Seventh Cycle of Academic Program Review
Self-Study Report
Department of Psychology
September 2019
Submitted for External Review
September 25, 2019
Psychology Department Self-Study
Table of Contents

SECTION 1.0: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ................................................................................. 3
SECTION 2.0: OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM ................................................................. 5
SECTION 3.1: PROGRAM PLANNING .................................................................................. 12
SECTION 3.2: STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT ............................................. 17
  Table 1. T/TT Faculty-Major Ratio 2002-2018 ................................................................. 19
  Table 2. Student Credit Units 2016-2018 ..................................................................... 19
  Table 3. FTES by Semester 2002-2018 ....................................................................... 20
  Table 4. Enrollment by Semester 2002-2018 ............................................................... 20
  Table 5. Psychology Faculty Count 2002-2018 ............................................................ 21
  Table 6. Undergraduate Student-Faculty Ratio 2014-2018 ........................................... 21
  Table 7A. Sources of New Psychology Majors 2014-2018 (Transfers) ....................... 22
  Table 7B. Sources of New Psychology Majors 2014-2018 (Pre-Psychology) ............ 23
  Table 8. Open Seats in Psychology Core Courses 2014-18 .......................................... 24
  Table 9. Open Seats in Hiring Request Courses Fall 2016-Fall 2018 ............................. 26
  Table 10A. New Student Profile for First Time Freshmen ............................................. 27
  Table 10B. New Student Profile Transfers ................................................................... 27
  Table 10C. First Time Freshman Graduation Rate ....................................................... 28
  Table 10D. Transfer Student Graduation Rate ............................................................... 28
  Table 11A. Average Time to Degree by Degree Level (University Level) .................... 29
  Table 11B. Average Time to Degree by Degree Level (College Level) ......................... 29
  Table 11C. Average Time to Degree by Degree Level (Program Level- Psychology) ... 30
  Table 12A. Graduation Summary by College (Last Major Tracking Approach) .......... 30
  Table 12B. Retention Summary by College (Last Major Tracking Approach) .............. 31

SECTION 3.3.1: THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM .................................................. 35
  Table 13. Student Graduation Rates 2007-14 ................................................................ 35
  Table 14. GE Courses in the Psychology Program ....................................................... 36
  Table 15. Required Courses ........................................................................................... 40
  Table 16. Bottleneck Courses ........................................................................................ 41
  Table 17. Articulated Courses/ TMCS .......................................................................... 41
  Table 18. Instruction in Technology and Software ........................................................ 43

SECTION 3.3.2: THE CURRICULUM - GRADUATE PROGRAMS ..................................... 59
  Psychology Masters Programs: Overview ....................................................................... 59
  Table 19. Master of Arts Concentration Courses ........................................................ 60
  Table 20. Master of Science Concentration Courses .................................................... 61
  Table 21. Proposed Master of Science Program in Industrial/Organizational Psychology (Currently a Master of Science Concentration) .............................................. 62
  Psychology MS Programs: ............................................................................................. 65
    Master of Science in Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology ............................. 65
    Table 22. I/O Graduate Program Enrollment .............................................................. 65

1
Section 1.0: Executive Summary

During the 2018-2019 academic year, the Psychology Department conducted an extensive program evaluation of its program and services. This included a detailed analysis of 1) Program Planning, 2) Student Learning and Achievement, 3) the Undergraduate and Graduate Curricula, 4) Faculty, and 5) Resources. Data were gathered from current and former faculty, students, and alumni through various means including face-to-face meetings and online surveys. In addition, program metrics were accessed from the SFSU Office of Institutional Research. Department faculty participated throughout the development of this report and assisted with the drafting of final documents.

The information summarized in this report indicates that, despite significant resource challenges, the Psychology Department manages its human capital and fiscal resources effectively. Student success metrics for undergraduate majors are outstanding. The undergraduate curriculum offers a wide array of opportunities for students to engage in learning activities that both expose them to the field of Psychology and prepare them for future employment. The three Master's programs, with five concentrations, are highly successful at placing graduates in careers in the field. Despite the significant workload and a Student-Faculty Ratio higher than most units in the University, faculty are highly productive and visible in their sub-disciplines. They also have an exemplary record of involving students in their scholarship.

Several key challenges and areas for growth and development were noted.

Key Challenges:

- Faculty resources are stagnant. Full-time T/TT head count is essentially flat from 2002 and has not been addressed since the 6th cycle review, even though it was identified as an urgent priority. Similarly, the undergraduate student-faculty ratio, which is nearly double most departments in the College of Science and Engineering (CoSE) and well above the campus average, has not been addressed since the 6th cycle review recommended alleviating it.
- Current space allocations are far below what is necessary to maintain an effective program or to accommodate necessary growth.
- Current faculty diversity is not reflective of the field of Psychology and does not align with the demographic representation of our students.
- Faculty desire more effective onboarding, more comprehensive mentorship, and greater transparency (particularly on budgetary matters).
• Faculty desire more clarity regarding issues of workload and service.

Priorities for Growth and Development:

• Maintain exceptional student success outcomes (retention, time to graduation, and graduation rates) while maintaining high academic standards.
• Maintain high level of faculty professional productivity and service.
• Improve key areas that impact student success, such as advising, access to research and community service learning, writing and quantitative competence, online learning, and D/F/W rates.
• Examine student success comprehensively through more systematic review of exit survey data and improved alumni outreach.
• Update and enhance the curriculum to address emerging areas in the field such as data science, neuroscience, and technical methods.
• Implement and assess the effectiveness of the First Year Experience general education course (PSY 205).
• Develop a Culminating Experience for undergraduate students.
• Increase diversity in faculty hiring.
• Improve faculty onboarding, including training for academic advising.
• Create and assess the effectiveness of a faculty mentoring program.
• Conduct exit interviews with departing faculty members and utilize the feedback as a catalyst for meaningful change.
• Improve transparency related to budgeting and resources.
Section 2.0: Overview of the Program

Program History and Overview. The Psychology Department, founded in 1934, has a rich history. Prior to 1959, Psychology had "program" status within the Education Division of San Francisco State College, and the faculty were housed on the third floor of the Education building. In 1960-61, with the mission of the college broadening beyond its original teacher preparation charter and a new President, the college was restructured. Based on its diverse offerings and services, Psychology was assigned "division" status, with a Director as head of the Division. Further restructuring occurred in 1964-1965 when "divisions" were designated as "schools." This led to the designation of Psychology as the Department of Psychology and its assignment to the School of Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Meanwhile, in 1965, as part of the physical expansion on campus, a separate 5-story Psychology Building was constructed. An augmentation grant from the National Science Foundation supported the construction of the fifth-floor research facilities. This brought the Department to its full range of offerings. As many as 65 faculty positions were created to cover the range of courses, and many of the positions were filled by lecturers. Research became an important dimension of the program, with many faculty members receiving grants and contracts that included released time from teaching to carry out research and scholarship activities. At one time, the Department had its own technical, computer, and library support for teaching and research activities. Throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s the Department maintained its large size, serving undergraduate majors, expanding the graduate programs, and providing other departments with a variety of courses to fulfill curricular needs. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, however, enrollments in Psychology courses temporarily stalled. One contributing factor was the change in the state-mandated general education program that deleted required courses in Psychology. Another factor was a general shift in students’ choices of major away from the behavioral and social sciences and toward more applied areas such as business and computer science. Simultaneously, a campus-wide administrative decision to avoid layoffs of permanent faculty resulted in a disproportionate share of reductions occurring in departments with large lecturer staffs.

By the end of the 1980s Psychology courses again were in great demand; student interest in the field, and the number of majors, minors, and graduate students in our Department, continued to grow. The overwhelming demand for the Psychology major at this time prompted some changes in the Department and led to the revision of the undergraduate major and the M.S. graduate programs. In 1995, the Department introduced its new undergraduate major. It was designed to eliminate bottlenecks caused by understaffing and to ensure that students graduate in a timely manner. In 2007 and again in 2013 we engaged in major undergraduate program revisions. These were designed to address
changes in the emphases and disciplines within the field of Psychology in order to stay competitive and to provide our diverse student body with a cutting-edge curriculum that would prepare them for their future academic, tech, or other careers. In 2008, we applied for impaction status for our undergraduate major, prompted by the realization that, given our current faculty allocation, we were unable to meet the curricular needs of our majors as well as our 150+ graduate students. In July of 2009, we were designated as an impacted major, a designation that allowed us to meet our student needs much more effectively and to increase student success within and beyond the Department.

During these years, our graduate programs underwent revisions as well. In 1994, the Department implemented course sharing among its graduate programs: I/O, Research, School, and Social Psychology graduate concentrations agreed to use PSY 770 (Research Methods and Techniques) to fulfill their research methods requirement, and the Developmental Psychology concentration followed suit a few years later. In 1997, the Clinical and School Psychology M.S. concentrations revised their curriculum to address staff shortages while still complying with the requirements of Federal and State accreditation boards. Two years later, the Industrial/Organizational Psychology M.S. program revised its curriculum to address staff shortages and changes in the discipline.

Despite increased student demand, the late 1980s and the 1990s brought further reductions in faculty allocation to Psychology. During this period, retirements and attrition canceled out any gains made from hiring new tenure-track faculty. The Department has still not recovered from these reductions in faculty. The 1985-1986 review noted that the Department had 52 permanent faculty (including 13 pre-retirement faculty), and a position allocation of 45.5. Currently, in contrast, the Department has 21 tenured/tenure-track faculty members and 4 FERPS. We have 2 full-time committed lecturer positions. One tenured faculty member who retired in July of 2019, Dr. Sacha Bunge, had been out of the Department on an administrative assignment. It is informative to note that our position allocation increased from 1992-2001 from 26.5 to 30.8 and since then has decreased to our present allocation. The current demand for Psychology courses is so great that the Provost’s office often funds additional sections of over-subscribed courses. Prior to impaction status, we regularly had about 1,650 majors, and regularly employed 10-20 lecturers (5-6 FTEF), depending on budget constraints, to cover the number of courses needed to serve our students. Current demands are addressed specifically in the body of the report.

**Faculty attrition without replacement is occurring at a time when Psychology is one of the most popular majors on campus. In Spring 2019, Psychology was second only to Business Administration in number of graduates. This massive student interest in the field of Psychology is one found consistently throughout the United States at both**
private and public universities.

