

## **2019 Psychology Program Review**

# Program Review Guidebook for Academic Departments 2018-2019

## Psychology

### Overview

#### **PROGRAM REVIEW: INTRODUCTION**

A program review is a systematic process for evaluating and improving academic programs. It is conducted through self-evaluation and peer evaluation by external reviewers, with an emphasis on assessing the quality and degree of student learning within the program. The comprehensive analysis which the review provides and the resulting Memorandum of Understanding are used to stimulate curriculum and programmatic changes and to inform planning and budgeting processes at various levels. The program review cycle occurs every five years.

Program review is a required element in WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) accreditation and has been a part of Pepperdine's assessment cycle since 2003. While data provides the foundation for effective program review, assessment of student learning, and other quality improvement strategies, the data must be turned into evidence and communicated in useful formats. The program review does this.

When implemented effectively and followed up deliberately, program review is a powerful means for engaging faculty, staff, and administrators in evaluating and improving programs to enhance student learning. The review process is an opportunity to refine a program to meet the changing needs of student learning, retention, curriculum in various disciplines, and student support services. It is also a purposeful opportunity to link decision-making, planning, and budgeting with evidence.

This guidebook provides a framework and resources to help with the review.

#### **GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

The process is intended to be meaningful, foremost, for the department and its enhancement of student learning. As a result, the process is flexible in order to serve the needs of both small and large programs as well as academic, co-curricular, and student support programs. The review should be a collaborative process involving faculty, staff, administrators, and students in order to align more effectively the college or department with institutional goals and objectives.

Two guiding principles are embedded in this Guidebook and are consistent with WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) standards:

**\* Ongoing Evaluation of What Students Learn:**

Evidence-based program review includes: a review of program learning outcomes; evaluation of the methods employed to assess achievement of the outcomes; and analysis and reflection on learning results, retention/graduation rates, core competencies, and other outcomes data over a multi-year period.

**\* Quality Assurance, Planning, and Budgeting Decisions Based on Evidence:**

The results of the program review are to be used for follow-up planning and budgeting at various decision-making levels.

### **PREPARATION FOR PROGRAM REVIEW**

The program chair is responsible for the planning of the review. An internal committee or working group should be developed to allocate responsibilities for writing the program review including data collection, writing, and use of resources. It is recommended that a meeting occur between the committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) to review data needs.

### **PROGRAM ALIGNMENT WITH THE UNIVERSITY, MISSION, AND INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES**

Program reviews focus on the meaning, quality, and integrity of a program as it relates to student learning and the mission of Pepperdine:

Pepperdine University is a Christian university committed to the highest standards of academic excellence and Christian values, where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership.

Each department carries out the University mission and institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). The ILOs are formed by two components:

\* Core commitments: knowledge and scholarship, faith and heritage, and community and global understanding

\* Institutional values: purpose, service, and leadership

Each basic commitment is seen through the lens of three essential institutional values drawn from the University mission statement: purpose, service, and leadership. These basic commitments should link to measurable objectives as stated in the student learning outcomes (SLOs).

### **OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM REVIEW COMPONENTS**

Program review at Pepperdine University is conducted on a five-year review cycle that involves three main components and six steps (see diagram below):

#### **SELF STUDY:**

- An in-depth, internal analysis written by program faculty/staff
- Department faculty or program staff (for co-curricular and student support services) conduct a departmental self-study within guidelines provided in the Guidebook. This portion of the review identifies program strengths and limitations, and suggests solutions to identified problems.

#### **EXTERNAL & INTERNAL REVIEWS:**

- An external review conducted by an outside expert in the field or discipline. The Guidebook describes how to secure qualified, objective external reviewers, including those with understanding and experience in addressing student learning outcomes assessment. Once the self-study is completed, the external review is organized.
- An internal review by the Advancement of Student Learning Council (ASLC)

#### **CLOSING THE LOOP:**

- A Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) developed by the department
- A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) developed by the dean

Closing the Loop is used to describe the act of making decisions based on evidence. The most important product of a program review is the advancement of student learning. Therefore, the program review cycle ends by identifying evidence-based changes in the

**QIP, and then the MOU explains how the plan will be supported and carried out over the next five years.**

## **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

**Please find the link below for the 'GLOSSARY OF TERMS'.  
<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B6ufJTOgPx32TmZjU19JZ3FTM00>**

## **INTRODUCTION**

**Reviews begin with an introduction that provides a context for the review. In contrast to the rest of the self-study report, this portion is primarily descriptive and should include:**

### **1. INTERNAL CONTEXT**

**This begins with an overview of the program describing (as appropriate).**

- a. where the program is situated (school/division),**
- b. degrees granted, concentrations available, programs offered**
- c. where is the program located (campus location)**
- d. Provide a brief history of the program**
- e. Describe the changes made to the program since the last review.**

The Psychology Program is part of the Social Sciences Division at Seaver College, located on the Malibu campus of Pepperdine University. This program grants a Bachelor of Arts degree in psychology. Although the program is also highly related to the Industrial/Organizational Psychology minor and the Social Work minor, the curricular discussion in this review will only address the major.

Although Pepperdine University has had a psychology program since its early years on the Los Angeles campus, it included both a bachelor's degree and a master's degree at that time. When the Malibu campus opened in 1972, the bachelor's program moved to the new campus and became part of the newly-created Seaver College, while the master's program stayed at the Los Angeles campus (later becoming part of the Graduate School of Education and Psychology; GSEP). At that time, the program had three full-time faculty members: Ola Barnett, James Greer, and Wyatt Jones. The faculty offered 19 courses, and a student had to complete at least seven courses to earn a degree; this included three core courses (i.e., Foundations of Psychology, Introduction to Research, and History and Systems of Psychology), one Psychology elective, and one course from each of three different content areas.

During the past 40 years, the program has grown and matured. Currently, there are nine full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members who have their primary/majority appointment in the Psychology program, and two faculty members who have their primary appointments in a different program but who consistently teach classes for the Psychology program. These faculty members will be discussed in greater detail in the Sustainability: Resources section of this report.

The curriculum has gone through two large-scale revisions in the past 40 years. The most recent large-scale revision was in 1995, when the faculty adopted guidelines set forth by the American Psychological Association for Best Practices in Undergraduate Psychology Education; these changes were made in an effort to increase the emphasis on critical thinking and research methodology, and to ensure that every graduating student had been introduced to each of four major core areas of psychology (i.e., individual differences, social/group processes, learning/cognitive principles, and biological principles). The overall substance, structure, and philosophy of the major has not changed in the past 17 years, despite small changes; for

example, several courses have been eliminated, several courses have been added, several courses have been renumbered, and (in response to a wide-scale change to the General Education program in 2001) one course (i.e., *Research Methods in Psychology*; PSYC 310) was designated as the required Presentation Skills (PS), Research Methodology (RM), and Writing Intensive (WI) course for the major. The current degree requirements are presented in the file attached to this section of the report. For the remainder of this report, classes will be referred to by course number, as listed in this appendix.

The final major change to the Psychology program was the development of the Honors Research Program in Psychology, which was instituted in 2009. To participate in this program, students apply during the fall of their junior year. Typically, six or seven students (representing approximately 10% to 15% of the class) are selected on the basis of their academic success (as indicated by both Psychology GPA and cumulative GPA), career goals, and successful completion of *Foundations of Psychology*, *Introduction to Statistics*, and *Research Methods in Psychology*. The honors program includes three required courses including a two semester *Research in Psychology* in addition to *Intermediate Statistics and Computer Applications*. During the spring of their junior year, students enroll in *Intermediate Statistics* and 3 units of *Research in Psychology* and spend the semester working with the professor of *Research in Psychology*, and a faculty mentor with similar research interests, to review relevant research literature, design an empirical research study, and create and submit a research proposal to Seaver College's Institutional Review Board. During the fall of their senior year, honors students enroll in 3 units of *Research in Psychology*, to conduct the proposed study, analyze the data, prepare and deliver an oral presentation, prepare a final written report, and submit the final project to either an undergraduate or professional conference. Students who successfully complete both semesters have the designation "Honors in Psychology" on their transcripts and diplomas. Finally, students submit their research for presentation at regional or national professional conferences, and they are urged to submit their final manuscripts for publication in peer-reviewed journals.

Since the last program review, the program has changed in several ways that will be elaborated on in the report. Specifically, we have added one program learning outcome focused on diversity and revised a different PLO, hired one new tenure-track faculty member to fill gaps in the curriculum and areas of specialty, and removed and added several courses. The new courses focus on major subareas of psychology, (i.e., Health Psychology), expanding our coverage of developmental psychology (i.e., Adult Development and Aging), covering other substantive areas of psychology (i.e., Psychology of Emotion) and providing more research opportunities tied to the curriculum. We revised PLO #4 to make it more assessable and feasible for faculty to tailor their pedagogy and assignments to furthering this PLO. Further, we did a substantial amount of research on other action items from our last program review but decided to not move forward with implementing those changes until we can arrive at better solutions or alternatives. Specifically, to address external reviewer feedback regarding our approach to capstones, Steve Rouse developed and presented a proposal for a single Capstone Course that all psychology seniors would be required to complete. However, the faculty realized that this capstone course would require too much demand on the faculty member teaching it and decided to await development of alternatives. To address comparison and external reviewer findings that our program might be strengthened by more laboratory resources, two faculty researched options for improving our laboratory resources. Since then, we have reorganized our primary laboratory space and stored away things that are no longer being used. Although we manage to share this space between multiple faculty, we could still benefit from additional laboratory space and resources.

## 2. THE EXTERNAL CONTEXT

**This should explain how the program responds to the needs of the area in which it serves: this can include the community, region, field, or discipline.**

In evaluating the curriculum and overall program, the Psychology faculty continue to place a high priority on recognizing that there are two distinct groups of students within the major: those planning to seek graduate or professional degrees, and those seeking employment in a psychology-relevant field after graduation. Although the necessary knowledge-base of these two groups of students is similar, there are other ways in which the needs of these two groups differ. For example, those seeking admission to graduate school (especially those planning to earn a Ph.D.) are benefitted by engaging in research, especially an independent research project of the type that would result in a presentation at a professional conference; this research experience is invaluable in the highly competitive process of applying to a research-oriented graduate program. On the other hand, those seeking a psychology-related profession at the undergraduate level and those seeking admission to graduate programs in applied psychology are benefitted by internship experiences that allow them to form professional networks and apply their educational experiences to practical professional settings. Research is accumulating to demonstrate the importance of such experiences. For example, a survey of employers conducted by the employer-members of the National Association of Colleges and Employers showed that 59% of internships converted into full-time positions. In fact, the College Employment Research Institute considers an internship to be a “high stakes” experience, because most employers consider an internship to be a requirement before being accepted for an entry-level job, so the internship is now the setting in which most college students begin their career journey. Field work and internship experiences have allowed our students to serve the nearby community in numerous settings. For example, students often fill internships at drug rehabilitation centers, autism treatment programs, rape crisis centers, and child development programs.

### Evidence

*Please attach evidence.*

[Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Psychology Degree.pdf](#)

## OUTCOMES & MAPPING

Please select your Program Learning Outcomes

Identifier	Description
CA-PEP-ILO-16.S-2-FH	Incorporate faith into service to others.

Additional Standards/Outcomes

Identifier	Description
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPSYCH-1	Critique the quality of published psychological literature and empirical research.
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPSYCH-2	Design and conduct an empirical study to answer a research question.
CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPSYCH-3	Describe and explain the major contributions of the core subdisciplines of psychology.

<b>CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPSYCH-4</b>	Integrate personal faith, sense of vocation, scientific knowledge, and APA Ethical Principles.
<b>CA-PEP-SVR-15.BAPSYCH-5</b>	Recognize and articulate the importance of diversity (including cultural, ethnic, racial, gender, sexual, age, and religious) as it applies to each subdiscipline.

**Please attach your Curriculum Map, PLO to ILO map, PLO to Core Competency map, and 5 Year Assessment Plan.**

#### **Attachment**

[Psychology Assessment Maps Curriculum Map.pdf](#)  
[Psychology Assessment Maps PLO to ILO.pdf](#)  
[Psychology Assessment Maps PLO to CC.pdf](#)  
[Psychology Assessment Maps Assessment Plan.pdf](#)

## **MISSION**

### **MISSION, PURPOSES, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES**

#### **3. MISSION, PURPOSES, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES**

**A key component in providing the context for the review is a description of the program's mission, purpose, goals, and outcomes.**

- a. Mission - This should be a general explanation of why the program exists, what it hopes to achieve in the future, and the program's essential nature, its values, and its work.**
- b. Goals are general statements of what the program wants to achieve.**
- c. Outcomes are the specific results that should be observed if the goals are being met.**

**The program's purpose, goals, and outcomes should relate to and align with the mission and goals of the college and of the University.**

#### **Mission**

“The mission of the Pepperdine University Psychology Faculty is to prepare students for their academic, professional, and personal futures by providing them with a well-balanced undergraduate education in psychology. As students progress through this educational process, they develop as individuals; acquire the knowledge, skills, and experiences of liberally-educated persons; and learn the principles, theories, methods, ethics, and applications of contemporary psychology. This process occurs in a challenging academic atmosphere characterized by a faculty dedicated to student development, active scholarship, professional activities, and community service.”

