which resulted in the hiring of Dr. Netta Schroer. Unfortunately, Dr. Haydn Davis unexpectedly retired in July 2013 resulting in no net increase of FT faculty. While we are thrilled to have Dr. Schroer in our discipline, our need for more FT faculty remains great.** |
| 1. **Analysis and Impact of Resources Received (Step III – Year 1 – Resource Requests for Discipline)**
2. **What is the dollar amount you received from IPC last year (2012-2013)? You can access the 2012-13 IPC PRP allocations by clicking on this link:** <http://www.palomar.edu/irp/201213resourceallocations.pdf>

**For Psychology: $5,100****For Psych via BS dept $2,000**1. **How were those funds spent?**

**a) $2,100 for a Mac Laptop for Fred Rose****b) $3000 for faculty travel (Fred Rose, Roger Morrissette, Judy Wilson and Katie Townsend-Merino)****c) $2,000 for 4 rolling cork easels**1. **Identify permanent employees requested and prioritized by IPC, i.e., classified/CAST/administrative. You can access this information by clicking on this link:** <http://www.palomar.edu/irp/staffingplan.pdf>

**(none)**1. **Describe the impact of these funds received from IPC on:**
2. **Curriculum (courses, SLOs)**

**Laptop:****Dr. Rose needed SPSS to analyze data for both research methods and statistics, but the College could not provide him with a site-licensed copy of SPSS for his personal laptop. He teaches Research Methods class using small groups; they meet in the classroom but it isn’t always feasible to project to the screen when there are other groups working in the class. They also frequently meet in or near his office, so, again, having the portability to analyze data wherever they are is critical. Thus, the laptop will, once received, allow him to use the software needed to effectively teach Psy 205 and 230 AND have the portability necessary when working in small groups.****Faculty Travel:** **We requested funds specifically to attend conferences to keep faculty updated in their field and for keeping abreast of the most recent information about teaching and learning in psychology.** **Morrissette/Society for Neuroscience Conference (11/13)****The annual meeting for the Society for Neuroscience was held November 9-13 this year in San Diego. This meeting is the largest brain research conference in the world with over 30,000 attendees and presentations. I attended many poster sessions, talks, and break-out sessions with a host of different neuroscience research scientists. The research updates I experienced will directly enhance my Psyc 210: Physiological Psychology lecture material. For instance, research was presented of an expanded function of a neurotransmitter: hypocretin and its role not only in narcolepsy but also addictive behaviors and maternal behavior. Each of these topics are typically covered in my Psyc 210 course. The breadth of new empirical studies will also be used to enhance the material I present in my Psyc 205: Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences course via examples of hypothesis testing, research design, and analysis.****Katie attended the National Institute for the Teaching of Psychology from 1/3 – 1/6 2014. She attended sessions that have already changed her teaching and assessing, including:****• Implementing the new APA Guidelines for undergraduate education, including outcomes for 2-year colleges. This will inform the re-write of our program outcomes this Spring.****• Review of the almost completed draft of STP/APA guidelines for what should be taught in Introduction to Psychology which will inform our curriculum.****• Sessions on Metacognition and Mindset and how to use what we know scientifically to improve our students ability to learn how to learn. (I’ve been working on this for the past year—very helpful.****• Evidence based learning—what do we know, scientifically about what REALLY works (e.g., elaborative processing activities, lots of low-stakes quizzing & cumulative testing across the year) and what does not (e.g., rereading, underlining).****• A great talk on why teaching is HARD and why there is no MAGIC BULLET for education. The main point was that if you don’t understand the theory behind WHY something works, you are likely to implement it poorly. What are the complex factors and how do we communicate this to stakeholders.****• A super session on technology tools to make your life easier. I’ve adopted several already.****• A teaching slam! (an idea I would love to bring back here—a 5 – 10 minute dynamic, killer demonstration)****Rose/International Neuropsychological Society (2/14)****Dr. Rose will evaluate these funds during the 14/15 PRP as the conference has not yet been held.****Wilson/Western Psychological Association & Terman Teaching Conferences (4/14)****Dr. Wilson will evaluate these funds during the 14/15 PRP as the conference has not yet been held.****Rolling Cork Easels:****These were ordered well before our Spring ’13 poster session, but were not received until the middle of summer. We used them for the Fall ’13 poster session and will be doing so for the Spring ’14 Research Methods Poster Sessions as well. They are able to display 8 posters out of a total of about 24 posters per semester and will be used for years to come.**1. **Number of students affected**

**Laptop: Approximately 192 students/year****Travel:** **Morrissette: Approximately 484 students/year** **Rose: Approximately 448 students/year** **Wilson: Approximately 320 per/year** **Townsend-Merino: Approximately 578 students/year****Additionally, we will be sharing information with at discipline meetings, potential reaching many more students.****Easels: 160 – 180 students per year for Psychology (they belong to department who may use them as well)**1. **Other**

**None**1. **Describe unmet funding requests as they apply to your planning and priorities.**

**We do not have unmet funding requests at this time.** |

**STEP II. Evaluation of Program & SLOAC Data**

**In this section, review and analyze updated program data, the results of SLOACs, and other factors that could influence your program plans for this upcoming year.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Program Data. Provide an analysis of the past six years (2007-08 through 2012-13) of your discipline’s data. Consider trends in the data and what may be causing them. (For enrollment, WSCH, & FTEF data, use Fall term data only). The links below will take you to the three sets of data to analyze.**
	* Enrollment, Enrollment Load, WSCH, and FTEF (<http://www.palomar.edu/irp/PRP_WSCH_FTEF_Load.xlsx>) **(Use Fall term data only).**
	* Course Success and Retention rates (<http://www.palomar.edu/irp/PRP_Success_Retention.xlsx>**). Note, this file is very large and there will be a delay both when you open the file and again when you initiate the first search.**
	* Degrees and Certificates (<http://www.palomar.edu/irp/PRP_Degrees_Certs.xlsx>).