Changes in Department culture. In response to excess faculty workload in the 1990s, the Department proposed a 9-unit teaching load that was approved by the Dean of the College of BSS. Since 1996, the Psychology Department workload has consisted of a 9-unit teaching load, 3 units for professional development, and 3 units for service. Faculty development activities have increased dramatically since the implementation of the 9-unit teaching load. A review of faculty curricula vitae demonstrates this most clearly. Faculty presentations at conferences, grant awards, and publication rates have increased as a result of the change in workload. This has benefited all of our students greatly; graduate programs are more competitive and provide more opportunities for our students, and our undergraduates benefit from exposure to research, chances to work as research assistants in labs and to conduct their own research, and increased opportunities for student publication and presentations at local and national conferences. All of these factors increase student success rates and make students more competitive candidates when they leave SF State.

This accomplishment is especially notable because SF State students, in general, and Psychology majors, in particular, come from a diverse range of academically underrepresented groups, which include ethnic, gender, age, sexual orientation, and social class. Thus, our mission has been and continues to be centered around fostering a curriculum that promotes cutting edge academic excellence and rigor while upholding multicultural and social equity values.

In 2011, the College of BSS was eliminated at SF State, and the Department of Psychology was relocated to the College of Science and Engineering (CoSE). This move was supported by a majority of faculty members and has had a significant impact on the culture within the Department. While the teaching load remained 3-3, FTE allotment shifted for particular commitments. For example, faculty no longer received 6 WTU for teaching a “large” (120+ student) section, but instead earned only 4 WTU for the same course. The move to CoSE did have some positive impact on faculty workload reporting because we began to provide some limited credit to faculty members for supervision courses. In addition, CoSE funds a reduced teaching load for assistant professors to facilitate their research program development. Currently, assistant professors receive a one-course reduction per semester their first three years (2-2 teaching load) and a one-course reduction per year in their last two years before promotion and tenure evaluation (2-3 teaching load). The College also provides summer salary for the first two summers with the expectation that the funded time will be devoted to research.

The move to CoSE coincided with a campus-wide shift in emphasis toward increased expectations related to professional development, research, publication, and external
funding. As the emphases of the University changed, faculty hires became more research-focused as well; as you can see from Appendix A, faculty productivity in the Department is outstanding. In the previous five years, ending in Fall 2018, faculty published 309 peer-reviewed papers, 43% of which were co-authored by students. This averages to 3.09 papers per year per faculty member. Faculty delivered 142 oral presentations (1.42 per year average), 28% of which included students, and participated in 355 conference poster sessions (3.55 per year average), 80% of which included student co-authors or lead presenters. Faculty have also been highly successful at obtaining external funding.

**Department Mission:** The Psychology Department Mission Statement was revised and approved in 2017 (see Appendix D).

**What are the defining characteristics of this program? How has the program changed in the last 5-10 (or more) years, and where does it hope to be in the next 5-10 years?**

We are one of the most multifaceted departments at San Francisco State University in terms of our size, array of sub-disciplines, and graduate programs. In particular, our student success estimates are among the best on campus despite our large undergraduate student-to-faculty ratio (SFR) of 39.7:1.

In addition to our undergraduate curriculum, we offer Master of Arts (M.A.) and Master of Science (M.S.) programs in a variety of areas. Specifically, we offer an M.A. in Psychology with concentrations in Developmental Psychology, Social, Personality and Affective Science, and Mind, Brain & Behavior. We offer an M.S. in Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology and an M.S. in Psychology with concentrations in Clinical or School Psychology. The elevation of the I/O concentration to a stand-alone M.S. program is currently under review by the Chancellor’s office. The School Psychology Graduate Program is accredited through NCATE/CCTC (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education/California Commission on Teacher Credentialing), and successfully completed the California re-accreditation process in Spring 2014.

**Recent changes.** Recent changes to our undergraduate program are wide-ranging. For example, we have recently developed PSY 205 as a First-Year Experience (FYE) GE course to address and enhance undergraduate student success even before students declare a major within the Department. In response to student interest and need, faculty are currently developing and implementing a number of hybrid and fully-online courses to complement our in-person offerings. Faculty research expertise and opportunities for students to experience the value of scientific method have been incorporated more broadly into the undergraduate program through inclusion of Psychology research participation in all Psychology Core courses. Our departmental culture has emphasized inter-departmental,
inter-university, and community-researcher collaborations (including in development of hiring plans and proposals) and development of relevant student opportunities. Examples of current faculty collaborations include partnerships with the SFSU Health Equity Institute, SF Build, University of California - San Francisco, and Stanford University. Additionally, an emphasis on the importance of international work, and the global implications and relevance of the field of Psychology, has been incorporated even more broadly into our courses and program offerings, as seen in the development of international programs like the China exchange program.

Within the graduate programs, the Department has also made several important recent changes. Specifically, 1) in response to 6th cycle review recommendations and to address resource needs, the MA graduate programs underwent significant course and program alignment, 2) we further aligned the curriculum of our Clinical and School Psychology M.S. concentrations, 3) the I/O graduate program was elevated from graduate concentration to MS program status in 2019 due to the fact that its curriculum could not be aligned with any existing concentration, 4) the Department initiated a 3+1+G program in Developmental Psychology as a partnership with two universities in China, and 5) the name of the Social Psychology graduate concentration was officially changed to “Social Personality and Affective Science” in 2019, to better reflect the breadth of expertise and representation of Department faculty in the field.

If the program has recently surveyed its alumni, current or graduating majors, employers, or other community stakeholders, what information do these surveys yield about the program’s distinctive achievements and most pressing challenges?

The Department collects information from our graduating majors on a yearly basis (See Appendix B). In addition, two online surveys of alumni were recently conducted by the University and the Department (in 2016). These data sources showed that a majority of Psychology alumni are either employed full time or pursuing continuing education, and that they benefitted from the training they received at SFSU. Key takeaways included the following:

- Approximately 54% of our alumni reported being employed full time, with another 14% reporting part time employment. Forty percent (40%) of those surveyed indicated that their work was within the field of Psychology.
- Approximately 22% of our alumni indicated that they are currently continuing their education. The majority of those pursuing graduate education are in some mental health field (e.g., Psy.D. [8%], Master’s [64%] or Ph.D. program [14%] in Psychology, with a handful of others pursing degrees in social work, law, medicine, teaching, or another field.
• The amount of time it took for graduates to find their current position varied widely, some indicating that they held their position already or found something “instantly” or within “a week” of applying, while others indicated that their job search lasted up to 2 years.
• Most alumni who responded reported that their training in the Psychology program at SF State contributed to their current employment. For example:
  • “I was hired mainly because of my experience in .... a research lab”
  • Psychology training “solidified, refreshed, and provided a new perspective at times.”
  • “My ability to understand human behavior has greatly helped me to work with the diverse populations I am constantly exposed to.”
  • “I was able to connect theory with practice. I joined a research lab on campus...”
  • “It has ... taught me empathy, boundaries, and assertiveness in my work.”

How does the program fit into the discipline? How does it reflect major disciplinary trends, and what are its particular elements of strength and innovation?

We recently revised our major, learning objectives and outcomes, and curricular structure to reflect the American Psychological Association’s (APA) current structure and emphases (See Appendix C). We did this in 2007 and again in 2013 -- an indication that we keep abreast of changes in the field and addressing the needs and interests of our students. The Department also offers weekly brown bag research meetings and a Distinguished Speaker Colloquium Series, organized by Dr. Ezequiel Morsella, that brings in two world-renowned researchers per semester to speak to faculty and students.

One of the most important tools the Department has used to keep in alignment with national trends is its 3- and 5-year hiring plans, developed in collaboration with all T/TT faculty members at regular faculty meetings. For example, in 2014, recognizing trends in interdisciplinary work related to trauma, the Department put forward a proposal for a triad of interconnected hires to fill that need; Dr. Melissa Hagan was hired in response to this proposal. That same year, Dr. Sarah Barber was hired to focus on older adult health. She left SFSU after the Spring of 2018 to take a more lucrative position at a state university in the Southeast U.S. In 2016, in response to the developing national trends toward “big data” and the increased use of statistical modeling in organizations, the Department hired Dr. Rav Suri. In 2017, the hiring of Dr. Diana Sanchez was finalized in order to bring a scholar to the Department with expertise in the applications of virtual reality technology to human resource training and development functions. Dr. Shasta Ihorn joined the faculty in 2018 to support our School Psychology graduate program and to provide guidance to the numerous
undergraduates seeking to apply their Psychology training with youth and within school systems.

In 2018, we submitted a hiring request for faculty in the areas of Developmental and Clinical Psychology. Neither request was funded. Our most recent hiring plan, submitted in the Spring of 2019, prioritized requests for three faculty members, with expertise in the areas of: Developmental Psychology, Clinical Psychology, and a general data scientist with expertise in quantitative methods. One of those hires (Developmental emphasis) was funded.

**What major challenges do similar programs in other institutions face? How have external or internal conditions shaped or affected the discipline? How will these affect the program under review?**

Perhaps the primary influencing factor on our Department health and success relates to the dearth of resources and faculty available to meet student needs. In 2008 we applied for and obtained “impaction” status on campus.¹ Prior to that time, we had more than 1650 majors and approximately 25 faculty members (including FERPs); students at that time were unable to enroll in necessary courses, unable to complete the major successfully, and faculty members were working beyond capacity. Today, with impaction status we have 1200 majors and Pre-Psychology majors (first- and second-year SF State students enrolled in lower division Psychology courses and on track to become Psychology majors when they achieve junior status), and have been able to improve our graduation rates, access to courses, and student satisfaction and success overall. Although the University has pushed in recent years to increase the number of students in the major and to remove impaction status, our faculty numbers have remained stagnant, while interest in the major has steadily increased. These data are presented in the report.

**How does the program advance the broader mission of the university?**

The Department’s Mission Statement is explicitly linked to each component of the University’s mission (See Appendix D).