This program mission statement is well-aligned with the university's mission statement: “Pepperdine University is a Christian university committed to the highest standards of academic excellence and Christian values, where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership.” Both statements emphasize the importance of service, and the leadership emphasis in the university's mission is promoted through knowledge of the principles, theories, methods, ethics, and applications of contemporary psychology, which would allow

students to attain positions of leadership in the field. Finally, alignment is seen between the university's emphasis on purpose, which is promoted through the Psychology Program's emphasis on a faculty dedicated to student development.

### Goals

In the fall of 2007, the Psychology faculty derived the following goals from the general mission statement. It was the desire that students would

1. Think critically when evaluating scientific and popular views of the human mind and behavior;
2. Obtain a well-rounded foundation of psychological concepts and theories;
3. Gain a broad foundation of empirical methodology and an understanding of its nature, strengths, and limitations;
4. Engage in thought and discussion about the ethical and moral treatment of others in all professional activities, informed by the *American Psychological Association Ethical Standards* and a Christ-like view of human value;
5. Understand the social, cultural, biological, cognitive, and spiritual processes that influence behavior;
6. Gain greater understanding of oneself and others;
7. Gain practical experience working in settings relevant to their psychological training;
8. Prepare for advanced studies in psychology or related fields or for applied careers; and
9. Integrate faith and learning in the context of psychological theory and practice.

### Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

In the Fall of 2010, responding to a university-wide initiative, the psychology program identified a small number of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), and examined the degree to which they aligned upward with Institutional Educational Objectives (IEOs) of Pepperdine University and downward with the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) of each course. Since our last program review, we have also added an additional PLO, i.e., PLO #5. Psychology faculty agree that students who successfully complete the psychology program are expected to be able to:

1. Critique the quality of published psychological literature and empirical research (PLO 1);
2. Design and conduct an empirical study to answer a research question (PLO 2);
3. Describe and explain the major contributions of the core subdisciplines of psychology (PLO 3);
4. Integrate personal faith, sense of vocation, scientific knowledge, and APA Ethical Principles (PLO 4); and
5. Recognize and articulate the importance of diversity (including cultural, ethnic, racial, gender, sexual, age, and religious) as it applies to each subdiscipline (PLO 5).

These PLOs are related to each of the courses taught in the Psychology program; a detailed Program Alignment Map is provided in the Outcomes and Mapping Section of this report, identifying the specific course in which each PLO is Introduced, Developed, and Mastered.

The IEOs for Pepperdine University are formed by two components: our Core Commitments (i.e., Knowledge and Scholarship, Faith and Heritage, and Global Understanding) and our Institutional Values (i.e., Purpose, Service, and Leadership). The intersections of these three Core Commitments and these three Institutional Values were the basis of the development of the nine IEOs, which are provided in the Outcomes and Mapping Section of this report. The alignment

between the Psychology program's PLOs and Pepperdine's IEOs are also provided in this section.

### **American Psychological Association's Guidelines for Undergraduate Education**

The Mission, Goals, and Outcomes of the Seaver Psychology program align well with goals identified in the American Psychological Association's Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major (<https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/about/psymajor-guidelines.pdf>; the latest 2013 guidelines which expire in 2023):

Goal 1: Knowledge Base of Psychology. Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.

Goal 2: Research Methods in Psychology. Students will understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.

Goal 3: Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology. Students will respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and, when possible, the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes.

Goal 4: Application of Psychology. Students will understand and apply psychological principles to personal, social, and organizational issues.

Goal 5: Values in Psychology. Students will be able to weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values that are the underpinnings of psychology as a discipline.

Goal 6: Information and Technological Literacy. Students will demonstrate information competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for many purposes.

Goal 7: Communication Skills. Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats.

Goal 8: Sociocultural and International Awareness. Students will recognize, understand, and respect the complexity of sociocultural and international diversity.

Goal 9: Personal Development. Students will develop insight into their own and others' behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement.

Goal 10: Career Planning and Development. Students will emerge from the major with realistic ideas about how to implement their psychological knowledge, skills, and values in occupational pursuits in a variety of settings.

As shown in the attached file in this section, examination of these goals shows strong alignment with the Goals and Outcomes of the Seaver Psychology Program. However, there are some notable differences. First, although APA Goal 7 indicates the importance of communication skills, these are not explicitly stated in the Seaver Psychology Goals or PLOs. However, as described above, Research Methods in Psychology was chosen to serve as the PS and WI course in the Psychology major. Thus, if it can be demonstrated that the students accomplish the class writing and presentation SLOs, then it can be assumed that the program is fulfilling this APA goal. Second, APA Goal 6 indicates the importance of technological skills. Research Methods was chosen to be the RM course in the Psychology major and, as such, includes instruction on two important technological skills: the use of PsycINFO for conducting a literature search, and the use of SPSS in analyzing the data obtained from a psychological study. Thus, if it can be shown that the students accomplish the class literature search and data analytic SLOs, it can be concluded that the program is fulfilling this APA goal. Third, although both APA Goal 1 and

Seaver Psychology PLO 3 address the importance of a broad knowledge base in four different subdomains of psychology, there are subtle differences in the ways in which the domains of the science are divided. The Seaver College Psychology degree requirements address the Individual Differences, Social/Group Processes, Learning/Cognitive, and Biological Principles subdomains, while the APA document identifies the main domains as 1) Learning/Cognition, 2) Biological bases of behavior and mental processes, 3) Individual differences, personality, psychometrics, and social processes, and 4) Developmental changes in behavior and mental processes. Notably, developmental psychology is conceptualized as a subdomain in the APA document, but it is merged into the Individual Differences subdomain in the Seaver curriculum. Although Lifespan Developmental Psychology and Adult Development & Aging are included in the course offerings for the psychology major, it is possible for a student to obtain a Psychology degree without having completed a developmental course, provided he or she completed either Abnormal Psychology or Personality.

### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[Alignment between Goals Identified by the APA Guidelines on Undergraduate Education and the Seaver Psychology Program Goals and Outcomes.pdf](#)

## **ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Meaning**

### **Analysis of Direct Student Learning: Meaning Quality and Integrity**

The university is required to define and ensure a distinctive and coherent educational experience for each of its degree programs. The findings from the program assessment and analysis process should explain how effectively courses, curricula, the co-curriculum, and other experiences are structured, sequenced, and delivered so that students achieve learning outcomes at the expected levels of performance in core competencies in their majors or fields of specialization, in general education, and in areas distinctive to the institution. It means ensuring alignment among all these elements, and maintaining an assessment infrastructure that enables the institution to diagnose problems and make improvements when needed. Direct student learning, an examination of how well students are meeting the program learning outcomes, should come from the past four years of annual assessments.

(2013 WSCUC Accreditation Handbook.)

**Meaning of the Degree: Describe how the program ensures a holistic experience by answering the following questions about the coherence and alignment within the program:**

**4. What are the learning outcomes and how does the degree support the institutional mission and institutional learning outcomes? How does the degree embody the distinct values, basic commitment, and traditions of the institution?**

Students that obtain a degree from the psychology program have been exposed to, shown an appreciation for, and gained competency in the psychology program learning outcomes, the institutional mission and institutional learning outcomes, and the distinct values and commitments of Pepperdine University. The learning outcomes for the psychology program are listed at the bottom of this section of the report. Our annual assessments of the program learning outcomes since the last program review have resulted in mostly favorable results and some room for improvement.

The learning outcomes of the psychology degree support the institutional mission and institutional learning outcomes in very specific ways as identified in the Assessment Map attached in the Outcomes & Mapping Section of this report. As can be seen on the assessment map, the psychology program PLOs tie directly to 7 of the 9 ILOs. Further, the psychology curriculum supports the institutional mission and the institution's commitments and values. Specifically, the commitments of the institution are knowledge and scholarship, faith and heritage, and global understanding. The psychology program demonstrates shared commitment to the institutional commitment of knowledge and scholarship in the following ways: 1.) all psychology courses emphasize the important of scholarship in creating the knowledge base of psychology; 2.) all psychology students are exposed to being a research participant through our requirement that they sign up to participate in studies through the introductory psychology course; and 3.) all students are encouraged to engage in scholarship alongside a psychology faculty member and are allowed to count this work as their capstone course if it rises to the appropriate level of independence and effort. Further, the psychology program demonstrates shared commitment to the institutional commitment of faith and heritage in the following ways: 1.) all psychology professors either formally or informally integrate faith discussion into their classrooms; 2.) one of the psychology faculty offers a capstone course on psychology and religion; and 3.) several psychology faculty members engage students in formal spiritual mentoring or serve as panelists on convocation-related programming. Finally, the psychology program demonstrates shared commitment to the institutional commitment of global understanding in the following ways: 1.) we offer a cross-cultural psychology course; 2.) psychology faculty attempt to help students explore global issues and concerns in various other courses. For example, both the health psychology course and adult development and aging course contain a module dedicated specifically to culture and global perspectives on the topics at hand; and 3.) our psychology faculty regularly participate in International Programs as faculty, teaching psychology courses in Shanghai, Florence, Buenos Aires, and Heidelberg. The institutional values of Pepperdine University are purpose, service, and leadership. The psychology degree embodies these values in the following ways: 1.) service learning is incorporated into several courses and 2.) psychology faculty often informally and formally engage psychology majors in discussions of purpose and leadership. For example, the adult development and aging capstone course includes a capstone project linked to each student's vocational exploration.

**Program Learning Outcomes**

PLO 1 Critique the quality of published psychological literature and empirical research.

PLO 2 Design and conduct an empirical study to answer a research question.

PLO 3 Describe and explain the major contributions of the core subdisciplines of psychology.

PLO 4: Integrate personal faith, sense of vocation, scientific knowledge, and APA Ethical Principles.

PLO 5 Recognize and articulate the importance of diversity (including cultural, ethnic, racial, gender, sexual, age, and religious) as it applies to each subdiscipline.

**5. Is there a coherent, aligned sequence of learning opportunities? Does the degree offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular major or program? Please explain.**

According to our external reviewer from our previous 5 year program review, "In accordance with APA Principle #3, Recommendation #5 ("Courses are sequenced in ways that allow upper division courses to build on concepts that are introduced in lower division courses"), the Seaver Psychology curriculum is organized according to Foundation Courses, Core Content Courses, Capstone Courses, and Specialized Interest Courses. Three of the four Foundation Courses coincide well with the three foundational courses recommended in the APA Principles (Introduction to Psychology, Statistics, and Research Methods). The Seaver Program's offering of a Capstone experience also coincides well with APA Principle #3, Recommendation #5 ("A quality curriculum in undergraduate education will also include an integrative capstone experience that allows students to see both the unity and differentiation of psychology's many subfields")."

**6. How current is the program curriculum? How has the curriculum changed (if at all) over the last five years including the reasons for the change (e.g., the result of a learning outcome assessment) and evidence used as a basis for change?**

Since the last program review, the program has changed in several ways that will be elaborated on in this report. Specifically, we have added one program learning outcome focused on diversity, hired one new tenure-track faculty member, and removed and added several courses. The new courses focus on major subareas of psychology, (i.e., Health Psychology), expanding our coverage of developmental psychology (i.e., Adult Development and Aging), and providing more research opportunities within the curriculum (i.e., Psyc 290: Research in Psychology).

The overwhelming majority of these changes arose from the last program review as well as suggestions from alumni surveys conducted by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE). First, the addition of our fifth PLO arose from the last program review and was validated by the UCLA/CIRP alumni satisfaction survey conducted in Spring 2018. The 194 psychology alumni that responded to this survey were not fully satisfied with the "integration of diverse perspectives in the classroom" (mean = 3.44 on a 5 point scale). PLO #5 should lead to improvement in this area as faculty now are more intentional in addressing diversity in their courses and considering which courses can substantially address this PLO.

The addition of Psyc 290 (Research in Psychology) to the curriculum was intended to address a need to expose more students to research. By providing course credit for becoming involved in research at the lower-division level (200s), we are encouraging students to become involved in

research early in their academic trajectory. Pepperdine alumni believed that there was room for growth in the program in terms of contributing to students' ability to conduct research (mean satisfaction = 3.33 on a 4 pt scale). They also highlighted room for improvement with respect to the extent to which working with a faculty member on research contributed to their personal (mean satisfaction = 3.01 on a 4 pt scale) and professional development (mean satisfaction = 2.91 on a 4 pt scale).

**7. Please present a curriculum comparison with at least three peer institutions and with national disciplinary or professional standards if available.**

The American Psychological Association has chosen not to prescribe a specific academic curriculum for undergraduate education. Therefore, one of the most informative methods of evaluating the current curriculum is by comparing it with the curricula offered by the eight institutions identified as Seaver College's Peer (i.e., Calvin College, Occidental College, Pomona College, and University of San Diego) and Aspirational (i.e., Baylor University, Carleton College, University of Notre Dame, and Wake Forest University) Institutions. The course offerings in Seaver's Psychology program are listed in the attached course comparison, along with those of the designated institutions.