**Describe your analysis and observations.****1) Because of existing prerequisites in these two classes, we asked for an analysis of the impact of the Psych 100 prerequisite on success on Abnormal Psychology and Physiological Psychology.** **We want our prerequisites to have positive impact on student success, but not pose unnecessary barriers. The findings were:****Physio: 88.2% of students who MET the prereq passed, compared to 80.5% who did NOT meet the prereq. A total of 22.8 % of students enrolled did not have a record of having taken the prereq.****Abnormal: 80% of students who MET the prereq passed, compared to 80.2% who did NOT meet the prereq. A total of 25.4 % of students enrolled did not a record of having taken the prereq.****ANALYSIS—This Fall we received a report with all names of students for whom the college had no record of having had the prerequisite of Psychology 100. We asked all professors teaching Physio and Abnormal to ask those students whether or not they actually did have the prerequisite. For abnormal psychology nearly 100% of students enrolled in F2F and online courses actually had completed the prerequisite. In Physio a number of those students had dropped the course already. And for that class it is clear that the prerequisite really does make a difference. Taken together, the data actually supports our desire to have the college begin enforcing these prerequisites as well.** **2. Degree DATA: Since developing our AA-T we conferred 5 psychology degrees in ’11 – ’12 and 29 in ’12 – ’13.****ANALYSIS—We are pleased at the increase in numbers and expect them to increase as we fully develop a comprehensive advising program.****3. WSCH.LOAD.FTES****a) Total FTEF: A general 5-year downward trend from 19.55 to 14.20 demonstrates the impact of continuous course cuts.****b) Full-Time FTEF: Went from a high of 7 in Fall 07 to a low of 4.2 Fall 12 (reflects retirements and 1 FTEF from Chair reassigned time)****c) Part-Time FTEF: Went from a high of 12.55 in Fall 07 to 10 Fall 12. (reflects course reductions)****d) Part-Time/FTEF: The percent of FTEF taught by PT faculty has been on a general upward trend to a high of 70.42% during Fall 12.****e) During Fall 12 our WSCH/FTEF ratio was at a 5-year high of 585** **f) Our census enrollment is remarkably high (2,676), given the reduction in total FTEF and our census load has been over 100% for the past four years, indicating that we do not offer more sections than we can fill and have room for growth.****These data demonstrate that we are good stewards of college resources, we plan well—we do not offer courses that do not fill. We have room for growth in the number of course sections we offer (but need access to more rooms and times for that increase to occur) and, importantly, the number of FT faculty teaching our courses remains inadequate to serve students and the discipline.** **3) Success/Retention Data****We asked for 6-year course-level data in order for us to do a gap-analysis on success and retention across classes. Here are notable trends and findings and analysis.****a) The retention rates in psychology are quite high across all classes, generally well above 90% and rarely in the high 80%’s. Retention does not appear to be an issue in psychology that needs addressing.****b) There are really no trends apparent in success rates within a course and the variations are substantial across years. These variations may have to do with both differences in instructor grading policies as well as natural student variation that are evident to those of us who teach multiple sections of courses. Thus it makes sense to examine the average success rates.****Course Pass Rate****ALL PALOMAR COURSES 71.4%****ALL BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE COURSES 69.1%****ALL PSYCH COURSES 68.9%****Introduction to Psychology 66.4%****Marriage and Family 74.5%****Developmental Psychology 72.7%****Personal Growth 77.4%****Social Psychology 66.1%****Human Sexuality 65.6%****Statistics 71.4%****Physiological Psychology 89.2%****Research Methods 85.4%****Learning and Behavior 64.1%****c) The success rates in our most advanced classes (Physiological Psychology and Research Methods) are substantially higher than other classes. For both courses it is likely related to the cohort of students who take those classes. Those students have demonstrated persistence, resilience, and the ability to work hard in other classes, often for several years.****d) We were aware that students struggled in Introduction to Psychology and after examining data that suggested that preparedness was a predictor of success, we instituted a prerequisite. We need time to assess the impact of this intervention.** **e) We note that Social Psychology, Human Sexuality, and Learning have lower success rates than our other courses. We wonder if preparedness of those student populations is related to student success and we will request a study to examine that factor. However, we are not sure if the de-cross listing of Social Psychology will have impact on these rates in the future.****4) Retention/Success Rates by Ethnicity****a. The retention rates in Psychology are very high. African Americans had a substantially lower rate of retention for the first time in 12- 13. We are not sure if that data point is an anomaly or not.****b. Across years there appears little in the way of trends regarding success rates by ethnicity. But, as is often the case in achievement gap data, we see that Asians and Whites have the highest success rates followed by Hispanic, Native American, Filipino, and Multiethnic identities (the specific order varies by year) then followed by Pacific Islanders and African American. The table below contains averages across-six years and are rounded numbers. N’s exist for First-generation status for comparison.** **Overall By First Generation Status Men Women****African American 57% 48%, 46 56% 58%****Asian 76% 71%, 48 73% 78%****Filipino 68% 59%, 32 68% 68%****Hispanic 62% 61%, 583 61% 63%****Multiple Ethnicities 66% 61%, 50 61% 68%****Native American 67.8% 69%, 13—only one year data N too small N too small****Pacific Islander 58% 57%, 14 75% (3 yrs) 62% (4 yrs)****White 75% 72.5%, 552 69% 76%****Overall Rate 69% 66% 66% 71%****ANALYSIS: We note that the difficult question of closing the achievement gap is an INSTITUTIONAL one and we hope the college begins a collegial conversation about all the necessary changes that would need to be made in both student services and instruction in order to have impact. We also are concerned that the constant presentation of this data may reinforce stereotypes and increasing prejudice.** **We examined the data by the closest proxy to SES we have, first-generation status, and note that while this seems to have a large impact on African-American students, it has much less impact than we thought it might, given the literature. It is possible that first-generation status is NOT as good a proxy for SES as we anticipated. Finally, we see that the gender difference is greatest among Whites and Asians—and is negligible among other ethnic groups. Judy Wilson has expertise in the area of latino student success in college and she’ll be providing us with some education and ideas for intervention.****5) Retention/Success Rates by Mode of Delivery (Day, Evening, DE)****a. The retention rates for both night and day classes are about the same, while the DE retention rates are slightly lower. There has been a downward trend in retention in online classes, hitting a low of 83.5% in 12/13.****b. There is much variability across years in success rates by time of day and DE delivery. However, on average night students pass at a SLIGHTLY higher rate of 72.1% compared to day students at 69.8%. But, on average, online students pass at a much lower rate 62.2%. These rates are VERY similar to the college overall rates.****ANALYSIS: We expect to examine practices that contribute to the increased success of online students. However, these data, again, are in line with both the college DE success rates and system wide rates. We would appreciate college-wide dialogue about what faculty CAN do beyond the best practices that are already in place in many of our DE classes, but importantly how the college can institutionally help students make better choices about enrolling in DE classes.****6) Retention/Success Rates by Gender****a. Retention rates across all genders are very high, with no clear gender differences.****b. Women passed their psychology courses at a higher rate than men during each of the six previous years. The average pass rate for women in psychology is 70.7% (72.3% college-wide) and for men is 66.1% (70.7% college-wide). However, our gender difference is almost identical to that of the entire Behavioral Sciences department that indicates 71.1% of women pass their BS classes compared to 66.6% of men.****ANALYSIS: The gender difference indicating that women are more likely to pass their psychology classes is wider than the similar college-wide difference. While we are aware that this is a nationwide finding, we don’t know the literature about what the possible contributing factors might be, or what we might do about such a finding. In the future we may choose to ask for a study to help us examine contributing factors.****7) Retention/Success Rates by Ed Center Site** **a. The only site that does not reliably have retention in the 90% or higher are classes at the Escondido Center which has slightly lower retention rates (two years had retention rates lower than 90%, but were at 89%.)** **b. Across all years the success rates are substantially higher at Camp Pendleton, often by 10 or more points. Escondido has success rates that are generally lower than average and were at an all time low last year at 58.35%. We note that these findings are similar to what is found college wide, even the all-time low Escondido success rates for 12- 13.****ANALYSIS: We have found that our students who are in the military are very dedicated to their studies. They complete their homework, attend class and are generally very persistent. We presume this contributes to their overall success. We WONDER if the students at Escondido are less prepared than those at the main campus. If the college has institutional data they feel would help us understand lower success at the Escondido campus, we would be interested.****8) Retention/Success Rates by Curriculum Type****Psychology only offers GE Transfer courses so this analysis does not provide additional information for our review.****9) Retention/Success Rates by Age****a. The retention rates do not demonstrate trends across time. However, for three of the past 6-years those age 50+ had slightly lower retention rates in the high 80%s.****b. The success rates of those students who are 50+ are much more variable than the other age groupings, ranging from the lowest success rates to the highest within a given year. However the n’s in these groups are quite low.****Aside from the highly variable 50+ group, and across all years, students who are 25 – 48 have the highest success rates (75.5%), followed by those 20 – 24 (68.77 and then those 19 and under (66.3%).****ANALYSIS: Make them work at Jack-in-the Box until they are 25?? Seriously, we are not surprised by these data, as older students tend to be more focused, motivated and have learned to be better learners. This does not seem actionable to us.****Does this data reflect your planning, goals, and activities? If not, why?****We believe that the data reflect SOME of our goals and activities, but we strongly feel that the institution needs to take responsibility for beginning difficult college-wide conversations about BOTH the student support and instructional changes that would be needed to make real change in some of these outcomes.** |
| 1. **SLOACs. Using the comprehensive SLOAC reports and faculty discussions as a guide, provide a summary and analysis of Student Learning Outcome assessments at the course and program level. Link to SLOAC resources:** <http://www2.palomar.edu/pages/sloresources/programreview/>
2. **Summarize your SLOAC activities during the 2012-2013 academic year.**