---

¹This trend is in line with other Psychology Departments across the CSU system. The Psychology major is impacted at 12 of the 22 campuses that offer it.
Section 3.1: Program Planning

In addition to the attached documents summarizing program review, the Psychology Department has a well-functioning committee structure to address issues of undergraduate and graduate program planning. Below is a list and brief description of each committee's charge:

**Advisory Committee** – Meets monthly to discuss issues of relevance to the Department and to determine or evaluate departmental priorities, including discussion of topics related to the role of the Department within the College, University, and the field itself. Consults with the Chair to set the monthly Department meeting agenda.

**Curriculum Committee** – Meets monthly to review proposed course and program revisions, additions, and deletions for both the undergraduate and graduate programs.

**Assessment Committee** – Meets on an ad hoc basis to conduct assessments of the undergraduate program and graduate concentrations.

**Research Culture Committee** – Meets on an ad hoc basis to review and propose Department policy to facilitate faculty and student research, and data collection.

**Constitution Revision Committee** – Meets on an ad hoc basis to review and revise the Psychology Department Constitution.

**Space Committee** – Meets on an ad hoc basis to manage and allocate available space in order to maximize efficiency and equity.

In addition to the committees described above, each year the faculty also elect an Undergraduate Coordinator and a Graduate Coordinator, whose responsibilities are described briefly below:

**Undergraduate Coordinator** – Responsible for facilitating the Department's two online (1 unit) core courses, PSY 303 and PSY 690, and train and supervise the undergraduate Peer Advisor program (PSY 680). The FTES from these courses, in effect, results in a course release each semester to compensate for the position workload. In addition to managing these undergraduate courses, the Undergraduate Coordinator has non-voting positions on the Curriculum and Advisory Committees, and is a designated signer for undergraduate advising forms (including applications for graduation).
**Graduate Coordinator** – Acts as a liaison between the six graduate programs (and their Concentration Coordinators), the Chair, and the Department at large. In addition, the Graduate Coordinator has non-voting positions on the Curriculum and Advisory Committees, and is a designated signer for graduate advising forms (including Culminating Experience forms, IRB applications, and applications for graduation).

**Reflect:**

*How relevant is the program’s mission statement? Does it reflect the program’s current goals, strengths, and achievements? How does it support and advance the university mission statement?*

In the 2016-17 academic year, the Psychology Department revised and updated the Department By-Laws, and as part of this process sought to revise the Mission Statement to make it more succinct and aligned with other Psychology Departments in the CSU. A member of the Constitution Revision Committee crafted a draft revision of the Mission Statement, which was reviewed by the faculty at a Department meeting. Feedback was gathered and incorporated into the new Mission Statement (see Appendix D). The Mission Statement is explicitly linked to the Core Values of SFSU and contains examples of this linkage in the text.

*How does the program conduct regular assessment and use the results to strengthen its curriculum and direct its planning efforts?*

The Psychology Department has an *ad hoc* Assessment Committee that is charged with conducting programmatic assessments of the undergraduate program and graduate concentrations. Examples of assessment activities for both undergraduate and graduate curricula include a) collecting data via surveys and focus groups to summarize perception of student learning and achievement; b) reviewing course content to verify alignment with general education and broader learning objectives; c) reviewing student learning outcomes against standards from external bodies (e.g., Association of American Colleges); and d) gathering alumni data to track outcomes. Its yearly reports are provided to the University and to Department faculty. Examples of how the results from recent assessments have been used to strengthen curriculum and direct planning include:

- Revision of the undergraduate major to reflect recent advances in the field of Psychology and to ensure major learning objectives align with the learning objectives set forth by the APA.
- Revision of two Psychology Core courses, PSY 400 (Research Methods) and PSY 371 (Psychological Statistics), to develop standard learning objectives. Additionally, changes were made in policy and scheduling to ensure that these courses are taken in a sequenced fashion.
• Development of workshops for undergraduate students interested in pursuing graduate education to provide information on how to write a personal statement, how to apply to graduate programs, etc.
• Development of several new hybrid and online courses to meet student need and interest.
• Initiatives to increase training in professional writing and in work with designated populations (e.g., families, elders, children, and groups) in existing courses within the Clinical graduate concentration and the addition of material on performance appraisal to existing courses within the I/O graduate concentration.

In addition to more formal assessment processes, our faculty members regularly engage in “informal assessments” of curriculum. For example, the Psychology Department utilizes its Peer Advising Program to gather daily feedback from students regarding curriculum concerns. Peer Advisors (who earn course credit through PSY 680) provide current students with basic curriculum information (major requirements, course content) and listen to student concerns. Peer Advisors report concerns directly to the Psychology Department Curriculum Committee. Recently, this student feedback mechanism led to a change in PSY 699 Independent Study (in response to student concerns, re-enrollment in this course is now permitted).

**How does the program involve the faculty collectively in assessment and planning?**

Results of program assessments are prepared by the Assessment Committee, reviewed by the Advisory Committee, and presented to the faculty in a Department meeting for review, revision, and approval by vote (see Appendix E).

All significant planning efforts undertaken by the committees listed above are reviewed by the Advisory Committee, and any proposals, policies, or initiatives are presented to the faculty for review and approval by vote. For example, the attached hiring plan was drafted by the Advisory Committee and Department Chair, then reviewed and approved by faculty vote (see Appendix F).

**How do its planning processes take into account the perspectives of current students, alumni, community stakeholders, and employers?**

The perspectives of current students (those entering the major) are considered through the major advising provided in PSY 303, the one-unit online Core course for new majors. As part of the course requirements, students meet with a Peer Advisor or faculty advisor. During this time, faculty and Peer Advisors hear about student concerns with the major, such as whether or not courses should transfer from community colleges or other
universities. This particular example actually led to our incorporation of a “test out” option for PSY 371 Statistics for students who felt they had mastered the content of this course prior to transfer to SF State.

In order to finalize graduation paperwork, all undergraduate majors must meet with a faculty advisor and later complete an exit survey and assessment (see Appendix B). This survey collects data to assess mastery of fundamental Psychology concepts. It also gathers information about courses taken, experience in the major, satisfaction with the Department, and future plans for each student. The Assessment Committee incorporates the findings into their reports and policy recommendations. Assessment data for graduate students are gathered periodically, according to the schedule provided by the Division of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning.

Undergraduate and graduate assessment activities also include qualitative data from focus groups of representative students. Community stakeholders and employers are consulted when planning community service learning and internship opportunities for students. Consultation activities include planning scope of work, arranging hours commensurate with units taken, and designing culminating experience projects.

**Plan:**

*How will the program strengthen its planning processes and make use of them outside the formal program review schedule?*

We believe that we can strengthen our planning processes by:

- Increasing transparency via use of shared online resources. For example:
  - Developing a shared iLearn page that allows many resources (such as online room availability) to be viewed and accessed more fully. Such a page was launched in Fall 2018 and currently contains Department updates, meeting agendas and minutes, the hiring plan, and various Department and campus policy documents.
  - Making advising resources fully available to faculty online, including resources for faculty to make advising scheduling more efficient (e.g., YouCanBook.Me software)
- Setting and reviewing departmental goals in a systematic way.
- Setting up formal and informal metrics to measure how the Department is performing relative to its goals.
- Providing more systematic compilation of yearly undergraduate exit survey data, and providing these data to faculty for review regularly.
• Increasing alumni contact and collection of feedback, perhaps as part of the Assessment Committee charge. For example, we need to learn how our curriculum is or is not leading to career success. Current planning efforts focus on graduation rates as a metric of success; alumni data will assess whether our courses prepare students for life after school.

• Developing some sort of budgeting committee to increase collaboration and transparency. Such a committee would increase the number of faculty members in the Department who understand how the resources are distributed, and would be involved in determining how resources are allocated. For example, such a committee might be involved with the:
  • Review and approval of applications for release time. Currently there is no formal process, and release time is granted at the discretion of the Chair in exceptional cases (e.g., Associate Chair service).
  • Review of requests for release time based on supervision/teaching overloads. Currently there is no formal process for review, and release time is granted at the discretion of the Chair in very rare and exceptional cases.
  • Approval of large departmental expenditures (e.g., research infrastructure, office equipment, capital improvements).
  • Creating an on-boarding document for new faculty members so they can be seamlessly involved in the planning and governing processes of the Department.

Our planning processes could be utilized in a variety of ways, including:

• Helping to integrate new faculty. A greater degree of transparency and access to departmental information could improve new faculty onboarding.

• Supporting faculty and students. Increased access to information, more efficient advising services, and improved student and alumni outreach could have positive impacts on faculty and student morale, student success, and departmental development efforts.

• Improving and providing input into curriculum development. Undergraduate exit and alumni survey data could be particularly useful to identify curricular needs, issues with course availability, and extent of transfer of learning from the classroom to the work environment.
Section 3.2: Student Learning and Achievement

Reflect:  
*How do the program’s learning goals remain relevant, and how can they be revised and updated? Do students adequately understand and share these goals?*

The Department’s learning goals were adopted from the APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major. The current version of the guidelines was approved by the APA Council of Representatives in August 2013. This document is a revision of the original APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major, approved by the council in August 2006. This first revision, effective as of August 2013, supersedes the previous APA guidelines. It will expire in 10 years. The Department’s Assessment Committee revised the learning goals in 2014 and 2018. These revisions were approved by the Department (see Appendix C). We anticipate a similar departmental revision process as the field, and APA guidelines, change in the future.

Regarding students’ awareness of the goals, starting in 2013 the Psychology Department has hosted yearly events with Pre-Psychology majors to introduce them to the major and provide a roadmap for successful navigation to graduation. Transfer students and new majors are required to complete a course roadmap with a faculty advisor as part of the orientation Core course, PSY 303. Learning goals for the graduate concentrations are discussed in Section 3.3.2.

*How has student demand for the major risen or fallen? Are there any significant trends or present or future challenges that can be discerned from enrollment patterns?*

Over the last five years (2014-2019), demand for the major has risen according to all metrics (e.g., FTES, SCUs, Enrollment, Transfers, Pre-Psychology Majors; see Tables 1-7). These are linear trends that suggest continued increases in demand for the major. Our major has been impacted since 2009, which has allowed the Department to manage student flow, maintain high standards of instruction, and improve graduation and retention rates. Admission decisions regarding the number of students to admit each year under impaction are made by the Chair and Associate Chair using longitudinal application and yield data. Criteria considered include grade point average, geographic proximity to SFSU, financial need, first-generation college student status, and transfer priority under SB 1440.