Based on a thorough comparison with 4 peer schools and 4 aspirational schools (please see the attached curriculum comparison), we have a comprehensive program that covers all the subareas that tend to be covered by at least 50% of our peer and aspirational schools. Our recent additions of Health Psychology and Adult Development & Aging have brought us more closely in line with other psychology programs since our last program review as all peer and aspirational schools have health psychology and 75% have more than one development-focused course. Further, we have numerous courses (i.e., positive psychology, Latino/a psychology, advanced statistics, psychology of religion, and eating disorders) that more than 50% of our peer and aspirational schools do not have. One major gap between our program and our peer and aspirational schools is lab courses, i.e., approximately 75% of our peer and aspirational schools have lab or research courses that correspond to various subareas of psychology but we do not. Additionally, 75% of our aspirational schools have a forensic psychology course or some course that is at the intersection of psychology and crime or psychology and the law. With respect to capstones or senior seminars (which was raised in our last program review by the external reviewer), there is no broad consensus across our peer and aspirational schools in that one of them had a capstone requirement similar to ours, less than half of them tended to have one capstone or senior seminar course, and the remaining schools tended to not have a capstone requirement. Finally, one of our courses (Psyc 341) has a course title (Principles of Learning) and catalog description that is fairly outdated compared to the course title and description for the same course used by other schools. We should change the course title to Learning and Memory and change the description. Review of catalog descriptions from other schools suggests that the following catalog description would be appropriate: "An overview of the cognitive and neural organization of memory and learning. Includes consideration of operant and classical conditioning, social learning, working memory and executive control, episodic and semantic memory, and implicit forms of memory and learning. Emphasizes integration of cognitive theory with neuroscientific evidence." This description more accurately describes our expectations and structure for this course.

**Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[CourseComparison.docx](#)

## PEDAGOGY

### **8. Please present measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching or implementing, scholarship on issues of teaching and learning, formative discussions of pedagogy among faculty, survey measures, participation rates, and student satisfaction surveys).**

Course evaluations, presentations on teaching and pedagogy, peer evaluations, and student surveys indicate that the psychology faculty exhibits teaching effectiveness.

Course evaluations written for the Psychology program faculty members tend to be strong. The course evaluation form has two main sections: questions related to The Course (e.g., “The course tests and evaluations are appropriate in content and difficulty” and “The course has increased my knowledge or understanding of the subject”) and questions related to The Professor (e.g., “The professor shows interest and enthusiasm for teaching the course” and “The professor presents course material in a clear and engaging manner”). Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale with options score values given from 1 to 5 for (respectively) Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, and Strongly Agree. The form is scored in a manner that allows summary scores for each item, for The Course items, and for The Professor items. Although college-wide comparison data are not available, the last four semesters yielded mean scores of 4.17 (Fall 2016), 4.19 (Spring 2017), 4.20 (Fall 2017), and 4.20 (Spring 2018) for *The Course* across psychology courses, and mean scores of 4.43, (Fall 2016), 4.40 (Spring 2017), 4.49 (Fall 2017) and 4.45 (Spring 2018) for *The Professor* across psychology courses. Thus, the mean scores for the items relating to The Course and The Professor fall between the “Agree” and “Strongly Agree” level, with slightly higher scores for The Professor than for The Course. Our faculty are consistently looking for opportunities to expand their pedagogy. For example, Jennifer Harriger was awarded a Diversity and Inclusive Excellence Teaching Grant (2017-2018) to incorporate diversity-focused elements into her courses.

Further, several of our faculty explicitly incorporate cutting-edge, evidence-based pedagogical approaches in the classroom. For example, flipped learning and gameful learning/gamification are each explicitly and meaningfully used by at least one of our faculty and in at least one course. Students from focus groups reported satisfaction with pedagogy. They noted that faculty showed enthusiasm for their topics, helped them apply theoretical topics to real-world examples, used role plays, effectively used discussion in the classroom, and integrated material from other disciplines and courses. Further, peer evaluations of teaching suggest high quality pedagogy. For example, during the same academic year as the current review, this writer conducted classroom observation of 2 of the psychology faculty across 3 different courses. These classroom observations demonstrated that psychology faculty are allocating time to directly engage students in critical thinking, to challenge students with engaging collaborative team-based problem solving, to scaffold student learning, and to present students with direct application of concepts. Many other peer evaluations and classroom observations have occurred since the last program review as well. Specifically, every time a faculty member was eligible for a change in rank or promotion (e.g., pretenure review, assistant to associate professor, 5-year review of full professors, etc.), his or her pedagogy was comprehensively evaluated by five other psychology faculty members, including classroom observations and reviews of syllabi, assignments, exams, and lecture slides/notes.

Also, the fact that faculty demonstrate a sufficient level of academic rigor in their teaching is evidenced by the grades assigned by psychology faculty. For example, the mean GPA assigned by Psychology program faculty in the semesters since the last program review was 3.05.

Finally, several psychology faculty members have either published scholarly chapters on teaching and learning or presented several peer-reviewed presentations on effective pedagogy at conferences since the last program review. These chapters and presentations are listed in the attached evidence file.

### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[Faculty Scholarship on Teaching and Learning Since Last Program Review.pdf](#)

## **ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Quality**

**Quality of the Degree: In meaning of the degree student learning outcomes and curriculum matrixes were used to define the degree. Now please describe the processes used to ensure the quality of the program.**

**9. Describe the high impact practices which enrich the learning experiences (How are they integrated in the curriculum? Are they assessed?)**

- a. Service learning**
- b. Research opportunities**
- c. Internships**
- d. Other high-impact practices**

The psychology faculty regularly and enthusiastically incorporate high impact practices (HIPs) into the psychology curriculum and co-curriculum with particular emphasis on a first-year seminar focused on loneliness, writing-intensive courses, collaborative work, undergraduate research, service or community based learning, fieldwork/internships, and capstone courses. Please see the attached for evidence of enrollment in courses related to HIPs.

a. Service Learning. Service learning is incorporated directly into the following 3 courses: cross-cultural psychology, abnormal psychology, and family therapy. Psychology alumni report feeling satisfied with service and volunteer opportunities (3.34 and 3.25 out of 4, respectively) and satisfied with opportunities for community service (4.38 of 5). Alumni focus groups conducted in January of 2019 gave additional insight into students' experiences with service learning. Specifically, they seemed to value the experience. They suggested that there should be more processing of the experience directly incorporated into the course.

b. Research opportunities. Research opportunities are offered to students on a consistent basis from all of our faculty. We have an introductory (Psyc 290) and advanced research course (Psyc 490) as well as the honors program. Psyc 290 was added to the catalog this academic year - 6 students enrolled in the Fall, 7 in the Spring. Please see attached figure for trends in enrollment in research courses (i.e., combined numbers for Psyc 290 and Psyc 490). As demonstrated, student enrollment in these courses has substantially increased in the past year. The honors program enrolls 4-6 high-performing students annually. All psychology faculty participate in the honors program via mentoring students and attending presentations by those students. Psychology alumni report that the psychology program contributed to their ability to conduct research (3.33 of 4). However, there seemed to be room for improvement with respect

to ensuring that working with faculty on research and conducting independent research contributes to personal and professional growth of students (3.01/2.91 and 3.14/3.05, respectively).

c. Internships. Internships are integrated into the curriculum through the Psych 495 course. Please see attached figure for trends in enrollment in the internship course. Since the last program review, enrollment in Psyc 495 increased but then decreased in the past 2 years. Psychology alumni report that the internships they completed as part of the psychology program contributed to their personal and professional growth, 3.34 and 3.39 of 4, respectively.

d. Other high-impact practices. Several High Impact Practices (HIPs) have been identified as important in the personal, educational, and professional development of undergraduate students. Many of these HIPs are broadly relevant to an institution as a whole, such as participation in an international program or a first-year seminar. Several, however, are directly relevant to individual programs and majors. Many of these major-related HIPs are built into the Psychology curriculum in such a way that all students will experience them. For example, Writing Intensive classes and Senior Capstone/Culminating classes are both considered HIPs, and every student in the Psychology major must complete at least one capstone class and the writing-intensive Research Methods course before graduation. First year seminars are also considered a HIP; one of our faculty (Khanh Bui) led a freshmen seminar on Loneliness this academic year.

For some of these HIPs, however, although opportunity is available, students are not required to participate. Specifically, both Internships and Independent Research Projects are recognized as valuable experiential learning opportunities; notably, independent research is a valuable component of applications for graduate school, and an internship can be a valuable component of applications to professional positions, as well as many graduate programs. Students can receive credit for Research on Psychology or Supervised Field Work, and this can count as a capstone experience; however, these are not required for graduation. Because of the value of these experiences in professional and personal development, one could argue that a greater percentage of students should be encouraged to participate in one or both of these experiences.

#### **10. Co-Curricular : How intentional are the co-curricular experiences which are provided and how are they integrated into the curricular plan?**

- a. Academic and career advising programs and resources**
- b. Tutoring, supplemental instruction, and teaching assistants**
- c. Orientation and transition programs**
- d. Financial support for obtaining scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc.**
- e. Support for engagement in the campus community**
- f. Support for emotional and psychological variables of success**
- g. Spiritual development programs and opportunities**
- h. Multicultural opportunities which support diversity**
- i. Plays, musicals, art exhibits, and lectures**
- j. the Sophomore Experience**
- k. Study Abroad**

a. Academic and career advising programs and resources. Every psychology student is assigned to one psychology faculty member as a "major advisor". Further, psychology alumni in focus groups reported that they often sought advising from other faculty members who were not their official advisor. Several of the faculty in the psychology program have participated in the Faculty-Student Mentor-Mentee program with students for several semesters (Natara Joseph, Jennifer Harriger). Through this program, faculty mentor students in areas tailored to that student's

professional development goals in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Annually, 3-4 of the psychology faculty participate in the Psi Chi graduate school night panel, in which we advise students on their academic and professional goals. Further, Janet Trammell collaborated with the Student Success Center to offer a learning skills workshop for students on learning and memory to grow their academic success. According to the UCLA/CIRP alumni satisfaction survey collected in Spring 2018, which used data from 194 Psychology alumni, alumni felt relatively satisfied with the advising they received in the psychology program (mean = 3.10 on 4-point scale) but there seemed to be room for improvement. Specifically, they felt comfortable contacting their advisor (mean = 3.34 on 4-point scale) and felt that their advisor was available (mean = 3.42 on 4-point scale) but felt there was room for improvement on helping with post graduation options and life after college (ratings between 2.6 and 2.8; disagree to agree range). Indirect evidence from focus groups support this same conclusion that there is room for improvement with respect to advising students about post-graduation options. Goal #5 of APA's goals for the undergraduate program focuses on Professional Development. A recent APA task force on assessment in psychology programs recommends that professional development be integrated into courses throughout psychology programs, i.e., at the introductory level, developing level, and mastery level (APA SNAP, 2016). Further, they suggested that faculty explicitly and routinely note to students the skills they are being taught above and beyond the content so that they are aware of the type of jobs for which they may be prepared. Finally, they suggest that faculty select textbooks that more seamlessly integrate career discussion into the psychological content.

b. Tutoring, supplemental instruction, and teaching assistants. Although psychology does not offer tutoring as part of its curriculum or program, most (if not all) of the psychology faculty refer students to the Writing Center both on their syllabi and/or on the first day of class. The Writing Center works extensively with students to improve their writing and guide them through the writing process. Psychology faculty that teach the introductory psychology GE course regularly need and obtain teaching assistants (TAs) that help with the educational experience of students. However, in recent years, there have been various difficulties in guaranteeing TAs for these courses. Psychology faculty usually are able to obtain TAs from Pepperdine's graduate program in psychology (GSEP). However, there needs to be a more consistent source of financial resources to do so as well as a mutual understanding with GSEP that these TAships are valuable to both their students and our program.

c. Orientation and transition programs. Orientations for new and transferring students are executed at the college level but psychology faculty regularly attend orientation events to meet new students.

d. Financial support for obtaining scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistantships. Several psychology students annually receive a Seaver faculty-staff scholarship, which ranges in amounts from \$650 to \$4000. Further, our division has yearly funds for scholarships specifically for students in the division. There are no scholarships or fellowships solely for psychology majors.

e. Support for engagement in the campus community. We have a chapter of the Psi Chi Honor Society associated with our program. Jennifer Harriger serves as the faculty sponsor for this club. Multiple psychology faculty (Natara Joseph, Khanh Bui, Steve Rouse) participate in Pepperdine's annual Step Forward Day on a regular basis and encourage students to do so as well. Step Forward Day provides students with an opportunity to serve the community alongside the rest of the Pepperdine Community. According to the UCLA CIRP senior survey, psychology seniors at Pepperdine tend to agree with the statement that they "feel a sense of belonging to this campus" and "see [themselves] as part of the campus community" (rating these items over the 2012-2016 interval average approximately 3 on a 4 point scale). This suggests that there is room for improvement in this area.