**In anticipation of the ’12 – ’13 AY we developed Program Outcomes during Spring ‘12 and aligned them with our Course Outcomes. This activity spurred the re-writing of many course level outcomes and generated new ideas for assessing the course outcomes. We agreed to assess all of the course outcomes under the program Outcome: Knowledge Base: Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology during ‘12 – ’13.****We met in August 2013 in part to discuss and evaluate our ’12- ’13 course outcomes findings and make updated plans. Unfortunately, not all of the course-level assessments were completed as planned, making our embedded program outcome assessment difficult to accomplish. Courses assessed were the same as the year before: Introduction to Psychology, Statistics, Physiological Psychology, Developmental Psychology, Learning and Abnormal. Additionally, we generally did not included PT faculty in the process, leaving out many course sections. We had robust conversation about these issues. All FT faculty were re-assigned particular courses and agreed to be responsible for assessing ALL sections of each course for the Knowledge Base program outcomes during the ‘13 – ’14 AY before moving on to a new program outcome.**1. **Course SLOACs: What did you learn from your course SLO assessments? What will you maintain and/or change because of the assessment results?**

**The courses below were assessed for each outcome that aligned with our Knowledge Base program outcome. As noted, we learned that we needed to develop assessments across sections to really assess our program.****Introduction to Psychology** **Goals of Psychology: 87.8% correct****Social: 83% correct****Biological: 78.2% correct****Learning: 88% correct****Memory: 84.9% correct****Abnormal 95.6% correct****These scores were all significantly higher than the prior year following the introduction of a new quizzing method designed to reward engagement and studying (but are based on one faculty members courses and the prior year included four faculty).****Following the ’12 – ’13 AY assessment we convened a workgroup to redesign an end-of-term SLOAC quiz that ALL Intro Psychology faculty will give to their students. We made sure that each outcome was also aligned with our COR and that was text book agnostic. The workgroup involved FT and PT faculty. The quiz was provided as a Bb assessment to each faculty member for ease of delivery and gaining access to reports. We are maintaining the outcomes, but changed the assessment.** **Statistics****During 2012-2013 all Knowledge based SLOs were assessed for 1 instructor’s 8 sections. The following results were found:****SLO 1. Give examples of the components of a Behavioral Sciences research design including such concepts as Research Hypothesis, Null Hypothesis, Independent Variable and Dependent Variable. 84.27% correct response rate****SLO 2. Differentiate between and calculate Descriptive Statistics including measures of central tendency and measures of variability. 74.31% correct response rate****SLO 3. Give examples of and calculate a Correlational analysis. 88.48% correct response rate****SLO 4. Differentiate between concepts associated with Sampling and Probability. 73.28% correct response rate****SLO 5. Give examples of concepts associated with variations in Experimental Methodology. 68.15% correct response rate****SLO 6. Differentiate between and calculate both parametric and non-parametric Inferential Statistics including Chi Square, t-test, and ANOVA. 78.75% correct response rate****SLO 7. Use established critical value tables and/or computer applications to determine statistical significance. 73.4% correct response rate****During 2013-2014 an aggregate assessment of all Knowledge based SLOs will be conducted adding and pooling the data of 2-4 additional instructors’ sections and a second assessment of the first instructor’s sections.****Physiological Psychology****There are typically only 2 different instructors who teach this course during the year. One instructor teaches one section in each of the two semesters and a second instructor teaches one section during the spring semester. During 2012-2013 all Knowledge based SLOs were assessed for 1 instructor’s 2 sections. The following results were found:****SLO 1. Give examples of how the biological concepts of cell biology, genetics, biochemistry, and evolution are involved in specific psychological processes. 80.20% correct response rate****SLO 2. Identify and describe the functions of the major structures in the Nervous System. 77.18% correct response rate****SLO 3. Explain neural transmission, including the steps involved in the propagation of an action potential. 64.77% correct response rate****SLO 4. Explain how synaptic functioning is affected by endogenous and exogenous chemical messengers. 68.95% correct response rate****SLO 5. Describe the psychobiological properties of complex systems (for example: sensory systems, arousal states, learning and memory, and/or sexual behavior). 72.27% correct response rate****SLO 6. Synthesize findings from a physiological psychology literature search and present a conclusion of those findings in both written and oral formats. 91.0% correct response rate****ASSESSMENT PLAN****During 2013-2014 an aggregate assessment of all the Knowledge based SLOs will be conducted adding and pooling the data of the second instructor and a second assessment of the first instructors sections.****Developmental Psychology****Students have met Student Learning Outcomes set criterion for this course at the proficiency level. Data from F12-S13 is consistent with data collected in previous semesters. Over 70% of students achieve proficiency in course SLOs (as assessed by a composite of multiple measures).** **Examination of student performance comparing in-class and online student performance during Spring 2013 suggests that mean composite scores in the in-person class was higher than the online student performance; however, the median scores for online students was higher. There is wider variation in student performance in the online course compared to the in-person course (range 57.6 vs. 27.8), as some online students excel, whereas other students performed poorly.****Because there are no prerequisites for this course, entering students come to the course with wide backgrounds in college level readiness (e.g. reading and writing skills, academic skills and preparation, previous coursework in psychology, etc.). However, as this course is required for other programs, particularly, nursing, students taking this course may be more academically prepared or motivated than students taking other entry 100-level courses. Thus, there is no data to support adding a prerequisite for this course at this time.****In general, Psych 110 students appear more proficient in being able to identify and recognize course concepts when assessed using a multiple choice test format than when assessed using an essay exam format. This likely reflects the higher-order cognitive and academic skills required in preparing and organizing time-limited written work compared to the recognition requirements of multiple choice test items. Nevertheless, students’ performance on both multiple choice items and essay items on exams early in the semester suggest that many students can improve in their test preparation, test-taking, and exam writing skills. Students were provided with multiple opportunities (at least every other week, if not more frequently) to practice their exam preparation, test taking, and written writing on exams skills over the course of the semester, and the majority improved their skills, which was reflected in an improvement in test scores over the course of the semester.****Thus, the maintenance of the course and its level of expectations suggests no major changes are needed to the course overall, although as additional data collection is planned, examination of instructor variability in student performance on SLOs is a goal for 2013-14. Data from assessment modalities suggests student weakness in the area of writing. This would support a college-level focus on increasing student writing skills, and providing more writing across the curriculum.****Abnormal Psychology****The prerequisite course for Psychology 225 is achieving a passing grade (“C” or better) in Psychology 100. However, this prerequisite has not been technically enforced. Perhaps more importantly, until Fall 2013, there was no prerequisites required for Psychology 100, so there could be still be a measure of significant variability in 225 students’ academic preparation. Previous SLO assessment suggests that students come to the course with diverse backgrounds in preparation (e.g. reading and writing skills, college-level academic skills and preparation, previous coursework in psychology, etc.). A recent analysis comparing success rates of students who did have the Psychology 100 prerequisite compared to those who did not was inconclusive, due to the possibility that students who were in the Palomar database as not having the prerequisite in fact, might have had the prerequisite. (based on an informal survey of Fall 2013 Psych 225 classes)****In general, 225 students appear more proficient in being able to identify and recognize course concepts when assessed using a multiple choice test format than when assessed using an essay exam format. This likely reflects the higher-order cognitive and academic skills required in preparing and organizing time-limited written work compared to the recognition requirements of multiple choice test items. Nevertheless, students’ performance on multiple choice items on exams early in the semester suggest that many students need improvement in their exam preparation and test-taking skills. Given that students should have taken previous Psychology coursework, it would be expected that when all prerequisites are enforced, 75% of students would be able to achieve proficiency for course SLOs if assessed in a multiple choice format.