It is also important to note that the management of impaction must always be balanced with the resource needs of the graduate concentrations. Graduate concentration enrollments, which are presented in Section 3.3.2, have been consistent over the last five years with an average of 8.2 new graduate students per concentration cohort per year.
Psychology faculty met in November of 2018 to discuss the future of impaction. A number of proposals were considered in this meeting, including the possibilities of: maintaining our current impaction status; lowering the transfer GPA cutoff to 2.01 for 2019-20; eliminating impaction status completely beginning in the 2020-21 academic year; and/or eliminating the Pre-Psychology major to allow new Freshmen to enter the major directly.

Using available data and in consultation with the Division of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, Institutional Research, and our Department’s Advisory Committee, the following decisions were made at that November 2018 meeting:

1. The Psychology Department lacks the resources to eliminate impaction for academic year 2020-2021.

2. To move toward a goal of coming off impaction beyond AY 2020-21, the Psychology Department will eliminate the Pre-Psychology major beginning Fall 2019. First-time freshmen will be directly admitted to the Psychology major beginning at that time.

As outlined below, the data indicate that lowering the transfer GPA cutoff to 2.01 would put an immediate resource stress in Fall 2019 on Core courses that are already over capacity. We do not currently have the staff to meet the immediate needs that would be required with this option. Alternatively, eliminating the Pre-Psychology major will allow us to more accurately predict the number of seats required in our courses, project resource needs, and work with the administration to ensure that documented needs will be met with full time staffing to make impaction removal possible. The Department formally requested that the University administration actively work with us to utilize available analytics to project resource needs. Consideration of full removal of impaction in the future is possible with evidence-based planning and ongoing resource commitments from Administration.
Table 1. T/TT Faculty-Major Ratio 2002-2018

ENROLLMENTS ARE INCREASING – SPIKES IN FALL SEMESTERS REFLECT FALL ADMISSION CYCLE DUE TO IMPACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Student Credit Units 2016-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCUs</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. FTES by Semester 2002-2018

NOTE: Table includes Pre-Psychology majors from 2014 to present. Pre-Psychology major implemented in F14. FTES and enrollment spikes in fall due to transfer and Pre-Psychology admissions. To project post-impaction FTES and enrollment, please see F02-F08 data in these two tables.

Table 4. Enrollment by Semester 2002-2018
Table 5. Psychology Faculty Count 2002-2018

FACULTY COUNT IS STAGNANT AND HAS DECREASED SINCE 2016

Table 6. Undergraduate Student-Faculty Ratio 2014-2018

Undergraduate Student-Faculty Ratio (2014-2018) is Significantly Worse Than CoSE and SFSU Benchmarks
Table 7a. Sources of New Psychology Majors 2014-2018 (Transfers)

1. Current SFSU Students who change major to PSY: Approx. 100 per year
2. Transfer Students: $\overline{X} = 257.2$, $SD = 37.46$; Average Yield: 29.9%
3. Pre-Psychology: $\overline{X} = 200.6$, $SD = 60.95$; Average Yield: 16.6%
Table 7b. Sources of New Psychology Majors 2014-2018 (Pre-Psychology)

Pre-Psychology Enrollments are steadily increasing.
The Psychology major requires students to complete six Core courses, six Area courses, and at least three Elective courses (see Appendix I for more detail about major requirements). Our Department has managed impaction by funneling new majors through several Psychology Core courses in a sequenced fashion. Newly admitted majors must take PSY 371 (Psychological Statistics) and PSY 400 (Research Methods) in sequence, and PSY 371 is a pre-requisite for PSY 305 (GWAR).

This process, along with careful planning and a strong commitment to advising, has resulted in retention, graduation rate, and time to degree outcomes that clearly outpace CoSE and university-wide metrics (see Tables 10c-12).

Admitting transfer students at a GPA cutoff of 2.01 would result in immediate resource overload in Core courses (see Table 8). The data project that admitting transfers at 2.01 would produce, conservatively, 200 additional Psychology majors in Fall 2019 alone. This would require two additional large sections of PSY 371, three to five additional Graduate Teaching Assistants, two additional large sections of PSY 400, and eight additional sections of PSY 305GW. As these students progress in the major, the strains would spill over to Area and Elective courses, the majority of which are currently at or over capacity. For example, the Ad Astra data for Spring 2019 enrollment indicates that the enrollment ratio is 95% or above for 64.7% of offered classes, and above 85% for 75% of offered classes.

Table 8. Open Seats in Psychology Core Courses 2014-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Seats - Psychology Core Courses (2014-2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Seats: PSY 305  PSY 371  PSY 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 305  PSY 371  PSY 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0  -10  -20  -30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0  10  20  30  40  50  60  70  80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80  70  60  50  40  30  20  10  0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full removal of impaction in Psychology will only be possible with significant and ongoing (perpetual) additional resources that keep pace with enrollment increases.

**DATA DRIVEN RESOURCE REQUESTS TO MEET ENROLLMENT TRENDS**

Psychology Department impaction in 2009 resulted from enrollment exceeding staffing capacity. Historical trends indicate that demand for an unimpacted Psychology major would approach 1400 FTES. Consideration of impaction removal must coincide with appropriate staffing to manage projected FTES increases with a reasonable student-to-faculty ratio, forecasted space availability, etc. However, full time tenure track staffing from 2002-2018 is essentially flat.

The Department has made good faith efforts to make progress by submitting staffing requests based on projected needs. For example, Table 9, below, lists the open seats and availability of Psychology Area courses taught by faculty associated with our current hiring requests. For reference, Area 1 – Basic Psychological Processes; Area 2 – Psychological Development and Individual Differences; and Area 3 – Social, Cultural, Organizational, and Community Courses.

Hires were requested in both areas (Spring 2018 requests) and were not granted. We re-submitted these requests in Spring 2019, in addition to a third request for a faculty member to teach GE and major Core statistics courses for which staffing is an issue (see Appendix F). One position (emphasis in Developmental Psychology) was approved.
Table 9. Open Seats in Hiring Request Courses Fall 2016-Fall 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>FALL 2016</th>
<th>SPRING 2017</th>
<th>FALL 2017</th>
<th>SPRING 2018</th>
<th>FALL 2018</th>
<th>MEAN OPEN SEATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSY 171</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 305</td>
<td>GWAR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 371</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 430</td>
<td>AREA 2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 431</td>
<td>AREA 2</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 433</td>
<td>AREA 2</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 434</td>
<td>AREA 2</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 435</td>
<td>AREA 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 436</td>
<td>AREA 2</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 441</td>
<td>AREA 3</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 451</td>
<td>AREA 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 452</td>
<td>AREA 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 455</td>
<td>AREA 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 521</td>
<td>AREA 2</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 525</td>
<td>AREA 3</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 571</td>
<td>ELECTIVE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XX = COURSE NOT OFFERED DUE TO RESOURCE LIMITATIONS

Over the past five years, where has the program been able to improve student progress, achievement, and graduation? Where might it further improve them?

Psychology is the third largest department by enrollment on campus. Only Biology and Engineering are larger. The largest non-CoSE department is Marketing, which ranks fifth overall. In terms of graduation numbers, Psychology consistently ranks first or second for most graduates across the University (although in 2018, Marketing graduated more students than either Psychology or Biology).

The bottom line is that impaction has worked. The profile of first-time freshman and transfer students in Psychology indicates that they enter SFSU with standardized test scores (FTF) and grades (transfers) that exceed campus and college norms (see Tables 10a and 10b). Substantial data indicates that these variables are predictive of college success, and our results align with these findings. Post-impaction, graduation rates have increased exponentially for first time freshman and have stayed very high for transfer students (See Tables 10c-10d). The Department metrics for undergraduate retention and time to graduation are more favorable than CoSE and SFSU benchmarks (see Tables 11-12. Time to degree has decreased linearly, and is also superior to CoSE and SFSU averages. For example, as shown in Tables 11a-11c, for those graduating in the Spring semesters, time to degree in Psychology has averaged between 2.8-3.1 years – below both the University (3.3-3.5 years) and CoSE averages (3.5-3.8 years).
### Table 10a. New Student Profile for First Time Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Avg HS GPA</th>
<th>Avg SAT Comp</th>
<th>Avg SAT Verbal</th>
<th>Avg SAT Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,642</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>4,323</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>4,287</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10b. New Student Profile Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Avg Trans. GPA</th>
<th>Avg Trans. Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,204</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10c. First Time Freshman Graduation Rate

![Graph showing first time freshman graduation rate]

NOTE: Impaction was declared in 2009.

Table 10d. Transfer Student Graduation Rate

![Graph showing transfer student graduation rate]
Table 11a. Average Time to Degree by Degree Level (University Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Avg. TTD</td>
<td>Avg. Units</td>
<td>Avg. GPA</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Avg. TTD</td>
<td>Avg. Units</td>
<td>Avg. GPA</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>136.7</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>136.7</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>136.4</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>135.4</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>134.2</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>134.1</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time to degree is measured in years. The calculations are based on dividing the academic year into three equal terms corresponding to Spring, Summer, and Fall terms.
Avg. Units = Average earned units at graduation
Avg. GPA = Average cumulative GPA at graduation

Prepared by the Office of Institutional Research
Contact: institutionalresearch@sfsu.edu