f. Support for emotional and psychological variables of success. The psychology faculty refer students to the Counseling Center when necessary and appropriate. Given that several of our faculty have clinical training, we are able to recognize signs of distress. Further, since the last program review, several psychology faculty have attended workshops and panels held by the Counseling Center and other university entities on student mental health. Dr. Folkers and Joseph both serve on the Alcohol & Other Drugs Coalition, a "thinktank" consisting of representatives from many university entities and meeting to discuss trends in alcohol and substance use among Pepperdine students as well as policies and initiatives to address these things. Further, Dr. Trammell recently held workshops in the Student Success Center focused on study skills and psychological variables in academic success.

g. Spiritual development programs and opportunities. The quality of our program is further enhanced by elements that are particularly unique to Pepperdine, including faith integration. The psychology faculty attend to the spiritual lives of students in various ways, some of which are integrated into the curriculum for Convocation credit, some of which are not. For example, multiple psychology faculty members (Khanh Bui, Cindy Miller-Perrin, Elizabeth Krumrei-Mancuso, Nataria Joseph, Steve Rouse) have engaged in one-on-one spiritual mentoring with students and/or club convos with groups of students across multiple semesters. Further several psychology faculty members (Khanh Bui, Elizabeth Krumrei-Mancuso, Cindy Miller-Perrin, Nataria Joseph, Steve Rouse) have served on panels or as individual speakers as part of the university convocation program. Finally, Cindy Miller-Perrin regularly engages psychology majors in spirituality-related research and information through the Christian Spirituality Research Institute, which she co-directs.

h. Multicultural opportunities which support diversity. Several psychology faculty members are leading (Nataria Joseph) or participating (Janet Trammell, Cindy Miller-Perrin, Steve Rouse) in the First Wave Advisory Council, which is a group of campus representatives interested in supporting first generation college students in their academic and social integration at Pepperdine, or its initiatives. These efforts promote diversity and involve events throughout the year and development of resources. Further, Steve Rouse currently serves as a Posse mentor, which involves regular one-on-one meetings and group meetings with a cohort of students from various majors. The Posse Foundation serves to support the academic, personal, and leadership growth of students from diverse backgrounds, cultivating safe multicultural environments on college campuses. Further, Steve Rouse participated in the Seeking Educational Equity & Diversity (SEED) program at Pepperdine, which is part of a national training on equity and diversity. He regularly translates what he learned from that program into his classroom pedagogy.

i. Plays, musicals, art exhibits, lectures. The college regularly brings renowned scholars and lecturers to the campus via the Distinguished Lecture Series and other programs. Psychology faculty members regularly encourage students to attend these when they are relevant to psychological knowledge and sometimes offer course points for attendance and reflection on these events.

j. The Sophomore Experience. Psychology faculty regularly participate in the Catalina trip and San Francisco trips, often offering educational tours or psychology-based sessions in these locations.

k. Study Abroad. Since the last program review, 3 of the psychology faculty have participated as abroad faculty and taught psychology courses to students abroad (Khanh Bui, Michael Folkerts, Cindy Miller-Perrin). Psychology students report satisfaction with their study abroad experience (4.73 on 5 pt scale) and reported that study abroad contributed to their personal and professional development (3.87 and 3.06 out of 4, respectively).

**11. Please describe evidence of students' research and publications, awards and recognition, professional accomplishments.**

Our students consistently publish research in professional and undergraduate journals and present at professional and undergraduate conferences. Since the last 5-year review, students have published over 20 peer-reviewed articles and delivered over 60 presentations for which they were competitively selected. These publications and presentations are listed in the attached file.

**Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[HIP\\_Course\\_Enrollment.pdf](#)

[Student\\_Research\\_Products.pdf](#)

## STUDENT SUCCESS, ALUMNI, AND ASSESSMENT DATA

**12. What is the profile of students in the program and how does the profile relate to or enhance the purpose and goals of the program?**

**Please explain your student success data (enrollment and retention data). Evidence should include student retention and graduation rate trends (disaggregated by different demographic categories such as race, gender, first-generation students, etc.).**

**OIE provides this data annually and houses the reports on the OIE website and LiveText site.**

**Student Success Data**

*Attached is the student success data for your program.*

[Enrollment Data Psychology Fall2013\\_17.xlsx](#)

[StudentFigures.pdf](#)

[Psychology Graduation Retention.xlsx](#)

Overall, the average number of psychology majors each year is higher for the five years preceding this review than it was for the five years preceding the previous review, suggesting that the psychology program will continue to need increased resources, faculty, and staff. Specifically, on average, each year preceding the previous program review consisted of 190 psychology majors whereas, on average, each year preceding the current program review consisted of 297 psychology majors. Please note that we also have had an average of approximately 42 psychology minors in industrial/organizational psychology each academic year.

The strengths of our student pool remain, i.e., on average, our psychology majors continue to have SAT section scores above 600 (ranging all the way up to 625 one year on SAT Math) and high school GPAs above 3.55.

The diversity of our students has remained steady in some areas and increased in others. The racial/ethnic diversity of the psychology majors has remained steady, i.e., on average, 47% of majors were non-White over the years leading up to the previous program review and 46% of majors were non-White in the years preceding the current program review. A closer examination

reveals that the number of non-White psychology majors has been decreasing over the past few years, returning to levels from a decade ago. It is possible that the high levels of non-White psychology majors from 2010-2013 were an anomaly rather than a trend and that recent decreasing levels suggest a return to baseline. In Fall 2017, 19% of psychology majors were Latino/a, 9% were Asian, 4% were African American, and 5% were two or more races. This parallels the fact that, in 2013, under 20% of the psychology workforce was non-White (APA Center for Workforce Studies, 2015). The gender diversity of the psychology majors has remained steady although there is some oscillation from year to year, i.e., on average, 77% of majors were female over the years leading up to the previous program review and 79% of majors were female in the years preceding the current program review. These numbers parallel national trends, e.g., the female:male ratio in the psychology workforce was 2.1:1 in 2014 (APA Center for Workforce Studies, 2015). There are indications that the religious diversity of the psychology student pool has increased, i.e., on average, 22% of majors were Church of Christ members over the years leading up to the previous program review whereas 16% of majors were Church of Christ members in the years preceding the current program review. Church of Christ is the university's denominational affiliation. The overwhelming majority of students continue to identify as Christian, especially Church of Christ, Catholic, nondemoninational, or Baptist. Compared to Seaver college as a whole, the psychology program tends to demonstrate less religious and gender diversity but slightly more racial/ethnic diversity.

With respect to retention, 92% of students who entered the psychology program the year following our last program review (Fall 2013) graduated within 4 years. For this entering class, non-White female students tended to graduate at higher rates than White female students whereas Latino males and non-resident alien males tended to perform worse than White males. Eighty-three percent of students that entered the following year (Fall 2014) graduated within 4 years. The cause of this drop in 4 year graduation rate is unclear. It could be due to double-majoring or other complex academic plans or it could be due to other factors. However, retention rates also showed a drop from the entering class of Fall 2013 to the entering class of Fall 2014. As can be seen in the attached graduation-retention Excel file, all retention rates, including 1 semester, 1 year, and 2 year retention, were lower from 2013 to 2014 moving from 100% to 95%, 97% to 87%, 90% to 82%, and 83% to 74%, respectively. Specifically, white males and females seem to be retained at lower rates from the entering class of Fall 2014 (relative to the entering class of 2013) and Latinas in the entering class of Fall 2014 seem to have a lower rate only for 3 year retention rates (relative to those in the entering class of 2013). As a note of comparison, the four-year graduation rate for Seaver College more generally is 77%.

Please see attached Student Figures document that contains figures that visually represent trends and data for the five years preceding the current review.

### **Student and Alumni Data**

**13. Please present your student and alumni survey data examining student attitudes, satisfaction levels and dispositions. OIE will provide the data in tables and graphs in their Educational Effectiveness Report. Programs are responsible for explaining the survey results. Survey data includes: UCLA/CIRP satisfaction survey data, alumni data.**

#### **Student and alumni survey data**

*Attached is the student and alumni survey data for your program.*

[Survey Report\\_OIE\\_Alumni\\_Survey\\_SOSC\\_08\\_03\\_18\\_redacted\\_.pdf](#)

[EEIs\\_Survey.pdf](#)

[OIEEIS\\_PsychOnly.pdf](#)

Overall Conclusions: According to the UCLA/CIRP alumni satisfaction survey collected in Spring 2018, which used data from 194 Psychology alumni, alumni feel quite satisfied with the psychology program. Further, each year from 2012 to 2016, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has surveyed Pepperdine seniors regarding many aspects of their educational journey. Psychology students tended to report satisfaction with the courses in psychology (approximately 4.4 out of 5 on average), with student-faculty interactions and mentorship (4.4 out of 5 on average), and with the quality of instruction at Pepperdine in general (4.2 out of 5 on average). Regarding student-faculty interactions, students consistently rated faculty highest on these items: "at least 1 faculty member took interest in my development" and "faculty believed in my potential to succeed academically" whereas they rated faculty the lowest on "faculty showed concern about my progress" although even the lowest rated items were consistently rated above a 3 (out of 4).

Psychology graduates felt that the psychology program prepared them for their employment in psychology reasonably well to extremely well (mean = 3.33 on 4-point scale) and prepared them for graduate or professional study reasonably well to extremely well (mean = 3.45 on 4-point scale). Further, they felt fairly satisfied with advising (mean=3.10 on a 4-point scale) and suggested that the program become more hands-on with helping students think about their post-graduation options and prepare for life after college. Other aspects of student satisfaction and attitudes are discussed in other directly relevant sections of this review.

Additional data can be found in all attached reports.

### **Assessment Data**

#### **14. Other relevant data. e.g. General education data, special reports.**

### **Assessment Data**

*Attached is the assessment data for your program.*

There are no additional relevant data other than that described above. As noted in the General Education tab, in Spring 2016, 60 students from Psyc 200 were sampled as part of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness' report on the Human Institutions and Behavior GE domain. They reviewed exam performance on 7 items on a multiple choice exam in this course and found that students excelled on specific exam items and that the remaining items were more challenging, though each item was answered correctly by a numerical majority of students. This suggests that Psych 200 contributes substantially to student development of this GE.

## ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE: Integrity

**In meaning of the degree (section four) student learning outcomes and curriculum matrixes were used to define the degree. Now please describe the processes used to ensure the rigor of the program.**

**15. Are the assessment methods comprehensive allowing for a triangulation of data using primarily direct student data supported by indirect student data? Are the assessment methods and tools quantified and robust enough to assess student learning? Is the student sample used for assessment adequate in size and representative of the student population?**

For the current program review, we have utilized direct, indirect, and authentic assessment data from all five previous years of annual assessment as well as new assessment data collected specifically for the purposes of this review. We collected some of this data ourselves and some of the data was provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE). These various forms of assessment resulted in similar conclusions and themes. Below, we assess the adequacy of various rounds of assessment data we have collected over the past 5 years. Overall, our assessment methods fit with the recommendations of the American Psychology Association for program assessment (APA Summit on National Assessment of Psychology in 2016). The psychology learner taxonomy distinguishes three different types of learning and the associated appropriate ways of assessing this learning (APA Summit on National Assessment of Psychology in 2016). According to these guidelines, "Students as Scholars" should be assessed using recognition and recall; "Students as Savvy Consumers" should be assessed by analyzing student assignments that involve application and analysis; and "Students as Producers" should be assessed by quantifying the extent to which students are creating new perspectives or psychological products. These guidelines suggest the use of both formative and summative assessments.

**New Assessment Data for this Review.** For the purposes of this review we collected new indirect data from multiple current and alumni student focus groups. For our alumni focus groups, we used a stratified random sampling approach to select potential participants. Specifically, using lists of all students that graduated in the past 3 academic years, we randomly selected students. Because we want to have the most up-to-date recent data regarding the psychology program, we wanted most of our alumni focus group participants to come from the last graduating class (2018) and the remainder to equally come from the Classes of 2016 and 2017. Thus, we randomly selected 10 alumni from the Class of 2018 (14.5%), 5 alumni from the Class of 2017 (5.5%), and 5 alumni from the Class of 2016 (5.5%). We had a high response rate in terms of students responding to inform us of their available dates and times. The final alumni sample included 7 students from Class of 2018 and 3 students from the Class of 2017 (i.e., 50% of the students we originally invited). This reviewer conducted a virtual focus group that lasted approximately 90 minutes with 4 of these students using the GoogleMeets platform given that these students were no longer living in the state of California. The remaining 6 students met with this assessor and a student co-leader for an in-person focus group that lasted approximately 90 minutes. We had additional student involvement in the coordination, execution, leading, transcribing, and analysis of the focus group data (Ms. Daisy Jauregui, current senior). For our current student focus group, we first attempted a random sample as well, contacting 20 current psychology majors (7%) based on a random number list. Many of those students submitted their availability for a focus group and expressed interest but ultimately only one of them confirmed that they would attend on the date/time selected. So, we had to try a different approach. For our second attempt at the current student focus group, we notified all current students by email of the opportunity to participate in this focus group. Nine students (3%) confirmed that they would

attend the group. Ultimately five students attended the group, including the student focus group leader. So that current students could feel comfortable, that focus group was led by an undergraduate student. It lasted approximately 1 hour and involved a diverse set of students, i.e., 3 females and 2 males, and the students represented most of the major racial/ethnic groups in the major with the exception of the fact that there were no African American focus group participants. The students were mostly seniors, with one sophomore. All focus groups, both current and alumni, were tape recorded and leaders took notes during the actual focus group.