****Students' level of writing abilities vary widely upon course entry. The majority of students are capable of completing SLOs with proficiency if the written assignment is a homework assignment where they are able to use outside resources and the writing is not time-constrained. However, previous semesters’ SLO assessment has found that the majority of students' in-class writing skills need substantial improvement in terms of clarity, detail organization, and precision. Students' written work on exams do improve over the semester when multiple opportunities and feedback are provided.****More than 75% of students achieved proficiency in course SLOs by the end of the semester (depending on assessment format used), but when averaged over the course of the semester, in composite form, it is slightly less than 75%. Data from Spring 2013 is consistent with data collected from Spring 2009. (Data was collected by another faculty member between 2009 and 2013, so 2013 data is not easily comparable). As in 2009, Spring 2013 Psych 225 students were more proficient in being able to identify and recognize course concepts when assessed using a multiple choice test format than when assessed using an essay exam format. This likely reflects the higher-order cognitive and academic skills required in preparing and organizing time-limited written work compared to the recognition requirements of multiple choice test items. Nevertheless, students’ performance on both multiple choice items and essay items on exams early in the semester suggest that many students can improve over the course of the semester in their test preparation, test-taking, and exam writing skills. Students were provided with multiple opportunities to practice their exam preparation, test taking, and written writing on exams skills over the course of the semester, and the majority improved their skills, which was reflected in an improvement in test scores over the course of the semester.****Examination of instructor variability in assessment modalities and student performance on SLOs for this course is planned for 2013-14. Based on the data from assessment modalities suggests student weakness in the area of writing. This would support a college-level focus on increasing student writing skills, and providing more writing across the curriculum. Given the inconclusive findings from analysis of student prerequisite data, enforcement of the Psych 100 prerequisite is planned for Fall 2014.****Learning****Students have met Student Learning Outcomes set criterion for this course at the proficiency level. Data from Spring 2013 is consistent with data collected in Spring 2011 and 2012. Over 50% of students achieve proficiency in course SLOs (as assessed by a composite of multiple measures).** **However, although the composite scores are similar, students from Spring 2013 demonstrated more improvement on their in-class writing on exams and research projects than students from Spring 2012. Students from Spring 2013 were more likely to improve in their group project and utilize their higher performing classmates (in Vygotsky’s terminology, “more knowledgeable other” (MKO)) and utilize the instructor as a resource for feedback prior to turning in their research projects, whereas the majority of students from the Spring 2012 class did not.****As in previous assessments, Spring 2013 Psych 235 students were more proficient in being able to identify and recognize course concepts when assessed using a multiple choice test format than when assessed using an essay exam format. This likely reflects the higher-order cognitive and academic skills required in preparing and organizing time-limited written work compared to the recognition requirements of multiple choice test items. Nevertheless, students’ performance on both multiple choice items and essay items on exams early in the semester suggest that many students can improve over the course of the semester in their test preparation, test-taking, and exam writing skills. Students were provided with multiple opportunities to practice their exam preparation, test taking, and written writing on exams skills over the course of the semester, and the majority improved their skills, which was reflected in an improvement in test scores over the course of the semester.****On the course research projects, students in Spring 2013 were provided with specific checklists for their research projects (intended to improve student learning). Like Spring 2012, students in Spring 2013 did not use the checklists on the first project, but unlike students in Spring 2012, students in 2013 did improve in their use of the checklist and their research and writing abilities for their second and final projects. 2013 students recommended that “model” projects be provided for future classes, and that an overview of the whole semester’s project trajectory be provided to future students, which will be added and analyzed in Spring 2014.****On the healthy behavior change data collection projects, similar to 2012, students’ self-report on the data collection was positive, indicating that the personal application component resulted in more student engagement in applying course concepts. However, despite more models being provided for students’ data collection of behaviors, there was still some confusion about both target behaviors and the implementation of behavior change. Because the behavior collection and changes are highly individualized to each student, the general models provided to students were not effective for all students, and it was sometimes not until the third data collection when students’ projects were satisfactory. To improve future data collection projects for 2014, additional models will be provided, as well as an integration of the project into discussion of research design and dependant and independent variables. A sabbatical leave project has been proposed by the main instructor of this course (K. Young) for 2015 to examine technology as a possible means of data collection (mobile apps). Additionally, early group and 1:1 consultation with students on their target behaviors is planned to improve understanding of the project.****Besides specific changes noted above, examination of instructor variability in assessment modalities and student performance on SLOs for this course is a goal for 2013-14. Based on the data from assessment modalities suggests student weakness in the area of writing. This would support a college-level focus on increasing student writing skills, and providing more writing across the curriculum.****Research Methods****A 26-item assessment was developed to measure the three Knowledge-Based Student Learning Outcomes for Research Methods. Students from all three sections of Research Methods will complete the assessment at the end of the Fall 2013 semester. Faculty who teach this course will meet to review the results and make suggestions based on the available data.****Human Sexuality****Student Learning Outcomes assessment for Human Sexuality, a cross-listed course with Sociology, last occurred for 3 of our SLOs in 2010. Although we planned to re-evaluate SLOs on a 3-year cycle, to align assessment of this course with the discipline’s decision to assess all SLO’s that map to the Knowledge-base program Outcome during the 13-14 AY, 4 of the 7 SLO’s for Psy 125 will be evaluated at the end of the Fall ’13 semester. Both full time and part time faculty are currently involved the development of an assessment method that is textbook agnostic. Once the results of this current assessment period are available, we will convene current instructors of the course to discuss the outcomes and what, if any, modifications to the instruction and/or assessment process might be necessary.** **Personal Growth****The PT faculty teaching this course is analyzing a reflection exercise that relates to the content knowledge for one of the SLOs and she will give me the results. We will evaluate the results to see if students are gaining the knowledge for this SLO and then will discuss revising how we are teaching the concepts, if necessary.****Social Psychology****Student Learning Outcomes for Social Psychology, a course cross-listed with Sociology, were not assessed in previous years. Full and part-time faculty (from Psychology and Sociology) who teach Social Psychology met during the Fall 2013 semester to develop a formal assessment of the two Knowledge-Based SLOs. A 16-item multiple-choice assessment was developed and all Social Psychology instructors will give this assessment to students before the end of the Fall 2013 semester. Data will be evaluated and faculty will meet once again to discuss the results and make any necessary changes to the instruction or assessment.****Marriage & Family****FT faculty from Psychology and Sociology are assessing for content knowledge for the two SLOs we currently have by imbedding five questions for each SLO and calculating the percentage correct for those questions. We will combine our results and submit a report at the end of this semester (Fall 13). We will review the results for any indication that we need to revise how we are teaching these concepts.****Psychology of Women****The CORs for Psychology of Women were updated as part of the discipline's decision to include the course in our AA-T. As a result, new Student Learning Outcomes were written to better align with the revised CORs. During the Spring 2014 semester, the Knowledge-Based Student Learning Outcomes will be assessed. Faculty who teach this course will meet to develop the assessment. After students complete the assessment and data is available, faculty will meet to discuss the results and make instruction and/or assessment changes as necessary.**1. **Program SLOACs: What did you learn from your program SLO assessments? What will you maintain and/or change because of the assessment results?**