Table 11b. Average Time to Degree by Degree Level (College Level)

| College | Degree Level | Summer | | | Fall | | | Spring | | |
|---------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|         |              | # | Avg. TTD | Avg. Units | Avg. GPA | # | Avg. TTD | Avg. Units |Avg. GPA | # | Avg. TTD | Avg. Units | Avg. GPA |
| Science and Engineering | Bachelor | 2012-13 | 96 | 4.1 | 143.0 | 2.88 | 251 | 4.2 | 144.7 | 3.04 | 651 | 3.8 | 143.4 | 3.11 |
|         |              | 2013-14 | 90 | 4.1 | 144.8 | 2.92 | 304 | 4.1 | 146.5 | 3.06 | 675 | 3.7 | 142.5 | 3.09 |
|         |              | 2014-15 | 84 | 4.9 | 146.2 | 2.91 | 298 | 4.4 | 144.2 | 3.06 | 661 | 4.3 | 143.0 | 3.12 |
|         |              | 2015-16 | 75 | 4.5 | 146.3 | 2.94 | 276 | 4.5 | 143.4 | 3.01 | 704 | 3.9 | 143.5 | 3.10 |
|         |              | 2016-17 | 147 | 3.8 | 141.7 | 2.98 | 312 | 3.9 | 143.2 | 3.64 | 737 | 3.6 | 143.5 | 3.12 |
|         |              | 2017-18 | 148 | 4.0 | 141.3 | 2.97 | 347 | 3.8 | 142.8 | 3.05 | 689 | 3.5 | 141.3 | 3.15 |
|         |              | 2018-19 | 159 | 3.7 | 140.6 | 3.02 | | | | | | | |
| Master | 2012-13 | 50 | 2.9 | 40.4 | 3.79 | 60 | 3.3 | 44.9 | 3.69 | 91 | 2.8 | 44.0 | 3.80 |
|         | 2013-14 | 57 | 2.8 | 45.3 | 3.77 | 63 | 3.4 | 42.0 | 3.76 | 96 | 2.7 | 41.7 | 3.76 |
|         | 2014-15 | 63 | 2.9 | 44.0 | 3.77 | 55 | 3.6 | 43.6 | 3.68 | 94 | 2.8 | 46.6 | 3.84 |
|         | 2015-16 | 66 | 2.7 | 40.4 | 3.80 | 61 | 3.4 | 42.2 | 3.74 | 86 | 2.5 | 42.8 | 3.85 |
|         | 2016-17 | 56 | 2.4 | 38.7 | 3.80 | 68 | 3.3 | 40.0 | 3.73 | 107 | 2.5 | 42.2 | 3.83 |
|         | 2017-18 | 51 | 2.8 | 39.0 | 3.80 | 81 | 3.2 | 40.0 | 3.72 | 101 | 2.8 | 43.9 | 3.82 |
|         | 2018-19 | 60 | 2.6 | 40.8 | 3.78 | | | | | | | |

Time to degree (TTD) is measured in years. The calculations are based on dividing the academic year into three equal terms corresponding to Spring, Summer, and Fall terms.
Avg. Units = Average earned units at graduation
Avg. GPA = Average cumulative GPA at graduation

Prepared by the Office of Institutional Research
Contact: institutionalresearch@sfsu.edu
Table 11c. Average Time to Degree by Degree Level (Program Level - Psychology)

San Francisco State University

Average Time to Degree by Degree Level - Program Level

College: Science and Engineering | Department: Psychology
Program: Psychology -BA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Avg. TTD</td>
<td>Avg. Units</td>
<td>Avg. GPA</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Avg. TTD</td>
<td>Avg. Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>130.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>126.8</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>128.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>127.7</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>132.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>131.1</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>130.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>130.4</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>127.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>127.6</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>127.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time to degree (TTD) is measured in years. The calculations are based on dividing the academic year into three equal terms corresponding to Spring, Summer, and Fall terms.
Avg. Units = Average earned units at graduation
Avg. GPA = Average cumulative GPA at graduation

Prepared by the Office of Institutional Research
Contact: institutionalresearch@sfsu.edu

Table 12a. Graduation Summary by College (Last Major Tracking Approach)

San Francisco State University
Graduation Summary, by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>1st Freshman</th>
<th>New CCC Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-Yr Grad%</td>
<td>5-Yr Grad%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 12b. Retention Summary by College (Last Major Tracking Approach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>1-Yr Retn%</th>
<th>2-Yr Retn%</th>
<th>3-Yr Retn%</th>
<th>4-Yr Retn%</th>
<th>6-Yr Retn%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1-Yr Retn%</th>
<th>2-Yr Retn%</th>
<th>3-Yr Retn%</th>
<th>4-Yr Retn%</th>
<th>6-Yr Retn%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,466</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,603</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,659</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSE</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All SFSU</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The last major tracking approach tracks student progress using the major in which the student either graduated or dropped out. This approach captures the contributions of retention and graduation rates by graduating major regardless of change of majors.

**What questions do the rates and trends in student enrollment, retention, and graduation raise for your program? How does the program interpret them?**

Psychology is an enormously popular topic for first-year students and often serves as a pathway to other majors that require discovery on the part of students (e.g., Health Education, Sociology, Nursing). However, because our student-to-faculty ratio (SFR) is so high (Table 6), we are clearly struggling to offer the current major courses. With aggressive hiring of new tenure-track and full-time lecturers, the Psychology Department could expand our lower division offerings beyond PSY 200 (General Psychology) to include more sections of PSY 101 (Psychology of Personal Development), PSY 171 (Critical Thinking), and PSY 205. PSY 205, a course developed to address the university’s new efforts in offering a “first year experience”, will be offered for the first time in Fall 2019. However, the expansion of lower division offerings is a considerably lower priority than the urgent need to address the SFR.
According to the Office of Institutional Research database, our Department’s Spring 2018 undergraduate SFR was 39.7:1. Student-to-faculty ratio (SFR) is not a new issue. It was explicitly referenced as a critical area in the 6th cycle review report (see Appendix G). To quote the 6th cycle review APRC report,

“Faculty workload, as reflected in an excessively high student faculty ratio, is the overarching challenge that affects every other aspect of this report’s evaluation: the curriculum, faculty and student experience, program-specific standards, the culminating student experience, and strategic planning.”

The external review in the 6th cycle referred to our student faculty ratio as “shocking” and added, “The Department’s SFR is an outrageous 42:1 and needs to be reduced immediately. An acceptable target is 25:1.”

For context, twelve (12) T/TT lines would be required just to reach the SFSU average SFR.

**How do your program’s current pedagogical practices meet students’ learning needs?**

**How does your program support pedagogical innovation?**

The explicit sequencing of the upper division major Core courses – PSY 303 and PSY 371 first semester, PSY 400 the second, PSY 305 the third, and PSY 690 the fourth, has worked very well from a scheduling and advising perspective. It also allows the Department to more accurately predict student demand and schedule course offerings to meet the demand.

In terms of innovation, we regularly use PSY 300 (Current Issues in Psychology), PSY 305GW (Contemporary Issues in Psychology), and PSY 891 (graduate level Seminar in Selected Problems) to offer novel and groundbreaking perspectives on trends in the field. PSY 303 and 690 include videotaped interviews with faculty in which they discuss their research and current trends in the field.

Other ideas for supporting pedagogical innovation include:
- Increased exposure to statistics, data science and artificial intelligence in the Core courses, and offering a more robust curriculum in these areas.
- Improved student attendance at Department colloquia through the implementation of some incentive process (e.g., extra credit; student research participation credit as tracked by SONA software system; healthy snacks).
- Enhanced integration of community service learning in classroom and research experiences.
Psychology major exit surveys show that graduating majors feel well-prepared to enter the field. Nearly 70% of students surveyed report that SF State provided them “to a great extent” with a general orientation to the field. Fifty seven percent (57%) of graduating majors report having developed skills for practical application in the field to a great extent; an additional 30% report having developed these skills “somewhat.” Complete exit survey data are provided in Appendix B.

**How will the program ensure that its learning goals remain relevant to students’ real needs and levels of achievement?**

The Department will continue to follow the APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major and will adjust learning goals and curriculum accordingly. We will also continue and extend communications with recent alumni about their experiences and their readiness for success post-graduation.

Student reports of their learning are consistent with learning goals of the major and the field (see APA Guidelines for Undergraduate Major, Appendix C). For example, 91% of graduating seniors report that they have learned to distinguish between academic and popular psychology, which is key component of establishing a knowledge base in the science of psychology (Learning Goal #1). Sixty-seven percent (67%) of graduating majors report having learned about scientific methods (Learning Goal #2) to a great extent, with another 30% reporting feeling somewhat confident with these concepts. Approximately 95% of students report having developed a broadened appreciation for and awareness of different cultural perspectives (Learning Goal #3). Ninety-four percent (94%) of graduates believe they have developed skills in written communication of psychological concepts (Learning Goal #4). Nearly all graduating seniors, 98%, report having obtained “broadened self-knowledge and understanding” through their experience in the program (Learning Goal #5).

**How will the program advance rates of student retention, progress, and graduation in the future?**

Advancement of student retention, progress, and graduation rates will require additional staff resources. In addition, to enhance student preparedness for life after graduation, the Department will continue to incorporate career development components into the Core curriculum. We currently use three courses (PSY 303, PSY 690, and PSY 680) to ensure students have mentorship during their pursuit of a Psychology degree, and to help new and current Psychology majors navigate the major and prepare for their careers. The Core courses PSY 303 (Psychology: The Major and Profession) and PSY 690 (Future Directions in
Psychology) are the “bookend” courses for the major, taken at the beginning and end of upper division coursework. PSY 303 educates students about resources within the Department and courses available and facilitates engagement with faculty advisors to assist with course planning. PSY 690 educates students about courses needed for their future career goals (e.g., graduate school) and the job search process. In addition, PSY 680 (Peer Advising in Psychology) is an Elective course in the major that provides credit to students for serving as Peer Advisors within the major. Other ideas for advancing rates of student retention, progress, and graduation include:

- Implement PSY 205 (FYE course, “Research as ‘Me-Search’”).
- Improve major course sequencing beyond the Core areas in order to maximize completion of the major in a timely manner.
- Expand student engagement through research experiences in faculty labs.
- Continue mandatory faculty advising through PSY 303 and frequent updating of PSY 303 class materials.
Section 3.3.1: The Undergraduate Curriculum

What are the graduation rates of students in the program?
See Table 13, using Last Major Tracking Approach Data (below).

The Department’s four- and six-year graduation rates have both steadily increased over the past 5 years, and are significantly higher than comparable rates in both the College and University. These rates dramatically increased in the years following declaration of impaction status in 2009.

Table 13. Student Graduation Rates 2007-14²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Four Year Graduation Rates (Program)</th>
<th>Four Year Graduation Rates (College)</th>
<th>Four Year Graduation Rates (University)</th>
<th>Six Year Graduation Rates (Program)</th>
<th>Six Year Graduation Rates (College)</th>
<th>Six Year Graduation Rates (University)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² These data are presented more comprehensively in Section 3.2.
**What courses does the program offer in the general education curriculum? Why were these courses chosen for GE by the Department? How does the program assess their effectiveness?**

See Table 14.