Assessment Data from 2017-2018 (PLO #4). Direct data was 23 written assignments from Family Therapy, a capstone course. Indirect data was a focus group of 2 junior and 2 senior students led by 2 junior and 1 senior trained focus group leaders. Authentic data was the 12 independent research products (professional presentations and manuscripts) of the 2 most recent cohorts of participants in the honors program.

Assessment Data from 2016-2017 (PLO #3). Direct data was obtained from 100 juniors and seniors who had taken a course or courses from the primary subdisciplines of the psychology major (i.e., individual differences, social/group processes, learning/cognitive principles, biological principles). Eighty-two of these students were female. Scores on representative items from cumulative final exams or quizzes/exams from throughout the course were used as assessment items. Authentic data was again the research presentations and publications of our 7 senior honors students.

Assessment Data from 2015-2016 (PLO #2). Direct data was obtained from 36 students enrolled in 2 separate sections of Research Methods. This direct data consisted of these students' written reports of the empirical studies that the students designed and conducted to answer research questions. These written reports were evaluated by 4 independent raters. Authentic data was again the research presentations and publications of our senior honors students. No indirect data was collected.

Assessment Data from 2014-2015 (PLO #1). Direct data was obtained from 42 senior students and a comparison group of 8 freshmen students. Specifically, all of these students responded to 10 multiple choice items focused on interpreting graphs and statistical results from two published research articles. We did not collect indirect data for this PLO as one of our earlier assessments had demonstrated that students' perceptions of their abilities in this area did not at all correlate with their actual skill level,  $r(56) = .07, p = .30$ . Authentic data was again the research presentations and publications of our senior honors students.

Assessment Data from 2014-2015 (PLO #5). Direct data was obtained from relevant exam items from 42 students enrolled in four upper-division psychology courses. Relevant items covered gender diversity, cultural diversity, age diversity, and ethnic diversity. Although we conducted comprehensive indirect assessment of diversity-related learning prior to the previous program review, we did not collect any additional indirect evidence for this PLO during the 2014-2015 academic year. However, we did obtain indirect evidence for this PLO from our focus groups conducted this academic year as part of the program review. We will assess this PLO again next academic year (2019-2020) using student writings from one or more courses in our Social/Group Processes core (direct evidence) and reflective questions on these writings and a focus group (indirect evidence). We have not yet determine a way to obtain authentic evidence for this PLO.

Assessment Data from 2013-2014 (PLO #4). Direct data was obtained from 13 student writings from courses in which students are expected to have mastered this PLO and 64 writings from courses in which students are expected to develop this PLO. We did not collect indirect or authentic data for this PLO this academic year.

It is important to note that, for every data point that involved scoring a written product, we utilized rubrics and calculated inter-rater reliability, which was always above 80% agreement, which is acceptable in psychological research.

**16. Are the graduates achieving the student learning outcomes at the expected level? How was the threshold determined? How do you know your expectations are appropriate? Do you use comparisons based on national standards or benchmarking? How have your assessment findings supported this? Is there assurance that students consistently meet the standards of performance that the major has established? What happens to students that don't meet the standards?**

We have thoroughly reviewed the reports and resources of the American Psychology Association for program assessment (APA Summit on National Assessment of Psychology in 2016). In these materials, they focus more on process and modes of assessment rather than on establishing particular numerical thresholds for assessing student learning outcomes. On direct assessments, our threshold for assessing whether students are achieving learning outcomes was typically 80%, i.e., the average student answering correctly at least 80% of items ("Students as Scholars") or 80% of students scoring at least at the capstone level on rubrics for written or oral products ("Students as Savvy Consumers" and "Students as Producers"). In the past several years, we have found that these thresholds are being met for all PLOs.

PLO #1 [Critique the quality of published psychological literature and empirical research]: Direct evidence demonstrated that psychology seniors performed significantly better than freshman on objective, knowledge based questions focused on understanding psychological literature and authentic evidence demonstrated that senior honors students have truly mastered this PLO given that they have been accepted to competitive presentations and submitted their projects for submission to peer-reviewed journals. Recent focus group data suggests that students feel quite competent in this area.

PLO #2 [Design and conduct an empirical study to answer a research question]: Both authentic and direct evidence demonstrated that more than 80% of students met or exceeded the requirements for this PLO (with the exception of 1 of the 7 elements of the written report for the direct evidence). Specifically, approximately half of the students did not meet requirements for APA Style Tables and Figures. For our direct evidence, we found that at least 80% of students, who completed Psyc 310 (Research Methods for Psychology) during the Fall 2015 semester, met or exceeded the requirements as specified by the APA Publication Manual (6th ed.) for six of the seven components of designing and conducting an empirical study to answer a research question. The six components for which students met or exceeded requirements included Introduction; Method; Results; Discussion; References; and signed consent forms, completed data collection forms, and printouts from SPSS analyses. The one component for which 80% of the students did not meet or exceed the requirements as specified by the APA Publication Manual (6th ed.) was presenting the results in the form of a table and figure. In sum, students' strengths in designing and conducting an empirical study clearly outnumbered their one weakness. Future sections of Psyc 310 could provide students with more practice in creating a table and figure that meet the requirements specified by the APA Publication Manual (6th ed.). For our authentic evidence, we found that all of our advanced honors students have designed and conducted strong independent empirical studies that have been accepted for presentation at regional and national scholarly conferences. Acceptance of a poster or paper indicates that outside experts deem the work of our honors students as meeting the standards of scientific psychology. Recent focus group data suggests that students feel quite competent in this area.

PLO #3 [Describe and explain the major contributions of the core subdisciplines of psychology]: Students scored a mean above 80% on all representative items from the various subdisciplines (means ranged from 82% to 89% correct for courses representing various subdisciplines). Thus, we concluded that psychology students are able to describe and explain the major contributions of the core subdisciplines of psychology. Authentic data from the research conference presentations and publications of seniors honors students also demonstrated mastery of various subdisciplines of psychology as student's research projects always focus on theories and methods from at least one core discipline of psychology, sometimes integrating theoretical frameworks from multiple subdisciplines of psychology. Please see attached evidence if you desire further details. Recent focus group data suggests however, that students themselves do not fully perceive that they have mastered this area.

PLO #4 [Integrate scientific knowledge with faith, sense of vocation, or APA Ethical Principles]. Direct, indirect, and authentic evidence suggest that students are achieving this learning outcome. Comparing the assessment of this PLO from 2017-2018 to that from 2013-2014, either the program has made substantial progress in this area or different ways of assessing this PLO result in different findings. If the former, then it is fair to conclude that students are now achieving this outcome at the expected level and at a higher rate than years ago. Recent focus group data suggests that students feel quite competent in this area.

PLO #5 [Recognize and articulate the importance of diversity as it applies to each subdiscipline]. Direct and indirect evidence suggests that students are achieving this learning outcome. With respect to the direct evidence, students scored on average above 80% on the test items. With respect to indirect evidence, recent focus groups suggest that current students perceive that diversity is emphasized in the program. Alumni recommend that faculty more directly emphasize helping students to "articulate the importance of diversity as it applies to each subdiscipline".

To ensure that graduates of our program are meeting the student learning outcomes appropriately, we have a policy that they have to pass the core courses (which particularly exemplify our program learning outcomes) with at least a C-. Those who do not do so have the repeat the course in order to meet this expectations. A student cannot graduate from the program without having met this policy. Therefore, students who do not meet the program's standards do not complete the program. The psychology faculty make every effort to support students who appear to be at risk for not passing a course.

**17. Please present an integrated analysis of the data collected from the assessment of direct learning and indirect learning ( survey data, focus group, alumni data, and authentic evidence). Please report on the findings from the last comprehensive program review. In summary please explain how the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the students' educational experience.**

Since the last program review, years of direct, indirect, and authentic assessment have resulted in a holistic evaluation of the psychology program. We consistently used or modified AAC&U's VALUE rubrics in our assessments. Further, over the course of the past 5 years, our direct evidence has been obtained from many different psychology courses, not just a few of them. This comprehensive assessment points to the following conclusions:

1.) Psychology students seem to be best mastering PLOs 1, 2, and 4; they seem to feel relatively less prepared for mastering PLO 3 or do not fully understand this PLO although direct data suggests that they are mastering it; and current students seems to feel more mastery over PLO #5 than alumni, suggesting that improvements in this area in that past few years have

substantially impacted student learning in the positive direction. The indirect, direct, and authentic evidence all suggest that students are mastering PLO #4 not only at the undergraduate level but are also approaching expertise in this area (mean score of 3.8 out of 4). Only one assessed student did not reach undergraduate level mastery of this PLO. Courses (especially research methods), research experiences, and fieldwork experiences all seem to be contributing to student development with respect to PLO #4. Overall, students are open to having more integration of faith discussion into the classroom and are seeking additional direct modeling from psychology professors about what it means to be a Christian psychologist. Further, students suggest that faculty capitalize on Capstone courses to create more "meaningful" projects or assignments, some of which would likely integrate science, faith, and vocation.

2.) Although there has been some progress with refining PLO #4 ("Integrate scientific knowledge with faith, sense of vocation, OR APA ethical principles"), it appears that this PLO needs additional revision. Students do not appear to be able to easily identify being exposed to the faith-science integration in their assignments or exams although they report that faculty integrated faith-based discussions into courses. Because many combinations of learning could result in successful mastery of the PLO as currently worded, it is unclear how reliably we can measure this PLO. In other words, a student who masters the ability to integrate scientific knowledge with ethical principles has a different skillset than a student who masters the ability to integrate scientific knowledge with vocation. However, both of these students would be considered as having mastered PLO #4 as currently written.

3.) Psychology majors are relatively satisfied with the breadth of courses offered in the curriculum and our curriculum compares well with our peer and aspirational schools. However, several independent sources of data from focus groups suggest that students would be interested in a course on forensic psychology (or psychology and the law, criminal psychology, or similar course). This could benefit students interested in a career in forensic psychology as well as students interested in law school. In one focus group, 6 out of 6 participants said that they would have seriously considered taking a forensic psychology course if it had been offered. As noted in the curriculum comparison, 75% of our aspirational schools do offer a course that is at the intersection of psychology and crime or psychology and the law. Further, several independent focus groups suggest that students would be interested in more neuroscience course offerings. As found in the course comparison, some of our peer and aspirational schools have several different neuroscience offerings within the same curriculum. Finally, one of our courses (Psyc 341) has a course title (Principles of Learning) and catalog description that is fairly outdated compared to the course title and description for the same course used by other schools. We should change the course title to Learning and Memory and change the description as well as noted in the curriculum comparison section.

4.) Advising continues to be one of the relatively weaker aspects of the program. Although our students successfully complete the major and advance to either jobs or graduate school in research or clinical fields, all assessment artifacts suggest that students desire additional forms of support in exploring and preparing for careers in psychology. In one focus group, a few of the participants did not know who their assigned psychology adviser was. Students in focus groups suggested perhaps integrating advising into the curriculum in the form of a 1 unit course.

5.) Students continue to desire more information and encouragement to participate in research opportunities. They often seem to not be aware of research in which faculty members are engaged or do not know steps to take to become involved in research. Considering that approximately 75% of our peer and aspirational schools have lab or research courses that correspond to various subareas of psychology, integrating research lab courses in social psychology, cognitive psychology, health psychology, neuroscience, and the other major

subareas into our curriculum may allow us to close these informational and experiential gaps for our students.

6.) Students continue to enjoy the service learning opportunities that are integrated into courses but hope to be provided with more on-campus service learning options in the future given logistical limitations they often face. Further, they seem to desire more direct processing of the service learning experiences during class time.

7.) Given our apparent need to offer a greater diversity of courses (based on our course comparisons, student feedback, and advising/career preparation needs), the continued demand for the psychology program, and our student-faculty ratios that differ from those of Seaver college as a whole, the program could benefit from hiring an additional faculty member. We could specifically benefit from a faculty member who could offer forensic psychology and/or neuroscience courses as well as other core courses so that current faculty can take on the development of other courses that we seem to be in need of (i.e., a career preparation/internship course, research/lab courses by psychology content area).

Summary of findings from last program review: Our program has made significant improvements since the last 5 year program review, including addressing 4 of our self-prescribed action goals from that review and 5 of our external review's recommendations.

#### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[PLO3DirectEvidence.docx](#)

[PLO3DirectEvidence\\_Expanded.pdf](#)

[PLO2DirectEvidence.pdf](#)

[PLO4Evidence.pdf](#)

[PLO1Evidence.pdf](#)

[PLO5Evidence.pdf](#)

## **WASC 5 CORE COMPETENCIES**

**18. How does the program ensure that graduates meet the WASC FIVE CORE COMPETENCIES? Present your findings of measurements you have done of the core competencies.**

### **Quantitative Reasoning (2018-2019)**

To ensure student's competency in quantitative reasoning, we place a high value on quantitative reasoning in pedagogy, assignments, and/or rubrics in our courses. Analysis of direct and indirect evidence suggests that our students exhibit a sufficient level of competency in quantitative reasoning but could benefit from additional direct exposure to and practice of quantitative reasoning across all courses, not just in the courses specifically focused on statistics and methods. The direct evidence supporting this conclusion included a quantitative reasoning exam executed during the 2017-2018 academic year and analyzed by OIE. Although separate data is not available for psychology specifically, 59 students from majors within our social sciences division completed the exam. They scored a 10.7 out of 20 on the exam, which is

comparable to the overall mean of 11.1 scored by 163 Seaver students across divisions. The indirect evidence supporting this conclusion included a focus group. Specifically, Steve Rouse conducted a focus group of 8 social science students in 2017 that included 4 psychology students. This focus group resulted in identifying room for improvement in developing quantitative reasoning. Particularly, the students suggested that, beyond the statistics and research methods courses, faculty should occasionally (once every two weeks) highlight the use of quantitative data and reasoning in an article relevant to the course.

### **Critical Thinking (2017-2018)**

To ensure student's competency in critical thinking, we place a high value on critical thinking in our pedagogy, assignments, and/or rubrics in all of our courses. Analysis of direct and indirect evidence suggests that our students exhibit a mastery level of competency in critical thinking and are satisfied with the critical thinking exposure available in the psychology program. Please see attached evidence that this process results in competency in critical thinking. As you will see in the attached document, our direct evidence included 5 journal manuscripts completed by students in the honors research program and scored by both the professor of record and participants on the Seaver College GELI committee using the AAC&U Value Rubric for Critical Thinking. All psychology students scored a 4 out of 4 (capstone level) on all elements of critical thinking, i.e., explanation of issues, evidence, influence of context and assumptions, student's position, and conclusions and related outcomes. These 5 students were also combined with other social science students to create a social science group of 22 students. On average, social science students performed better than students university-wide in each of the five areas of critical thinking. Our indirect evidence included a focus group and surveyed attitudes. Steve Rouse conducted a focus group of 8 social science students in 2017 that included 4 psychology students. This focus group resulted in the realization that the best way to assess critical thinking is to examine statement papers on professionally-relevant topics, i.e., assignments in which professors ask students to use information from the course to support their position on a particular contemporary topic. According to the UCLA/CIRP alumni satisfaction survey collected in Spring 2018, which used data from 194 Psychology alumni, alumni feel that the psychology program developed their ability for critical thinking (mean = 3.61 on 4-point scale).

### **Information Literacy (2016-2017)**

To ensure student's competency in information literacy, we place a high value on information literacy in our pedagogy, assignments, and/or rubrics in our courses. Analysis of direct and indirect evidence suggests that our students are highly competent in information literacy and in fact excel at it. Please see attached evidence. Our direct evidence was a research paper from 16 psychology students in the research methods course along with accompanying research journal entries and reflective essay about their research process. As you will see in the attached document, these artifacts were assessed using the AAC&U Value Rubric for Information Literacy. The following three aspects of information literacy were assessed using the reflective essay: determine the extent of information needed, access the needed information, and critically evaluate information and its sources. The following two aspects of information literacy were assessed using the actual research paper: use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose, access and use information ethically and legally. The 16 psychology students scored better than students from all other participating majors on average across the five dimensions of critical thinking (3.68 out of 4). Specifically, the psychology students averaged scores from 3.4 out of 4 to 3.9 out of 4 on each of the five dimensions of information literacy. Of the five dimensions, psychology students scored best on the fifth dimension (i.e., access and use information ethically and legally), with 15 of the 16 students scoring at the capstone level for this dimension and relatively lower on the third and fourth dimensions, i.e., critically evaluate the

information and use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose. Indirect evidence including a focus group and surveyed attitudes. Steve Rouse conducted a focus group of 8 social science students in 2017 that included 4 psychology students. This focus group resulted in the conclusion that information literacy is the top strength in the social science programs, including psychology. Students reported significant growth and independence in being able to access and read scientific articles. According to the UCLA/CIRP alumni satisfaction survey collected in Spring 2018, which used data from 194 Psychology alumni, alumni feel that the psychology program developed their ability for information literacy (mean = 3.52 on 4-point scale).

### **Oral Communication (2015-2016)**

To ensure student's competency in oral communication, we place a high value on oral communication in our pedagogy, assignments, and/or rubrics in all of our courses. Please see attached evidence that this process results in high competency in oral communication. As you will see in the attached document, our assessment artifacts were both direct and indirect. The direct evidence was derived from video recordings of students delivering research presentations in the Research Methods in Psychology course. These recordings were assessed using the AAC&U Value Rubric for Oral Communication. Our indirect evidence was a focus group discussion with graduating seniors in social science majors about the five core competencies, including oral communication. Steve Rouse conducted a focus group of 8 social science students in 2017 that included 4 psychology students. According to the GELI and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness reports, our student's mastery of oral communication from the direct evidence was on par with other Seaver departments (i.e., psychology students scored mostly milestones (3 out of 4) or capstones (4 out of 4). The students performed consistently more highly on the "overall message" dimension of the rubric relative to the delivery, language, organization, and supporting material dimensions. It appears that delivery is the dimension in which students could use the most additional practice, i.e., one section scored 2.75 out of 4 in this area and the other section scored 3.25 out of 4. Based on indirect evidence (the focus group), our assessment coordinator that year also concluded that all faculty that include an oral presentation requirement in their course should directly engage students in learning how to present specifically in the psychology discipline, for example, in a separate mini-lesson. However, given that, based on direct evidence, the delivery aspect of oral communication is the area that needs the most improvement in our majors, it does not appear that psychology-specific lessons would necessarily improve delivery. The American Psychological Association's task force on assessment defines communication as it applies to the undergraduate psychology major as "dissemination of information such that understanding is exchanged and achieved between participants" (APA SNAP Executive Summary, 2016, <https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/undergrad/summary-communication.pdf>). Further, they state that some psychology-specific aspects of communication that need to be addressed are "accurate understanding and usage of psychological concepts" and "effective use of images, figures, and tables" (APA SNAP Executive Summary, 2016, <https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/undergrad/summary-communication.pdf>). Further, they state that, ideally, communication should be assessed both formally and summatively, i.e., that faculty should provide formative feedback to students on their communication efforts and allow them to attempt to improve before receiving summative assessment. Our research methods course, which officially fulfills the communication requirement for the major, is generally structured in this way for written communication but perhaps less so for oral communication. According to the UCLA/CIRP alumni satisfaction survey collected in Spring 2018, which used data from 194 Psychology alumni, alumni feel that the psychology program developed their ability for oral communication writing (mean = 3.58 on 4-point scale).

### **Written Communication (2014-2015)**

To ensure student's competency in written communication, we place a high value on written communication in our pedagogy, assignments, and/or rubrics in all of our courses. Please see attached evidence that this process results in high competency in written communication. As you will see in the attached document, our direct assessment artifacts included 61 graduating seniors' writing for a course on personality, research methods, or child clinical psychology. Using the AAC&U Value Rubric for Written Communication or a modification of it, our assessment of graduating seniors' writings demonstrated that our graduating seniors demonstrated writing competency, i.e., they scored mean scores of 3.44 to 3.86 out of 4 on the five dimensions. The dimensions of written communication are Framework for Writing, Content Development, Genre and Disciplinary Conventions, Syntax and Mechanics and Sources of Evidence. The psychology students scored highest on sources and evidence and relatively lower on control of syntax. Regardless, on all dimensions, between 95% and 99% of students scored either a 3 (milestone) or 4 (capstone). As indirect evidence, Steve Rouse conducted a focus group of 8 social science students in 2017 that included 4 psychology students. This focus group resulted in identifying room for improvement in developing written communication skills. Particularly, the students suggested that professors give lessons prior to deadlines for written assignments regarding discipline-specific writing. The American Psychological Association's task force on assessment defines communication as it applies to the undergraduate psychology major as "dissemination of information such that understanding is exchanged and achieved between participants" (APA SNAP Executive Summary, 2016, <https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/undergrad/summary-communication.pdf>). Further, they state that some psychology-specific aspects of communication that need to be addressed are "accurate understanding and usage of psychological concepts" and "effective use of images, figures, and tables" (APA SNAP Executive Summary, 2016, <https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/undergrad/summary-communication.pdf>). Further, they state that, ideally, communication should be assessed both formally and summatively, i.e., that faculty should provide formative feedback to students on their communication efforts and allow them to attempt to improve before receiving summative assessment. Our research methods course, which officially fulfills the communication requirement for the major, is generally structured in this way for written communication but perhaps less so for oral communication. According to the UCLA/CIRP alumni satisfaction survey collected in Spring 2018, which used data from 194 Psychology alumni, alumni feel that the psychology program developed their ability for effective writing (mean = 3.46 on 4-point scale).

#### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[CC\\_WrittenCommunication.pdf](#)

[CC\\_OralCommunication.pdf](#)

[CC\\_Critical\\_Thinking\\_Report\\_2017\\_2018\\_Final.docx.pdf](#)

[CC\\_Information\\_Literacy\\_Report.pdf](#)

## General Education

### **Please report on how your program supports the GE curriculum (include data reports on assessment.)**

Our introduction to psychology course (Psyc 200) contributes substantially to the GE curriculum, particularly the Human Institutions and Behavior emphasis of the GE curriculum. We offer this course every semester. This semester 158 students are enrolled in this course and last semester 166 students were enrolled. The learning outcomes for the Human Institutions and Behavior GE is as follows: In the Human Institutions and Behavior requirement, students will: Understand how theories of human behavior are tested scientifically.

In Spring 2016, 60 students from Psyc 200 were sampled as part of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness' report on this GE domain. They reviewed exam performance on 7 items on a multiple choice exam in this course and found that students excelled on specific exam items and that the remaining items were more challenging, though each item was answered correctly by a numerical majority of students.

Our introduction to statistics course (Psyc 250) also contributes to the GE curriculum, particularly the Mathematics requirement of the GE curriculum. We offer multiple sections of this course every semester.

## SUSTAINABILITY: RESOURCES

### **Sustainability**

**19. With the rapid changes in the higher education environment, the University needs to demonstrate how financial viability and planning of their long-term stability are ensured.**

**In order to demonstrate this each program should address**

- a. questions about the level of student demand for the program and**
- b. the degree to which resources are allocated appropriately so they are sufficient to maintain program quality.**
- c. What is happening within the profession, local community, or society that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future? (If appropriate include market research.)**

Since the last program review, we have adapted and allocated resources in a manner that maintained program quality in the face of continued high demand for the psychology major. In short, we hired one new full-time faculty member and consistently updated classroom, office, and laboratory space. However, with expected continued demand for the major, we are in need of more resources if we are to address all areas for improvement identified in the program review.

a. Student demand for the program. As noted in previous sections of this report and as can be seen from the attached figures document in this section, the number of psychology majors and graduates has been consistently higher relative to the last program review, suggesting that the psychology program needs increased resources, faculty, and staff. Although the trends indicate a decrease in the past couple of years, the overall level of demand remains substantially higher than that prior to the previous program review. Although the 2017-2018 academic year saw a substantial drop relative to the preceding few years, the number of students in the major that year was still higher than numbers preceding the previous 5 year review.

b. Resource allocation. When we hired a new faculty member starting in the 2015-2016 academic year, it improved allocation of faculty resources and student-faculty ratios. After the increase in strain placed by the number of majors in 2011-2012, we have been consistently moving in the right direction towards more adaptive student-faculty ratios. However, we are still not yet back to pre-2011/2012 levels. Given that our student-faculty ratios continue to be less adaptive than student-faculty ratios in other Seaver departments despite the fact that we hired a new faculty member approximately 4 years ago, faculty allocation is relatively strained compared to other Seaver departments. The ratios of Degrees Awarded to Full-Time Faculty (see Figure in attached document), Majors to Full Time Faculty (see figure in attached document) and Student Credit Hours to Full Time Faculty (see figure in attached document) show that the Psychology faculty members are serving a substantially higher number of students than their counterparts Seaver-wide. Over the years since the last program review, we graduated approximately 9 students per faculty member each year on average whereas, over the years preceding the last program review, we graduated approximately 6 students per faculty member, exhibiting an overall 50% increase from program review to program review in this particular measure of program demand. Over the years since the last program review, we served 35 majors per full time faculty member each year on average whereas, over the years preceding the last program review, we served 25 majors per faculty member, exhibiting an overall 40% increase from program review to program review in this particular measure of program demand. Over the years since the last program review, we logged 642 students credit hours per full time faculty member each year on average whereas, over the years preceding the last program review, we logged 568 student credit hours per faculty member, exhibiting an overall 13% increase from program review to program review in this particular measure of program demand. Further, average class sizes at Seaver are 19 students whereas average class sizes for psychology have been approximately 30, 27, 28, 25, 30, and 28 for the past six semesters. Please see attached class size pdf for more detailed documentation of class sizes.