**We use an embedded course outcome assessment to assess our program outcomes. We reviewed data from Intro Psych (these outcomes were all improved this year, especially in problem areas, in part because of introduction of a mastery-based, multiple-take quizzing system or because the data were from 9 sections from one professor and not across sections); from Physio (those outcome results were similar to the previous year, improving in two areas due to changes in instruction), from Learning, from Developmental and from Abnormal Psychology (these courses were assessed using a combination of both MC and essay) . These results suggested that courses have their own personality that impact results, independent of our teaching. We also noted that students tend to do better on multiple-choice assessments and continue to struggle with written assessments. Even sections taught by the same instructor, taught with the same pedagogy can have divergent results. We noted that In general, we find that abut 70 - 80% of our students show mastery of course outcomes under "Knowledge Base" for the courses we assessed.** **We intend to spend the ’13 – ’14 AY engaging in broader, deeper engagement across all sections to get a much more accurate assessment of our Knowledge base program outcome. We will identify any areas for improvement during summer ’14. We already have identified course outcomes that need to be rewritten in order to be appropriately assessed, but will delay that until after this year when we will rewrite our program outcomes to be aligned with the new American Psychological Association Outcomes.** |
| 1. **Other Relevant Data and Information.**
2. **Describe other data and/or information that you have considered as part of the assessment of your program. (Examples of other data and factors include, but are not limited to: external accreditation requirements, State and Federal legislation, four-year institution directions, technology, equipment, budget, professional development opportunities).**