**Table 14. GE Courses in the Psychology Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What courses does the program offer in the general education curriculum?</th>
<th>Why were these courses chosen for GE by the Department?</th>
<th>How does the program assess their effectiveness?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PSY 111 (A3) Logic & Psychology of Critical Thinking  
*Enrollment:*  
AY 15-16: 487  
AY 16-17: 502  
AY 17-18: 475 | Content directly related to requirement (i.e., critical thinking); course re-introduced to address this need in a way that would serve Psychology and potential Psychology majors | This course is relatively new to the program. Proposed future assessments will include efforts to: identify the number of students who take this class who later apply to be Psychology students; compare GPA of psych major students who complete this course with non-majors. |
| PSY 171 (B4 pathways) Quantitative Reasoning in Psychology  
*Enrollment:*  
AY 15-16: 153  
AY 16-17: 195  
AY 17-18: 178 | Content created and developed to provide direct support to students preparing for advanced statistics/quant reasoning | This course was evaluated and revised as part of the SFSU Student Success in Majors Initiative Grant in 2017.  
Proposed future assessment includes: compare success in PSY 371 of students who took 171 vs. those who do not. |
| PSY 200 (GE D1; E1 LLD) General Psychology  
*Enrollment:*  
AY 15-16: 1,070  
AY 16-17: 807  
AY 17-18: 1,039 | Large sections available to serve greatest number of students; basic introduction to social science material accessible for possible majors or non-majors | This course was evaluated and revised as part of the SFSU Student Success in Majors Initiative Grant in 2017. In addition, some information about learning in this course is gathered as part of the graduation assessment of our majors.  
Additional proposed future assessments will compare |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What courses does the program offer in the general education curriculum?</th>
<th>Why were these courses chosen for GE by the Department?</th>
<th>How does the program assess their effectiveness?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSY 205 (GE) Research as Me-Search: Translating Personal Experiences to a Science of Mind and Behavior</td>
<td>Designed to fill the “First Year Experience” requirements.</td>
<td>Course will be offered for the first time in Fall 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 320 (GE E1 LLD; GP; UD-D) Sex &amp; Relationships</td>
<td>Large sections available to serve greatest number of students; basic introduction to social science material accessible for majors or non-majors</td>
<td>Content from this course is included as part of the end-of-major assessment exit survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 330 (SJ; UD-B) Child Development</td>
<td>Large sections available to serve greatest number of students; basic introduction to developmental/life science material accessible for non-majors</td>
<td>This course is provided explicitly for non-majors. We systematically evaluate its enrollment numbers and grade spread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 435 (UD-D) Behavior Problems of Children</td>
<td>Large sections available to serve greatest number of students; basic introduction to social science material accessible for majors or non-majors</td>
<td>Content from this course is included as part of the end-of-major assessment exit survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 450 (SJ; UD-D) Variations in Human Sexuality</td>
<td>Large sections available to serve greatest number of students; basic introduction to social science material accessible for majors or non-majors</td>
<td>Content from this course is included as part of the end-of-major assessment exit survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 474 (SJ) Psychology of Social Justice</td>
<td>Content closely related to SF Studies requirement topic; open to non-Psychology majors from CJS and related areas.</td>
<td>Content from this course is included as part of the end-of-major assessment exit survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 668 (GP) Psychology of Leadership</td>
<td>Content closely related to SF Studies requirement topic</td>
<td>Content from this course is included as part of the end-of-major assessment exit survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What courses does the program offer in the general education curriculum?

Why were these courses chosen for GE by the Department?

How does the program assess their effectiveness?

| AY 16-17: 37 | AY 17-18: 44 |

How do the Program’s GE courses meet the “Educational Goals for the Baccalaureate at SF State” and how are these goals assessed?

The Psychology GE courses meet the Educational Goals of the University in a variety of ways. General Psychology (PSY 200) is completed by approximately 1000 students each year and directly serves the goal of recruiting potential majors while showcasing some of our most gifted teaching faculty. In particular, the course introduces lower division students from across campus to competencies for lifelong intellectual endeavor (critical questioning, quantitative reasoning, research skills), allows them to become conversant in domains of knowledge (social science in particular), and incorporates lessons in ethics and diversity in its broad overview of the field. These are lessons that majors and non-majors alike will use in future coursework and can utilize in evaluating information (e.g., news, media) and thinking about how to solve challenging questions, particularly through the use of research methods.

The other Psychology lower division courses (PSY 111, 171) were designed expressly to address the GE needs of the university, and to support both non-majors and pre-majors in their initial introduction to statistics, critical questioning, and reasoning skills. They map directly on to the Department’s articulation agreements (see Appendix H).

The upper division Psychology GE courses serve to directly integrate the aspects of the field that touch the lives of all people. This includes the broadest areas of the field like human sexuality (PSY 320, 450) and human development (PSY 330). Again, these courses serve the purpose of making social scientific evidence and methods accessible to a broad audience, expressly allow students to connect their own lives to the field, and highlight qualities of mind and spirit. These courses are taught in large sections and are frequently taught by T/TT faculty.

PSY 435 (Behavior Problems in Children) represents another topic which broadly spans the needs and experiences of SF State students— the materials are relevant to students in CAD, counseling, and CJS, among others. Again, we see an emphasis on integration and
application of knowledge, using social scientific evidence to address societal questions and concerns, and highlighting issues related to both diversity and ethical engagement.

The remaining two GE courses in the Psychology Department, (PSY 474 and PSY 668) each address a very particular area of the field (social justice; global perspectives). In addition to making these topics available to students in the University at large, these courses allow Psychology majors to meet SF Studies requirements in the context of a deep exploration within the field.

*Develop a map or flowchart of the program’s curriculum in the major, illustrating the pathways from entry to graduation that students are expected to take, and differentiating required courses from electives.*

See Psychology Major Roadmap ([Appendix I](#)).

The Psychology major requires a total of 41 units, including 3 units of lower division Introductory or General Psychology. After completing an Introductory/General Psychology class, students are required to complete all five (5) Core courses. In addition, students must complete at least 2 courses in each of three subject Areas (Area 1 Basic Psychological Processes; Area 2 Psychological Development and Individual Differences; Area 3 Social, Cultural, Organizational and Community Contexts). Finally, students must complete a minimum of three additional Elective courses, selected from any of the three subject Areas, or from an additional list of Elective courses.
Identify how often, when (both in the semester and in the weekly time schedule), and where required courses are offered, including GWAR courses, noting enrollments for the past three years (in matrix form).

See Table 15 (below).

Table 15. Required Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>How Often?</th>
<th>When (Semester)</th>
<th>When (Weekly)</th>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>Enrollments for the last 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSY 200</td>
<td>Every Semester</td>
<td>Fall, Spring</td>
<td>MW; MWF; TR</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>1,070; 807; 1,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 303</td>
<td>Every Semester</td>
<td>Fall, Spring</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>404, 394, 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 371</td>
<td>Every Semester</td>
<td>Fall, Spring, Summer</td>
<td>M; T; W; R; F; TR</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>359, 510, 587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 400</td>
<td>Every Semester</td>
<td>Fall, Spring, Winter, Summer</td>
<td>M, W, R; TR</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>333, 297, 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 305</td>
<td>Every Semester</td>
<td>Fall, Spring, Summer, Winter</td>
<td>M; T; W; MW; TR; TR</td>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>332, 297, 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 690</td>
<td>Every Semester</td>
<td>Fall, Spring</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>258, 321, 341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identify courses that your program regularly offers that are required by other majors (service courses): who teaches these, how often are these taught, and what is their enrollment

Although we offer a number of cross-listed courses and courses that can be used to support requirements in other majors across the University (e.g., CJS; CAD), the Psychology Department is not currently providing required courses for another major.

Identify courses that are required in your program but are offered by other departments: who teaches these, how often are these taught, and what is their enrollment? How are your students’ needs communicated to the departments who teach the courses?

All required courses are offered by the Psychology Department.
Identify bottleneck courses (courses required for graduation that regularly attract more students than can be enrolled), describe why they have become bottlenecks for students and describe the program’s strategies for reducing them.

See Table 16 (below).

Table 16. Bottleneck Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Program’s strategy to reduce bottleneck courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSY 305</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Through the Pre-Psychology major process, the structure of the major, and the sequencing of Core courses, the Department is able to project the number of PSY 305 sections that will be needed each semester. That is why the number of seats fluctuates from semester to semester. It is important to note, however, that the resources needed to staff PSY 305 sections create gaps in the schedule each semester, meaning a reduction in Area 1, 2, 3, and major elective courses (i.e., for each faculty member who is teaching a PSY 305 course, one content-area course is not being offered.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identify efforts to ease the transition of transfer students through articulated courses, or Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs).

See Appendix H for the Psychology Transfer Model Curriculum.

We currently have two articulated courses: PSY 171 (Quantitative Reasoning) and PSY 200 (General Psychology). Equivalent Quantitative Reasoning courses are accepted from any UC, CSU, or community college. For PSY 200, we accept any Introductory Psychology course from any CSU, UC, or accredited institution. Thus, transfer students are immediately eligible to enroll in PSY 371, the gateway course to the rest of the Psychology major. See Table 17.

Table 17. Articulated Courses/ TMCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articulated Courses</th>
<th>Number of Articulations</th>
<th>Name(s) of Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) Accepted by Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSY 171</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 200</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Introductory Psychology; General Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe the culminating experience requirements for undergraduate majors in your program.

At present the Department does not have a designated "culminating experience" for undergraduate majors. As a direct result of this Self Study, however, faculty have begun conversations about the most appropriate ways to address this guideline within our major. (Please see expanded discussion of culminating experience, below, for further detail about these conversations and considerations.) Although there is currently no formalized culminating experience, there are several elements of our program that meet some of these articulated goals:

All students complete PSY 690, a broad-reaching course that ties together topics from the entire major while providing students with a framework for extending their Psychology major education to the “real world,” including extensive consideration of career paths and graduate education. Each student engages with a faculty or community mentor as part of this course and completes several interviews with the mentor intended to guide them in their next steps.

In an alternative form of program culmination, some students participate in the Psychology Department’s Honors Program. These students design and complete a Psychology research project over the course of a year, working closely with both a faculty advisor and the Honors Program Director. This experience includes the completion of four courses, at least one of which exceeds minimum requirements for the major.