c. Anticipated program needs. The job outlook for psychologists was expected to grow 14% from 2016 to 2026, faster than the national average (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). This suggests that students will feel compelled to major in psychology as they can feel confident that they will ultimately obtain psychology jobs, especially if they pursue graduate education afterwards. In 2015, psychology bachelor's degrees were the 4th most prevalent type of bachelor degree awarded, after business, health professions, and social sciences/history (APA, <https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/about/enrollment>). A similar pattern is present at Pepperdine where psychology is the second most popular major, after business. The number of psychology bachelor's degrees conferred in the United States has gradually but consistently increased over the past 25 years (NCES, 2016, as cited by APA <https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/about/trends.pdf>). There are no indications that these patterns will reverse, especially given data from the high school pipeline. In 2016, psychology ranked 6 out of 37 in terms of most popular AP exams taken by highschoolers, and in 2015, approximately one-third of SAT test takers had taken a psychology course during high school (College Board Research & Development, 2015 and U.S. Board of Education, as cited by APA, <https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/about/enrollment>). Further, psychology bachelor's holders continue to be employable in a diverse range of occupations, so students of varied interests may continue to be attracted to the psychology major (APA, <https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/about/enrollment>). Finally, with respect to our introductory psychology GE course in particular, the APA Board of Educational Affairs suggests that the demand for this psychology GE course will increase dramatically given that the addition of behavioral and social science to the MCAT will lead to more pre-health students interested in taking this course (<https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/undergrad/mcat-changes.pdf>). They suggest that there might be a significantly smaller increase in pre-health students wanting to take psychology research methods and psychology statistics for the same reason, i.e., the MCAT now includes items focused on statistics and research. They suggest that psychology departments

may need to add additional sections of at least Introductory Psychology in response to this increase demand after collecting data on the number of pre-health students and typical number of students taking the MCAT each year.

## **20. FACILITIES**

**Please describe the adequacy of**

**a. Classroom space**

**b. Laboratories**

**c. Office space**

**d. Programming venues**

**e. Student study spaces**

We currently have adequate classroom space and office space. Further, the laboratory space and student computing spaces have undergone substantial upgrades in the past 5 years.

**a. Classroom space.** The Social Science Division has priority use of six classrooms, ranging in seating from 24 to 54, and access to the large lecture hall, Elkins Auditorium, for general education classes. One of the classrooms was specifically designed for use by the Psychology program, and has storage space available for psychological tests and equipment used in class demonstrations. All of our classrooms have been upgraded with new computers and AV systems since the last program review. Two of the classrooms have been upgraded with digital touch-panels to control the projection. Our tech liaison plans to upgrade the remaining classrooms at a rate of 1-2 per year. The Psychology program has a dedicated computer lab with 15 workstations, available for statistical analyses by students working in the Honors Program or working on an Independent Research Project. These workstations have SPSS and the Microsoft Office packages available for statistical analyses and for preparing papers and posters for presentations. Further, psychology professors that teach research methods and statistics utilize this computer lab so that students have easy access to SPSS and other computing tools. This space has approximately 15 computers as well as table space in the center of the room. The technology in this room was updated in 2014 and in 2018. The first upgrade changed the types of student work stations to individual computers. This really helped students be able to work more efficiently. In the old system, all student stations connected to one of two servers, which hosted all of the programs and did all of the computing. With 7- 8 students simultaneously working on workstations connected to each of those servers, the servers would get used to capacity. This resulted in excessive time needed to process large data sets in SPSS. The computers were upgraded again Summer 2018, adding additional storage as well as processing power. We also added the capability to use STATA and R in addition to SPSS and upgraded the audiovisual (AV) system with a new TV monitor, touch-control panel, speakers, and DVD/Blu-Ray player. In addition to these extensive technology upgrades, a color printer was added to this room around the time of the last program review and a whiteboard was added approximately 2 years ago to allow faculty to work spontaneously on formula, calculations, or demonstrations.

**b. Laboratories.** The psychology faculty share one small laboratory space, which has been adequate only because many faculty chose to conduct their data collection in the community or online. This lab has a one-way mirror, which allows a researcher to observe or video the behaviors or interactions of one, two, or three individuals. Since the last program review, a large TV monitor has been added to this room and our IT liaison will add touch-panel controllers for it this summer. Further, this summer, our IT liaison will be adding a DVD/Blu-Ray player and new computer to the room as well. In addition, Mike Folkerts also has a research lab for his neuroscience research, large enough to allow up to three researchers or research assistants to

work simultaneously. We would need additional laboratory space if one or more of current faculty members start new data collections that require utilization of this space or we add a new faculty member that engages in on-campus data collection.

**c. Office space.** We currently have sufficient office space for all tenured, tenure-track, and full-time visiting faculty. Each full-time faculty member has his or her own office, and additional office space is available to be shared among adjunct faculty. No concerns have been voiced to suggest that this physical space is insufficient for the needs of the program. However, if/when we add an additional tenure-track faculty member, we will need additional office space.

**d. Programming venues.** n/a

**e. Student study spaces.** There is no psychology-specific study space. The Appleby Center, in which the psychology program operates, has an area with furnishings (chairs and tables) that students often use to study or meet up to discuss class projects. Our division is located close to the Payson library, which has abundant student study space.

## **FACULTY AND STAFF**

**21. What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty/staff in the program in relation to the program purpose and goals? How do faculty/staff members' backgrounds, expertise, research, and other professional work contribute to the quality of the program?**

**Evidence in this category should include (this could be collected through faculty CVs) :**

- a. Proportion of faculty with terminal degrees**
- b. List of faculty/staff specialties within discipline (and how those specialties align with the program curriculum)**
- c. Record of scholarship for each faculty member, professional presentations for staff members**
- d. Faculty/staff participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment**
- e. External funding awarded to faculty/staff**

Attached is a list of the nine tenured or tenure track psychology faculty.

a. Terminal degree status. The Psychology faculty is primarily comprised of the nine professors listed in the attached file, all of whom hold a terminal degree. One faculty member, Tomás Martínez, holds an appointment that is split between Seaver College (two-thirds) and GSEP (one-third), and the remaining eight hold full appointments within Seaver College. Additionally, the program is served by two faculty members who hold their primary appointment in a different program (i.e., the Social Action and Justice program for Jeff Banks, who teaches *Interpersonal Behavior* twice each academic year, and the Social Work program for Emily Scott-Lowe, who teaches *Lifespan Developmental Psychology* twice each academic year).

b. Faculty specialties. The psychology faculty members hold degrees from specialization areas that are broadly dispersed across the domains of psychology, providing for full coverage of the primary topic areas in the psychology curriculum. Since the last program review, one of our faculty (Elizabeth Krumrei-Mancuso) became licensed in California as a professional psychologist. All nine faculty members hold membership in appropriate professional organizations including broad organizations and organizations specific to their specialties, and together, they participate in 26 different professional societies and organizations, including the American Psychological Association, the Association for Psychological Science, the Western Psychological Association, the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, the Society for the Psychological

Study of Social Issues, the National Neurotrauma Society, the Academy for Eating Disorders, the American Psychosomatic Society, the Society for the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality (APA Division 36), Christian Association for Psychological Studies, Western Positive Psychology Association, National Association of Professional Women, the National Latina/Latino Psychological Association, the California Latino Psychologist Association, the International Society for the Prevention of Child Abuse/Neglect, American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children, California Professional Society on the Abuse of Children, the Association for Research in Personality, the Society for Personality Assessment, Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, the Society for the Improvement of Psychological Science, the Society for the Teaching of Psychology, Cognitive Science Society, International Society for Anthrozoology, and the Council for Undergraduate Research.

Further, since our last program review, Dr. Rouse was granted Fellow status at the Society for Personality Assessment and Dr. Cindy Miller-Perrin was granted Fellow status at the American Psychological Association (2013). Together, the psychology faculty serve (or have served at some point since the 2012 review) on the editorial boards of several professional journals, including *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research* (Steve Rouse), *Journal of Personality Assessment* (Steve Rouse), *International Journal of Child Maltreatment* (Cindy Miller-Perrin), *Advances in Child and Family Policy and Practice* (Cindy Miller-Perrin), *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma* (Cindy Miller-Perrin), *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* (Cindy Miller-Perrin), *Journal of Child and Adolescent Trauma* (Cindy Miller-Perrin), *Journal of Integrated Social Science* (Cindy Miller-Perrin), *Journal of Drug Issues* (Khanh Bui), and *College Student Journal* (Khanh Bui). Additionally, they have held leadership positions in professional organizations including the APA Committee on Division/APA Relations (vice chair, Cindy Miller-Perrin), APA Society for Child and Family Policy and Practice (President, Cindy Miller-Perrin), the APA Interdivisional Task Force on Physical Punishment of Children (co-chair, Cindy Miller-Perrin), Academy of Eating Disorders (subgroup co-chair, Jennifer Harriger), APA Division 37 (Member-at-Large, Cindy Miller-Perrin) and its Section on Child Maltreatment (President, Cindy Miller-Perrin), and Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health Services Cross-Cultural Competency Committee (Community Advisory Member, Tomás Martinez; until 2017).

The members of the faculty also held several endowed appointments since the 2012 review. Nataria Joseph (2017/2018), Elizabeth Krumrei (2012/2013), Jennifer Harriger (2013/2014), and Janet Trammell (2016/2017; 2013/2014) were named Seaver Fellows in Social Science, Elizabeth Krumrei was selected for a Named Professorship (2016-2021), and Cindy Miller-Perrin continued as the Frank R. Seaver Chair of Social Sciences (2004 – 2014).

c. Faculty scholarship. The lists of publications (see attached document) and presentations (see attached document) since the 2012-2013 program review attests to the high productivity of the program faculty. Together, the psychology faculty accumulated 60 publications and 118 research presentations since last program review. Notably, a substantial level of success has been achieved in co-authoring articles and conference presentations with undergraduate students.

d. Faculty professional development. Since last program review, several faculty participated in teaching conferences, i.e., the Teaching Professor Conference (Nataria Joseph, Elizabeth Krumrei-Mancuso), the Lewis M. Terman Western Regional Teaching Conference (Khanh Bui), the Educause Learning Initiative (ELI; Janet Trammell, Nataria Joseph), the ICPS Teaching Institute (Janet Trammell), and the APS-STP Teaching Institute (Janet Trammell). Further, faculty often attend seminar and workshops held by Pepperdine's Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) as well as present at those workshops. For example, Drs. Joseph and Bui attended the Flipped Learning Certification Course, Dr. Rouse attended workshops on gamification pedagogy and online teaching, and Drs. Joseph and Trammell have presented at CTE workshops on flipped learning and learning and memory, respectively. Several faculty attended technology workshops

led by the Technology & Learning team at Pepperdine. Further, Pepperdine's Center for Faith & Learning regularly offers seminars and workshops relevant to teaching and learning. Several faculty attended these since the last program review. For example, Drs. Joseph, Trammell, and Bui all attended the Vocation and Higher Education seminar. Finally, Janet Trammell currently chairs the Teaching, Learning, and Technology committee at Seaver college. Dr. Rouse and Trammell participated in the SEED (Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity) program at Seaver college, and directly translated what they learned to their classrooms. Dr. Bui attended a seminar on teaching first-year seminars and as part of her role in assessment at that time, Dr. Bui attended several workshops on assessment led by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness as well as a workshop on critical thinking. Finally, Dr. Rouse completed five online courses on R (an open access statistical program) within the past 2 years and Dr. Bui attended three statistics workshops since the last program review.

e. Faculty external funding. The Psychology faculty members received several external grants since the 2012 review, including grants from the National Institutes of Health (\$419,662; Nataria Joseph; \$184,575; Michael Folkerts), the Templeton Foundation (\$165,000 and \$148,576; Elizabeth Krumrei; \$127,500; Elizabeth Krumrei and Steve Rouse), the Glazer Institute (\$8000; Elizabeth Krumrei), and the APA Committee on Division/APA Relations (CODAPAR) Grant (\$2000; Cindy Miller-Perrin). They also received internal grants, including grants from the Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative (Nataria Joseph, Elizabeth Krumrei, Janet Trammell, Cindy Miller-Perrin, Khanh Bui, and Jennifer Harriger), the Dean's Research Grant (Elizabeth Krumrei, Nataria Joseph), the Cross-Disciplinary/Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Research (CDIUR) Grant (Nataria Joseph, Elizabeth Krumrei), the Seaver Research Council Grant (Janet Trammell, Nataria Joseph, Elizabeth Krumrei, Cindy Miller-Perrin, Jennifer Harriger), the Linley Community-Based Research Fellowship (Elizabeth Krumrei), the Keck Mini-Grant (Tomas Martinez), and the Summer Undergraduate Research Program (Khanh Bui). Two of our faculty (Nataria Joseph, Janet Trammell) also received grants for collaborating with the Student Success Center to improve academic success of our students.