**None**1. **Given this information, how are your current and future students impacted by your program and planning activities? Note: Analysis of data is based on both quantitative (e.g., numbers, rates, estimates, results from classroom surveys) and qualitative (e.g., advisory group minutes, observations, changes in legislation, focus groups, expert opinion) information.**

 |
| 1. **Labor Market Data. For Career/Technical disciplines only, provide a summary of the current labor market outlook. This data can be found on the CA Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information for Educators/Trainers at:** <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/Content.asp?pageid=112>**. Click on summary data profile on right side of page to search by occupation. (Check other reliable industry or government sources on Labor Market Data websites that support findings and are relevant to Region Ten – San Diego/Imperial Counties. Include job projections and trends that may influence major curriculum revisions.)**

**The Chancellor’s Office Salary Surfer Data indicate that for those students who earn an AA in psychology in the state increase their salaries from $16,287 two-years before earning their degree to $20, 021 two-years after and five years after $27,437 demonstrating that there is real financial value of an AA in psychology. http://salarysurfer.cccco.edu/Salaries.aspx** |
| 1. **Discipline/Program Assessment:** **Based on Steps I and II above, describe your discipline’s or program’s:**
2. **Strengths**

**a. We’ve developed a coherent vision of our work, with shared responsibility for meeting our goals. We now see ourselves as providing a unified program for students with goals towards transfer, rather than simply providing a smorgasbord of independent courses. We are collaborating for students’ success –aligning our program with the leadership of the American Psychological Association and keeping our fingers on the pulse of the discipline, particularly as it relates to teaching.****b. We are good with numbers and are analytical. We value research to help guide our decision-making and make good use of the research department to help us understand our students.****We used the PRP resources we received (travel, equipment) to enhance our student-centered program.**1. **Weaknesses**

**We are increasingly challenged by increasing administrative workload with fewer full-time faculty, given our FTES and PT faculty load. The reassigned time that is provided to help with such tasks does not get down to those of us doing the actual work. This is a problem inherent in a multi-disciplinary department, given the distribution of labor in our department.** 1. **Opportunities**

**a) Develop a comprehensive advising program for our students****b) Begin a challenging equity conversation regarding our students’ success** **c) Revise the workload distribution in our department****d) Provide better support and guidance for our substantial numbers of PT faculty.**1. **Challenges**

**a) The allocation of work and the distribution of department reassigned time does not support those faculty teaching full loads who do much of the administrative work.****b) We do not have enough FT faculty to do all the necessary work well and without feeling exploited.** **c) It is truly nearly impossible to provide adequate support, mentoring, and guidance to work with our large contingent of PT faculty.****d) We cannot grow without more access to classrooms during prime times.** |

**STEP III. Updated Goals & Plans**

**Taking the analyses you completed in Steps I and II, describe your program’s goals and plans.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Goals and Plans: What are your goals for 2013-14? When establishing goals, consider changes you are making to curriculum, schedule, and staffing as a result of the assessments you completed in STEPS I and II above. Goals should reflect your program/discipline’s top priorities for the coming academic year.**

**For EACH goal provide the following:** |
| **GOAL #1** |
| **Program or discipline goal** |  **Assess all Knowledge Base Outcomes in all sections of all courses & meet with all faculty to review findings and make any necessary action plans** |
| **Plans/Strategies for implementation** |  **All psychologists have been assigned responsibility for courses. Each individual has developed an assessment plan and is working with all PT faculty who teach that course. After assessments are completed this Fall, faculty leads will examine data with PT faculty to determine whether any action is suggested by the findings.** |
| **Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)** | **Determine how well the knowledge base program outcome is being met by the courses in our AA-T. Make action plans as necessary.** |
| **GOAL #2** |
| **Program or discipline goal** | **Design a robust psychology advising program to begin ’14 – ’15, including the feasibility of reinstating a Psi Beta chapter and a peer-mentoring Psych-Cess program with CSUSM, and designing an appropriate advising webpage (Dr. Rose sabbatical project for Fall ’14)** |
| **Plans/Strategies for implementation** | **Netta and Katie do a feasibility study for Psi Beta and a Psych-cess peer mentoring program with CSUSM during Spring 14. Fred to develop advising webpage during his sabbatical Fall 14.** |
| **Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)** | **Begin Psi Beta Honor Society Fall ’14, begin peer mentoring program with CSUSM Fall ’14. Webpage complete by end of Fall ’14.** |
| **GOAL #3** |
| **Program or discipline goal** | **Curriculum Changes: Redesign Psych/Soc 205 to include 1-unit of computer-based analytical tools, especially SPSS. De-cross list Social Psych. Add Psych of Women to AA-T. Update AA-T to reflect those differences.** |
| **Plans/Strategies for implementation** | **Roger and Susan lead Psych/Soc 205 discussion and COR revision. Netta to update Psych of Women and Social Psych COR’s. Katie to update AA-T to reflect these changes.** |
| **Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)** |  **Updated Program and Course Outcomes** |
| **ADDITIONAL GOAL (*if needed*)** |
| **Program or discipline goal** |  **PLEASE SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT FOR THE REMAINING 6 GOALS OF OUR DISCIPLINE**  |
| **Plans/Strategies for implementation** |  |
| **Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Alignment with College Mission and Strategic Plan Goals.**
2. **How do your goals align with the Palomar College Mission?**