Beyond the Psychology Department Honors Program, many more students explore aspects of the field and their future potential as Research Assistants (RAs) in a faculty research lab. These students often enroll in PSY 699. In fact, between 7-12% of our students are enrolled in PSY 699 any given semester, and 21% of graduating seniors report having been an RA at some point, an experience that provides students with direct, hands-on engagement with the field.³ Eighty-one percent (81%) of students who work as a Research Assistant report

³ Enrollment in PSY 699 is represented in the table below. N.B. pikes in numbers of students enrolled in PSY 699 each spring is consistent with the department’s course ordering, since the majority of our students take PSY 371 in the fall, a prerequisite for participating in PSY 699.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Number of Students in PSY 699/ Total Students in Major</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Enrolled in PSY 699</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>59/899</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>80/735</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>68/827</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>71/643</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>54/701</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
upon graduation that the experience was “very valuable,” with an additional 16% reporting that the experience was “somewhat valuable” to them.

*Identify where in the major students receive instruction in technology appropriate to the major and how their learning is assessed.*

All Psychology majors receive training in basic spreadsheets (e.g., Excel, Google Sheets) and statistical software programs (SPSS, SAS, R) in PSY 371 and PSY 400, both Core courses. Additionally, students access and use iLearn in almost all courses, increasing student exposure to online communication, blogs, and electronic collaboration. Each GWAR course provides for students to learn some of the basic tools for online searches and library research. In addition, students may obtain specialized technical training in advanced statistical programs, qualitative analysis software, and other technologies in PSY 571 and other content courses, as well as in individual research labs (PSY 699). Approximately half of faculty members recently surveyed indicated that they teach technology skills in at least one of their classes or labs. See Table 18 (below) for specific programs/technologies.

**Table 18. Instruction in Technology and Software**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software/Technology</th>
<th>Location of Offering (Courses, Labs, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/V equipment</td>
<td>Labs (PSY 699)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral observation equipment</td>
<td>Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biopac software</td>
<td>PSY 582 &amp; labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DirectRT</td>
<td>Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-prime</td>
<td>Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encryption software</td>
<td>Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endnote</td>
<td>Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel</td>
<td>PSY 171, PSY 371, 400 &amp; labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mplus</td>
<td>PSY 371, PSY 400 &amp; labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noldus Observer</td>
<td>Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nVivo</td>
<td>Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological recording equipment</td>
<td>Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualtrics</td>
<td>Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>PSY 371 &amp; labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>PSY 571, 772 &amp; labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription equipment</td>
<td>Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zotero</td>
<td>Classes and labs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflect:

*How does the program take General Education into account in its curricular planning and development?*

General Education (GE) represents the University’s core commitment to liberal education, and programs that contribute to GE help advance the knowledge, methods, and skills that every SF State graduate should master. Undergraduates at SF State can take three lower-division Psychology courses as part of the GE requirement: PSY 111 Logic and Psychology Critical Thinking (A3: Critical Thinking), PSY 171 Quantitative Reasoning in Psychology (B4: Math / QR), and PSY 200 General Psychology (E1: Lifelong Learning Development; D1: Social Sciences). These lower division courses allow students to explore the major while fulfilling GE requirements. These lower division courses also provide foundational knowledge that promotes success in the Psychology major upper division courses. PSY 205 (a GE course as part of the FYE program) will be offered for the first time in Fall 2019.

In GE courses, students are exposed to major ideas in the field, including key concepts in statistics, logic, learning and general Psychology.

*How do GE courses in the program reach out to non-majors and frame disciplinary methods and knowledge within broader educational contexts? Do they succeed?*

GE courses are distinct from other courses in the major in their effort to engage and challenge a diverse cross-section of students in broadly resonant ways. They showcase the signature strengths of the Department, including its most gifted teaching faculty, while serving the university’s mission and shared values.

The Psychology Department evaluated and revised PSY 171 and PSY 200 as part of the SFSU Student Success in Majors Initiative Grant in 2017. The course revisions were designed to attract and increase success of students from all backgrounds. Revisions included an increase in advising opportunities to students in lower division courses. The increase in advising include access to Psychology Peer Advisors (i.e., students enrolled in PSY 680 Peer Advising in Psychology), access to the Department’s office staff, and PSY 200 tutoring provided by upper division Psychology students. Regarding PSY 171, we removed the traditional textbook and relied on instructional materials tied to the specific learning outcomes identified for B4 GE requirements. This adjustment provides the instructor autonomy to tailor the teaching style to SF State students.
**How does the curriculum (both GE and in the major) reflect current and future directions in the discipline?**

The Department recently engaged in a thorough evaluation of the major and re-structured our curricular and course goals and objectives to reflect new APA standards for undergraduate education. As described above, the Department uses campus-wide opportunities to evaluate and revise its curriculum and course material. Specifically, PSY 111 and 171 were recently revamped to incorporate the most current pedagogy and curriculum.

The field of Psychology has incorporated the scientific method in almost all areas of application. The scientific method is used to evaluate clinical treatments, parenting styles, school programs, business trainings, and conduct academic research. Because T/TT faculty are researchers, we model for students what it means to be an empirical researcher and provide them opportunities to serve in our research labs (PSY 699 Independent Study) and complete an Honors Research Project (PSY 697 Senior Project Preparation; PSY 698 Senior Project in Psychology). This expertise also means that faculty, as active contemporary researchers, can and do incorporate the newest science into their courses. Our emphasis on science and research has had a direct impact on student learning. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of graduating seniors report (in exit survey) feeling competent in the area of scientific methods either “somewhat” or “to a great extent.” Upon graduation, approximately 21% of students have participated as a Research Assistant in a faculty research lab; 57% of students report that they have designed a research study as part of a class or program; 78% of students have served as a research participant in a research study by the time they graduate, and 91% of those students report that the experience was “somewhat” or “very” valuable.

On a departmental level, we focus on current interventions and major foci of research in the field (e.g., minority stress, positive Psychology). This comes up, for example, in the context of discussion about departmental goals and hiring plans. All faculty use the most recent Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) and textbooks incorporating the most current diagnostic models and research for courses. Additionally, many courses incorporate new peer-reviewed articles in curriculum, updating readings each semester or year.

Current and future directions of the field are reflected in individual courses as well: In PSY 200 (a GE course), at least 3 different faculty members are brought in to discuss current research each semester. Our FYE course, PSY 205, has been designed to reflect the most current issues in the field; it will be first offered in Fall 2019. The course is designed to allow students to study and explore topics that are interesting and relevant to them.
directly, while encouraging metacognitive skills and critical thinking. A variable topic course, PSY 300 (Current Issues in Psychology), allows faculty to develop new and specific courses relevant to their individual expertise. These courses often provide the basis for new courses introduced later to the curriculum, and allow us the flexibility to address student needs within a quickly changing field. Recent changes in APA recommendations for reporting statistical results have been incorporated into PSY 371 and other courses. The “replication crisis” in the field (whereby the findings of many seminal social Psychology studies have not been replicated in later studies) has been discussed in numerous courses. Discussions of the impact of cultural and social diversity are incorporated into numerous courses.

A recent faculty decision to encourage student participation in active research projects on campus resulted in a requirement that students complete a certain amount of time as participants in research studies (or an alternative activity) in PSY 200, 371, and 400. This requirement involves students as participants in active research projects on campus, exposing them in a more “hands-on” way to current research. In the 5 years prior to this policy implementation, approximately 78% of graduating seniors reported having participated in a research study, and 91% of those found it to be a “somewhat valuable” or “very valuable” experience. The new policy will provide even more students with the opportunity to participate in research, and will allow another opportunity for students to understand the relationship of scientific research and the research model to the field and the profession. This policy also brings our Department in line with other highly competitive programs in Psychology at other universities (e.g., University of California) that have long required undergraduate student research participation.

**In developing each semester’s schedule, how does the program align course offerings with student need? How does the program attempt to avoid bottlenecks and advance student degree progress? Does it balance core requirements with elective courses, and are these evenly distributed among faculty in the program? How does the program assure that required courses are offered frequently enough, and in spaces and times that meet student demand?**

Prior to impaction status, PSY 371 and 400 were bottleneck courses that prevented transfer students from being able to take content courses in the major that required these prerequisites. Currently, bottlenecks are minimized/addressed through a combination of student advising and curriculum design.

We provide advising opportunities to students throughout their SFSU tenure. The advising is designed to help students feel engaged in the major while encouraging them to take courses in an optimal sequence. Currently, there is an orientation at the beginning of the
freshmen year, and again at the beginning of the second year (to prepare students to apply to the major). We work to avoid bottlenecks by directing students when they should take required (more in-demand) courses in the major during PSY 303 Psychology: Major and Profession. Specifically, students in PSY 303 meet with a Psychology Advisor (Faculty Advisor or Peer Advisor) to design a course roadmap and learn when to take the Core courses in the major.

Two of our Core classes (PSY 371 and 400) are most effective when taken in sequence; while sections of each class are offered every semester, more seats are available each fall in PSY 371 and more seats in the Spring of PSY 400. Students are encouraged in advising to utilize this sequencing to make it easier for them to enroll.

Student demands for course offerings are met by offering all Core courses each semester and two of the Core requirements online with unlimited enrollment (PSY 303 and PSY 690). The flexibility in the major requirements (Appendix I, Psychology Department Roadmap) also helps the Psychology Department meet student demands for course offerings. Students select from a list of options to fulfill 18 units of Basic (or “Area”) Courses and 9 units of Electives. This flexibility of choosing from a list of courses enables the Psychology Department to offer the courses that align with faculty expertise and schedule needs. The flexibility also allows us to determine student interests objectively by courses most commonly filled, such as PSY 493 Motivation.

The distribution of courses includes Core requirements (14 units), Basic/Area courses selected from a list of options in three topic areas (18 units), and Electives in any area of Psychology (9 units) (see Appendix I). This distribution of courses provides a proper balance of structure and flexibility for students.