f. Administrative and support staff. The Psychology program is part of the Social Sciences Division, which also includes the Economics, Political Science, Sociology, Industrial/Organizational Psychology, and Social Work programs. As a result, it receives division staff support: an Office Manager (Bob Escudero), an Administrative Assistant (William Webb IV), a Technology Liaison (Chris Low, whose responsibilities are shared with the Religion Division), and seven student employees. No concerns have been voiced to suggest that this staff is insufficient for the needs of the program

## **22. FACULTY/STAFF**

**Are there sufficient numbers of faculty/staff to maintain program quality? Do program faculty/staff have the support they need to do their work?**

- a. Distribution of faculty across ranks (or staff years at institution)**
- b. Diversity of faculty/staff**
- c. Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty)**
- d. Student-faculty ratio**
- e. Faculty workload**
- f. Faculty review and evaluation processes**
- g. Mentoring processes**
- h. Professional development opportunities and resources (including travel and research funds)**
- i. Sufficient time for research, program development**

Attached is a list of the nine tenured or tenure track psychology faculty. Although the current quantity and quality of the faculty/staff and their resources has proved adequate to support the program, additional resources would be necessary to continue to maintain, improve, and grow the psychology program.

a. Diversity of faculty ranks. Our faculty range from assistant professor to full and endowed professor, with the faculty currently containing 1 assistant professor, 4 associate professors, 3 full professors, and 1 distinguished full professor.

b. Diversity of faculty/staff. Since the last program review, we have hired a female, African-American tenure-track professor. We now have representation from all the numerically largest racial and ethnic groups in the United States. We currently have a 2:1 female to male faculty ratio. In addition to our diversity, the psychology faculty regularly engage in discussions and workshops on diversity, e.g., participation in the SEED program, sitting on the Seaver University Diversity Council, and attending lectures on various religions. According to the UCLA/CIRP alumni satisfaction survey collected in Spring 2018, which used data from 194 Psychology alumni, alumni felt that there was room for improvement with respect to ethnic diversity among the faculty (mean satisfaction = 3.10 on a 5 pt scale) and gender diversity among the faculty (mean satisfaction = 3.9 on a 5 pt scale).

c. Number of full-time faculty / full-time faculty to part-time faculty ratio. We have nine full time, tenured/tenure-track faculty and one full-time visiting professor.

d. Student-faculty ratio. Our current psychology student-faculty ratio is 32 students for every 1 faculty member whereas the overall Seaver student-faculty ratio is 13:1. Psychology is the second most popular major at Seaver.

e. Faculty workload. On average, psychology faculty members are advising 32 students. Tenured faculty have a 3/3 teaching load, i.e., 3 courses per semester. Pre-tenure faculty have a 3/2 teaching load.

f. Faculty review and evaluation process. The faculty evaluation policy is described in detail in the Seaver College Rank, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Handbook. In short, the formal evaluation system includes a third-year pre-tenure review and a tenure review. In each of these cases, five designated peers evaluate the candidate on the basis of a review of a submitted portfolio and observation of the candidate's classes; the Chair of the Social Sciences Division makes an independent review, based on the materials available to the designated peers and the course evaluations' written by the candidate's students. The RTP Committee (which is comprised of one member from each of the eight divisions of Seaver College and one pre-tenured at-large member) examines the submitted materials, the five peer reviews, and the chair review, before making a recommendation to the Seaver College Dean, who independently examines the same materials. Although the pre-tenure reviews are not directed beyond the college to the university level, the tenure recommendation of the RTP committee and the recommendation of the Dean are ultimately directed to the University Tenure Committee, the Provost, the President, and eventually the Board of Regents. Faculty members receive a similar review when applying for promotion to Full Professor, and a similar review every five years thereafter. Finally, faculty members are evaluated on a periodic basis by the Chair of the Social Sciences Division, who is responsible for recommending step increases to the Dean, whereby a person progresses through nine different ranked steps (i.e., Levels I, II, and III for Assistant professor, Associate Professor, and Professor). Faculty are also evaluated on an annual basis by the Chair of the Social Sciences Division.

- g. Mentoring processes. All first year faculty at Pepperdine (including psychology faculty) are mentored by administrators and senior faculty through the full-year First Year Faculty Orientation Program and attend the week-long New Faculty Retreat the summer after their first year.
- h. Professional development opportunities and resources. Annually, each individual faculty member has between \$2500 and \$3000 available for travel to conferences. Further, there are various teaching grants available to our faculty as well as additional opportunities from the dean's office or other programs for attending teaching conferences.
- i. Sufficient time for research, program development. Pre-tenure faculty automatically receive a course reduction each year in order to facilitate research and professional development. In addition, pre-tenure faculty in their first year are exempt from serving on university committees and advising students. Tenured faculty may request a course reduction by submitting a proposal to the Seaver Dean's Office. Tenured faculty may submit sabbatical requests every seven years. Of course, faculty at all universities could always benefit from some additional time for research and focused, systematic thinking about program development.

### **Evidence**

*Please attach evidence.*

[Publications by Psychology Faculty Members since Fall 2012.docx](#)  
[Presentations by Psychology Faculty Members since Fall 2012.docx](#)  
[Faculty in the Psychology Program.pdf](#)  
[Figures FacultyStudentRatios.pdf](#)  
[ClassSizes.pdf](#)

## **FINANCIAL RESOURCES**

### **23. Financial Resources:**

**Please describe your operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends over a 3-5 year period.**

The budget for the psychology department is controlled at the divisional level. Therefore, there is no specific psychology operational budget for us to detail here.

The salary structure for faculty in the Psychology program follows the general guidelines that are fully described in the Seaver College Faculty Handbook. In short, Seaver uses a fixed salary structure; although stipends may be awarded for specific duties, the base salary of all faculty at the same rank (e.g., Assistant Professor II or Associate Professor III) is standardized.

The Social Science Division funds each faculty member's professional travel to two conferences per year, one national and one local. In addition, it sponsors professional travel for any student who is presenting research at a professional conference by paying up to \$300 in costs related to the trip. However, this only covers a small portion of the expense of participating in a professional research conference.

Internal support for research is available through several programs. First, the Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative provides \$500 of funding for the expenses of a student's independent research project. Second, the Summer Undergraduate Research Program provides a \$1,000 stipend for faculty members supervising a student's summer independent research project, and provides the student with a scholarship to cover the cost of 4 units of credit. Third,

the Dean's Research Grant provides awards up to \$1,500 for faculty research projects. Fourth, the Seaver Research Council awards grants ranging from \$1,000 to \$4,500 for research purposes, especially those for which the awarded funds could be used as a foundation for applications for external grants. Fifth, endowed Chairs, Professorships, and Fellowships provide funding for research purposes. The endowed Chair positions are available to faculty members who have reached a rank of Professor. These positions have \$6,000 annual stipends for research/professional support, and a person who holds this chair is eligible to retain the position until retirement (assuming continued positive Five Year evaluations). One endowed Chair is specified for the Social Sciences Division, and Cindy Miller-Perrin currently holds that chair. Additionally, two At-Large chairs are available to faculty members from any of the eight divisions of Seaver College. The endowed Professorships are available to faculty members who have reached a rank of Associate Professor or Professor. These positions have \$4,000 annual stipends for research/professional support, and the position is held for five years. One endowed Professorship is specified for the Social Sciences division, and Steve Rouse held that Professorship from 2005 through 2010. Additionally, five At-Large professorships are available to faculty members from any of the eight divisions. Finally, fellowships are available those faculty members at the Assistant Professor rank. These annual Fellowships have \$1,000 stipends for research/professional support. Five At-Large fellowships are available, and have been previously held by Jennifer Harriger, Janet Trammell and Nataria Joseph since the last program review. Additionally, some options exist for internal funding for specific purposes, such as the Cross-Disciplinary/Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Research program for faculty working with undergraduate students whose research interests transcend individual disciplines, and the Harris Manchester College Summer Research Institute for faculty members seeking to pursue research interests at Oxford University. For expenses beyond these funding options, faculty members are expected to apply for external grant support.

## EXTERNAL REVIEW

### External Review Report

**In summary please explain how, through the findings in the annual assessments, the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the educational experience that is supported through benchmarking. (Has the program been reviewed by external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, or compared with other similar institutions, or national standards?)**

#### I. GUIDELINES FOR ORGANIZING THE EXTERNAL REVIEW

**The external review typically occurs after a program or department completes its self-study report, but the selection and invitation of external reviewers can occur during the self-study process to ensure the availability of the best reviewers. However, programs with concurrent accreditation (e.g., AACSB, APA, ABA) can use the visiting team for that discipline-specific accreditation as the external review. The report from the site visitors should be included in the final report. For an illustration of potential areas for the reviewers to consider, see Attachment below.**

#### II. CHOOSING REVIEWERS

**The size and composition of the review team can vary, depending on the size of the program under review. Usually, the team involves one or two people. At the time a department or program is notified that it will be conducting a program review, appropriate individuals should submit a list of names of possible reviewers. These reviewers should**

be external to the school/University. External reviewers should be distinguished scholars/teachers/practitioners in the field and be familiar with campuses that are similar to Pepperdine University and the program undergoing review. It is also helpful for external reviewers to have had experience with program administration and with program assessment. At least one of the reviewers should be experienced with student learning outcomes assessment in order to review and analyze the program's assessment processes and results. The Dean of each School will have the final approval of the external reviewer.

### **III. MATERIALS FOR THE EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM**

At least 30 days prior to the scheduled department visit, the information from the program self-study and appropriate additional materials are sent to each member of the external review team. An identical information package should be provided to appropriate members of the administrators overseeing the program. The reviewers should compile a report that includes observations, strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations based on evidence. The attached External Review Report expectations outlines the guidelines for the external reviewers' site visit and report. Reviewers and Divisional Deans should also sign a consultant agreement. External Reviewers should also be given a schedule for their visit and a confirmation letter, and programs will submit a budget proposal for the site visit to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

### **IV. CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION**

- Curriculum
- Faculty
- Resources
- Viability

### **V. EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM VISIT AND REPORT**

The review team visit typically lasts for two days, during which time the review committee members meet with department faculty, academic advisors, students, and select administrators. The review team typically takes part in an exit interview just prior to concluding its departmental visit.

The team is expected to submit its written evaluation to the campus program review committee no later than 4 weeks after the visit. The written evaluation should include a review of strengths and challenges, resource allocation, and program viability as well as suggestions for policy and resources. Upon submission of the report, off-campus reviewers receive a previously agreed upon stipend and travel expense reimbursement (to be determined by the department under review).

As soon as the program receives the report from the external review team, it is distributed to the appropriate individuals. The department is typically asked to review the report (within a brief time period) for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions. To maximize the effectiveness of program review, the findings and resulting decisions should be shared with all of the stakeholder groups. Such sharing of findings generates buy-in to the program's and/or institution's goals. To facilitate and track the implementation of improvement plans, each year the relevant faculty members should review the progress of programs reviewed in previous years. If the department/program was not successful in implementing all aspects of the plan, they may follow up with their appropriate administrative unit regarding resource allocation or other barriers involved in preventing successful implementation.

### External Reviewer Report Expectations

Please find the link below for the "External Review Summary Sheet".  
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Z835R7F>

### External Reviewer Report Expectations

*Please attach the completed form.*

[Pepperdine Psychology external review report Abe March 2019 1 .pdf](#)

## QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

For the Quality Improvement Plan, the program should extract from the "preliminary quality improvement goals and action plan" of the self-study (section A.III) as well as from both the external and internal review recommendations.

The following prompts may be helpful in considering your QIP:

1. Are the curriculum, practices, processes, and resources properly aligned with the goals of the program?
2. Are department/program outcomes aligned with the institutional learning outcomes (ILOs)?
3. Is the level of program quality aligned with the school/University's acceptable level of program quality?
4. Is the level of program quality aligned with the constituents' acceptable level of quality?
5. Are program goals being achieved?
6. Are student learning outcomes being achieved at the established standard of achievement? What are you using for comparison/benchmarking?
7. How have the results of program review been used to inform decision-making and improve instruction and student learning outcomes?
8. What was identified in the process of examining the institution's program review process that may require deeper reflection, changes, and/or restructuring? What will be done as a result? What resources will be required?
9. What have the reviewers learned as they carried out assessments of student learning? How have assessment protocols, faculty development, choices of instruments, or other aspects of assessment changed as a result?

Many of the changes that occur following program review are related to curricular adjustments that are, in essence, resource neutral. Program faculty or staff should make note of the ways that they used data to make decisions. Changes that are outside the control of the program or need additional support should be noted and reviewed by the dean in the final section, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

### QIP Form

Please find the link below for the "QIP Form".  
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6ufJTogPx32M3JiNTM3bV9KNVk/view?usp=sharing>

Please attach the QIP form

[QIP\\_Form.docx](#)