**Currently, the discipline of psychology is focused on supporting any curricular changes, course redesigns, program development, and increasing advising that would assist students who aim to transfer to a four-year college in psychology. Transfer is one of the primary missions of Palomar College. We are beginning conversations about equity in education and the achievement gap—part of the college mission is to be “engaging teaching and learning environment for students of diverse origins.”**1. **How do your goals align with the College’s Strategic Plan Goals? See the College’s Strategic Plan 2016 Goals at:** <http://www.palomar.edu/strategicplanning/PALOMAR_STRATEGICPLAN2016.pdf>

**Our goals are directly related to the Colleges goals and objectives, specifically:****Goal 1: Student Connections, Pathways, Learning and Success****Objective 1.4: Transfer Credit Evaluation, Education Planning & Degree Audit****Objective 1.5: Increase the number of students beginning remediation in their first year****Objective 1.6: Define Career Pathways****Goal 2: Partnerships: Educational Partnerships with CSUSM****Goal 3: Human Resources****Objective 3.3 Rebuild Staffing Levels****Objective 3.4: Support Faculty Innovation through Action Based Research**1. **Based on your program review and planning, describe any issues/concerns that have emerged that require interdisciplinary or College-wide dialogue and/or planning.**

**We believe that entire college needs to engage in collegial discussions about****a) Achievement Gaps by Ethnicity (if unrelated to SES)****b) Achievement Gaps by Gender****c) Increasing Student Success in Online courses** |

|  |
| --- |
| **STEP IV. Resources Requested for Academic Year 2013-2014:**  |
| **Now that you have completed steps I – III, identify the resources needed to achieve the goals and plans identified in Step III. Categorize resource requests as noted below. Provide rationale for requests to get better information. Please note that all resources allocated are for one year only. NOTE: DO NOT INCLUDE RESOURCE REQUESTS THAT DUPLICATE REQUESTS FROM OTHER DISCIPLINES IN YOUR DEPARTMENT. PLACE REQUESTS COMMON TO TWO OR MORE DISCIPLINES ON THE FORM “Academic Department Resource Requests”.** |

**a. Equipment (600010) (per unit cost is >$500) *Enter requests on lines below. Click here for examples of equipment:*** [***http://www.palomar.edu/irp/2013CategoriesforPRPResourceRequests.pdf***](http://www.palomar.edu/irp/2013CategoriesforPRPResourceRequests.pdf)

| **Resource Category** | **Describe** **Resource** **Requested** | **Discipline goal addressed by this resource** | [**Strategic Plan 2016 Goal Addressed by this Resource**](http://www.palomar.edu/strategicplanning/PALOMAR_STRATEGICPLAN2016.pdf) | **Prioritize these requests (1, 2, 3, etc.)** | **Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline’s goals, plans, analysis of data, SLOACs, and the College’s Strategic Plan.****(If this resource is already funded in part or full, name the source and describe why the source is not sufficient for future funding.** | **Amount of Funding Requested (include tax, shipping, etc.)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **a1.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **a2.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **a3.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **a4.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **a5.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **b. Technology (600010) (computers, data projectors, document readers, etc.) Enter requests on lines below. *Click here for examples of Technology:*** [***http://www.palomar.edu/irp/2013CategoriesforPRPResourceRequests.pdf***](http://www.palomar.edu/irp/2013CategoriesforPRPResourceRequests.pdf) |
| **Resource Category** | **Describe** **Resource** **Requested** | **Discipline goal addressed by this resource** | [**Strategic Plan 2016 Goal Addressed by this Resource**](http://www.palomar.edu/strategicplanning/PALOMAR_STRATEGICPLAN2016.pdf) | **Prioritize these requests (1, 2, 3, etc.)** | **Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline’s goals, plans, analysis of data, SLOACs, and the College’s Strategic Plan.****(If this resource is already funded in part or full, name the source and describe why the source is not sufficient for future funding.** | **Amount of Funding Requested (include tax, shipping, etc.)** |
| **b1.**  | **SPSS Base package (statistical analysis software package) site licenses for all computers on campus. SPSS Advanced Statistics for all Full Time Faculty and the computers in MD-130.**  | **#3: Curriculum changes** | **Goal 1: Student Connections, Pathways, Learning and Success as well as Goal 3: Providing infrastructure in support of student learning, programs, and services.** | **1** | **We decided to move to a 4-unit Statistics course to include a robust inclusion of SPSS for multiple reasons. We want to remain consistent with our articulation agreements and with current practices at local colleges, and to provide students with the support they need to be successful in other classes (e.g., Research Methods for which Stats is a prerequisite) as well as other courses after transfer. Further, in the 21st century virtually all research data are analyzed with the aid of computer packages (SPSS being one of the most widely used) so providing instruction and access to SPSS will provide our students with currency and relevance in modern data analysis. Importantly, by shifting away from an emphasis on hand calculations, instructors can spend more time developing conceptual understanding and ultimately improving all learning outcomes for Psy/Soc 205. To meet these goals, SPSS software will need to be made available on campus. By far, the most cost effective means of equipping the campus is to get a campus wide license. This SPSS base license cost is $13,940. Although it is not clear why our multi-disciplines (Psychology and Sociology) would have to incur this cost, IT has assured us that this would be a one-time cost to the disciplines. An additional $4,410 is requested for the SPSS Advanced Statistics add-on module for 6 faculty members. The Advanced package provides additional capabilities that will be used in both Psy/Soc 205 and Psychology 230: Research Methods but do not necessitate campus-wide deployment. The new Psy/Soc 205 course is slated to begin in Fall of 2014 and will NOT be able to meet the needs of the new COR and SLOs if this software is not in place campus wide. These resources are relevant to Palomar's mission of transfer readiness, general education, and career training. It is notable that almost all job descriptions for researchers in the community college system require working knowledge of SPSS. This request for an increase in availability of SPSS also addresses Palomar's strategic planning goal of providing infrastructural support of student learning, programs, and services.** | **$18,350.00** |
| **b2.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **b3.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **b4.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **b5.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| **c. Funds for Supplies (400010) (per unit cost is <$500 supplies) *Enter requests on lines below. Click here for examples of Supplies:***  [***http://www.palomar.edu/irp/2013CategoriesforPRPResourceRequests.pdf***](http://www.palomar.edu/irp/2013CategoriesforPRPResourceRequests.pdf) |
| --- |
| **Resource Category** | **Describe** **Resource** **Requested** | **Discipline goal addressed by this resource** | [**Strategic Plan 2016 Goal Addressed by this Resource**](http://www.palomar.edu/strategicplanning/PALOMAR_STRATEGICPLAN2016.pdf) | **Prioritize these requests (1, 2, 3, etc.)** | **Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline’s goals, plans, analysis of data, SLOACs, and the College’s Strategic Plan.****(If this resource is already funded in part or full, name the source and describe why the source is not sufficient for future funding.** | **Amount of Funding Requested (include tax, shipping, etc.)** |
| **c1.**  | **Supplies necessary for the Psy 210 (Physiological Psychology) laboratory. These include: Laboratory Bench Pads, microscope slides, Microscope cover slips, methylene blue stain, sheep brains, cow eyes. See Appendix 1 for cost breakdown.** | **#10: Promote excellence in teaching among all psychology faculty** | **Goal 1: Student Connections, Pathways, Learning, and Success** | **2** | **These are recurrent supplies based on 6 lab sections of approximately 130 students per year (3 labs in the fall; 3 in the spring) and current inventory as of 11/10/2013. Without these supplies necessary to maintain the status quo, the course cannot run as described in the COR and would threaten our AA-T and transfer agreements, important components of the Palomar's mission of transfer readiness and general education opportunities. The resources meet the strategic planning goal of Student Connections, Pathways, Learning, and Success. The equipment supports the SLOACs for Psy 210 as they provide basic knowledge and processes involved in psychology.**  | **$1236.63** |
| **c2.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **c3.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **c4.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **c5.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| **d. Funds for Operating Expenses (500010) (printing, travel, maintenance agreements, software license, etc.) *Enter requests on lines below. Click here for examples of Operating Expenses:*** [***http://www.palomar.edu/irp/2013CategoriesforPRPResourceRequests.pdf***](http://www.palomar.edu/irp/2013CategoriesforPRPResourceRequests.pdf) |
| --- |
| **Resource Category** | **Describe** **Resource** **Requested** | **Discipline goal addressed by this resource** | [**Strategic Plan 2016 Goal Addressed by this Resource**](http://www.palomar.edu/strategicplanning/PALOMAR_STRATEGICPLAN2016.pdf) | **Prioritize these requests (1, 2, 3, etc.)** | **Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline’s goals, plans, analysis of data, SLOACs, and the College’s Strategic Plan.****(If this resource is already funded in part or full, name the source and describe why the source is not sufficient for future funding.** | **Amount of Funding Requested (include tax, shipping, etc.)** |
| **d1.**  | **Travel funds for each Full Time faculty member to attend professional conference(s).** | **Maintaining currency in the field; Student Advising** | **3: Human Resources and Professional Devleopment** | **3** | **The abiliity to attend professional conferences relating to the teaching of psychology and relevant subdisciplines (e.g., neuroscience, social psychology) are vital to maintaining currency in a rapidly changing field. This currency will translate into improved instruction and advising of our students, consistent with Palomar's mission of transfer readiness and general education. The request also aligns with the strategic plan goals of increasing Professional Development opportunities (Goal 3, Objectives 3.3 and 3.4).**  | **$6000.00** |
| **d2.**  | **Membership fees for Full Time faculty professional organizations.** | **Maintaining currency in the field; Student Advising** | **3: Human Resources and Professional Devleopmen** | **4** | **As with travel funds, each Full Time faculty member maintains professional affiliations as a means of maintaining current in the field. These membershipp fees provide accsss to scientific publications and (cheaper) admission to professional conferences. Membership translates into better advising capabilities, greater modeling for student career goals/planning, and improved classroom instruction. This request is consistent with Goal 3, Objectives 3.3 and 3.4 of the Strategic Plan emphasizing increased professional development opportunities. In this case, the funds directly relate to faculty areas of expertise and improved classroom instruction.**  | **$964** |
| **d3.**  | **Food/drinks for our bi-annual All-Psychology meetings and our all-day planning retreats (currently one of our FT faculty members pays for these )** | **Student advising; Curriculum changes, SLOAC, Program outcomes, prerequisites** | **1: Student Connections, Pathways, Learning, and Success** | **5** | **SLOACs, Program outcomes, prequisite enforcement, enrollment management, program review and planning, are all vital tasks required of our discipline. Done correctly, they are also time consuming and we have found extended, all-day retreats (2 per year) to be very productive. It is quite costly to personally absorb the costs of these meetings while performing the District's business. These meetings are extremely productive in meeting the strategic plan Goal 1 : Student Connections, Pathways, Learning, and Success through our discussion of SLOAC data, prerequiste enforcement, curriculum changes, and greater coordination of goal attainment as detailed in this document.**  | **$800** |
| **d4.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **d5.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| **e. Funds for temporary or student workers (230010/240010) Enter requests on lines below** |
| --- |
| **Resource Category** | **Describe** **Resource** **Requested** | **Discipline goal addressed by this resource** | [**Strategic Plan 2016 Goal Addressed by this Resource**](http://www.palomar.edu/strategicplanning/PALOMAR_STRATEGICPLAN2016.pdf) | **Prioritize these requests (1, 2, 3, etc.)** | **Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline’s goals, plans, analysis of data, SLOACs, and the College’s Strategic Plan.****(If this resource is already funded in part or full, name the source and describe why the source is not sufficient for future funding.** | **Amount of Funding Requested (include benefits)** |
| **e1.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **e2.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **e3.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **e4.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **e5.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**STEP V. Classified and administrative (contract) positions requests for academic year 2014-2015**

**f. Enter requests on lines below. These requests will be used by IPC to develop its annual Staffing Plan priorities.**

| **Resource Category** | **Describe** **Resource** **Requested** | **Discipline goal addressed by this resource** | [**Strategic Plan 2016 Goal Addressed by this Resource**](http://www.palomar.edu/strategicplanning/PALOMAR_STRATEGICPLAN2016.pdf) | **Prioritize these requests (1, 2, 3, etc.)** | **Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline’s goals, plans, analysis of data, SLOACs, and the College’s Strategic Plan.****(If this resource is already funded in part or full, name the source and describe why the source is not sufficient for future funding.** | **Amount of Funding Requested (include benefits)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **f1.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **f2.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **f3.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **f4.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **f5.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 **Department Chair/Designee Signature Date**

 **Division Dean Signature Date**