Course assignments are a collaborative effort between the Chair and the faculty and are negotiated initially by faculty through their Concentration Coordinators: (1) The normal teaching load (without buyout) for T/TT faculty members is 9 WTU per semester, which typically involves a combination of undergraduate, graduate and supervision courses. No more than 3 WTU of supervision can count toward the 9 WTU requirement. (2) Graduate courses required to sustain each concentration are typically filled first (and generally taught by T/TT faculty) because they require instructors with Ph.D.s and are more costly to staff. Undergraduate courses are then staffed with T/TT faculty and supplemented with our lecturer database. (3) The assignment of all courses corresponds to faculty hiring expectations, the expertise or interest required to teach the courses (e.g., a faculty member specified as a “Quantitative” hire is generally one of those responsible for teaching PSY 371, our core Statistics course), or preferred teaching assignments. The majority of courses, including Core courses, are assigned in this way. (4) Each concentration has a handful of
“Area Courses” that are directly connected to its content area, or are directly related to faculty specialty areas (e.g., the Developmental concentration is initially responsible for staffing PSY 330 Child Psychology and PSY 440 Developmental Psychology, as well as graduate courses in the content area). After initial assignments have been made, Concentration Coordinators work with the Department Chair to fill in any remaining gaps in the schedule, including through lecturer positions. (5) Faculty history, experience, and preferences are taken into account at each of these steps.

How does the program plan the curriculum with the faculty as a whole? How are decisions about curriculum made? Do all faculty have the opportunity to review and respond to courses that may not be in their area of expertise, but are part of the curriculum as a whole? How is this feedback taken into account in the curricular development process?

Curricular planning can begin with faculty recognition of changes in the field, student concerns or interest, or faculty interest, among other reasons. When curricular questions or suggestions have been raised (either programmatic or course-specific), the topic is referred to the Department Curriculum Committee for consideration (this committee includes representatives from each Programmatic area as well as the Graduate and Undergraduate Coordinators); faculty members may be explicitly invited to attend meetings if the conversation is directly related to their interests or subject area (all faculty members are always welcome to attend these meetings). Once the Curriculum Committee has discussed ideas and developed a proposal or suggestions, these are presented to all faculty (generally in faculty meetings). At this point, all faculty have the opportunity to review and respond to courses and curricular changes, even those that may not fall directly within their area of expertise. The Curriculum Committee then reviews this feedback from faculty, makes necessary revisions, and course proposals are submitted for campus review in accordance with policy.

How does the program’s GWAR course address how writing is done in the field? Has student writing improved as a result of GWAR courses?

Our GWAR courses have an emphasis on APA-style, which is important not only in psychological science but in other fields as well. Student writing improves from GWAR in part because of the variations in writing topics offered. Although our GWAR courses have the same student learning objective and general structure, each GWAR instructor designs the course around a topic within their expertise (e.g., happiness, human development, workforce development). The variation in writing topic across GWAR offerings allows students to choose a topic most interesting to them and facilitates student engagement.
In 2012 (prior to implementation of our current GWAR structure), 83% of students believed the major improved their written communication skills and 80% of students believe the major improved their oral communication skills; these numbers have been consistent historically. More specific, additional data collected in the past 5 years suggest that at graduation 60% of students feel that they have developed writing skills related to communication of psychological concepts “to a great extent” and another 34% reported that they felt their written communication of psychological concepts had improved “somewhat.”

With no formal mechanism for assessing student writing competence currently in place, and a great degree of flexibility in the timing of students’ completion of the GWAR course (many students complete GWAR in their final semester), there has been no documented change in departmental assessment of student writing skills since GWAR courses began to be offered in the Department. Anecdotally, some faculty have expressed serious concern about the loss of English course requirements outside the Department based on perceived decreases in student writing competence upon entering their GWAR course.

It would be worthwhile to consider implementation of a more formal evaluation at the end of the GWAR courses, perhaps a survey that asks students about specific aspects of their writing and whether they feel their writing has improved. Additional assessment tools could be included in our Department exit survey.

*How does the culminating experience represent an appropriate level of achievement for the discipline? How does it prepare students to integrate their disciplinary knowledge and make connections between their GE, major, and elective courses?*

As described briefly above, we currently have two courses that all students in the major complete, one at the beginning and one at the conclusion of the major (PSY 303 & 690; 1 unit each). In these courses, students:

- Complete a major roadmap and receive extensive advising
- Explore career options and receive resources and information
- Conduct an informational interview with faculty
- Develop a CV and have the chance to work on a personal statement
- Complete their graduation application

In addition to our bookend courses (PSY 303 and 690), at this time all majors applying for graduation complete an end-of-major assessment. This assessment requirement allows students the opportunity to reflect on all the courses they have completed in the major and a chance to think about the most influential and significant experiences in the major.
Due to the large number of undergraduate students and small number of T/TI faculty (39.7:1 SFR), it is difficult to envision a way that we could incorporate another seminar-style type course or individual mentoring opportunity to be accessed by all majors, nor is it feasible to require all students to complete another course (like Honors courses or Independent Studies). However, as we engaged in the self-study process, we were inspired by the descriptions of possible culminating experiences, and are engaging in further conversation on this matter. Although current staffing and resource limitations make it impossible to incorporate an additional seminar or Core course required of all students, other possible options for development of a culminating experience include:

- Students could submit a reflection on a topic of interest they learned about in the major that was most important to them.
- Students might create an online portfolio which includes an assignment from each course taken.
- It might be possible to adapt existing courses to be structured as a culminating experience. For example, a GWAR course could include information about careers; opportunities in PSY 558/559 (Field Services) could be expanded to students with a variety of career goals (although currently we do not have the capacity to require this course for all students).

**How does the program make it possible for transfer students to enter upper division coursework without burdening them with excessive prerequisites?**

Currently, our major is designed to facilitate transfer students entering upper division coursework smoothly. For example, we accept Introductory or General Psychology courses from any college or university. And, although students who complete four years on our campus have Pre-Psychology courses available to them, there is no requirement that transfer students complete these lower division courses.

Our Core courses are scheduled with the expectation that large numbers of students will transfer into the major in the fall (offering many seats in PSY 371, a Core course and prerequisite for many other Psychology courses; we then offer many seats of PSY 400, the sequenced Core course, each Spring semester).

Since impaction, we have been able to provide adequate seats in PSY 371, 431, and 440 every fall, and these courses are recommended for transfer students in their first semester. Prior to impaction status, PSY 371 and 400 acted as bottlenecks that prevented transfer students from being able to take content courses in the major that required these prerequisites.
How are the high impact practices working for students?

An FYE course (PSY 205), to be taught for the first time in Fall 2019, is designed to allow students to explore issues that are interesting to them personally, while encouraging metacognitive development and critical thinking skills.

In 2018, the Psychology faculty voted to incorporate participation in a research study (as a participant) as a foundational component of three of our Core courses (PSY 200, 371, and 400). Participating in a research study is a specific type of hands-on, experiential learning. Students having the opportunity to participate in a research study exposes them to “real world” research and how it is conducted, and allows them to observe methodological implementation and design up close.

As described above, in the 5 years immediately preceding this policy implementation, approximately 78% of graduating seniors reported having participated in a research study, and 91% of those found it to be a somewhat or very valuable experience. The new policy will provide even more students with the opportunity to participate, and more context for students to understand the relationship of the experience to the major.

Research Projects: All T/TT faculty maintain an active research lab in which they supervise some number of undergraduate and graduate students. Each student enrolled in PSY 699 (undergraduate research supervision) or PSY 799 (graduate research supervision) with a faculty member receives hands-on, individual guidance and experience in the various stages of research. Illustratively, between 8-12% of students are enrolled in PSY 699 in any given semester, and approximately 20% of students report having served as a Research Assistant at some point during their time in the major. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of those students found this to be a valuable experience.

- A recent faculty survey (n=13) indicates that the number of students each faculty member supervises as research assistants ranges from 4-25 undergraduate and graduate students each semester, with an average (and median) number of 12 students per faculty member.
- Faculty research is linked with student success. In the five years prior to Fall 2018, 43% of faculty peer-reviewed papers, 28% of conference presentations, and 80% of conference posters were co-authored by students.

Between 8-15 senior undergraduate students each year enroll in the Psychology Honors Program, a 4-course, year-long program in which students design and carry out their own research study, including writing the study up at the end of the year. Applicants to the program are required to have a 3.5 GPA, the endorsement of a faculty advisor who agrees to supervise their research project, to have completed statistics (PSY 371) and methods
(PSY 400) Core Courses, and to submit a written research proposal as an application. Many of these projects lead to publications and presentations at local, national, and international conferences in collaboration with faculty advisors.

- Upwards of 75% of honors students are applying to graduate school in any year (often 100%); in the past 10 years, honors students applying to graduate programs have a 90-100% acceptance rate.

The Psychology Department has a long history of supporting underserved, underrepresented students with a large number of high impact practices (e.g., internships, capstones, and research experience) through its former NIH-funded Career Opportunities in Research (“COR”) from 2000-2014, and currently through its participation and collaboration with the SF Build program.

In a recent survey, faculty addressed their use of high impact practices in courses. Student exit data demonstrate the success of these practices:

**Writing Intensive:** Two-thirds of responding faculty (12/18) indicated that they would consider at least one of the classes they teach (other than GWAR) to be writing intensive. Ninety-four percent (94%) of our majors report that their writing has improved during their time in the program.

**Collaborative Assignments and Projects:** 83% (15/18) of faculty indicated that they use collaborative assignments in at least one class.

**Global and Diversity Learning Strategies:**

- 44% (8/18) responding faculty members indicated that they use elements of global and diversity learning strategies in all of their classes; an additional 28% (5/18) use strategies in 1-2 of their courses. 28% (5/18) indicated this isn’t a teaching strategy they use.
- Student exit surveys demonstrate that 95% of students report having broadened appreciation and awareness of different cultural perspectives by the time they graduate from the program.
- The Psychology Department has one of the very few international/study abroad programs at the University. Since the program’s inception in 2017, more than 40 students have had the opportunity to travel for an extended period to China, and engage in service work directly related to children’s social emotional development.

**Service/Community Based Learning:** 33% (6/18) of faculty indicated that they use service learning in some way in at least one of their courses. Community-based learning is formally built into our PSY 558/559 courses, in which students engage in a community
service placement for a certain number of credits in PSY 559, and receive academic
guidance and support while engaged in this experience as part of PSY 558.

**Internship Programs:** Approximately 40% of faculty indicated some involvement with
internship programs. Many of our undergraduates, and nearly all of our graduate students,
complete some form of internship experience during their time at SF State.

**Capstone Courses and Projects:**
As described above, approximately 8-15 senior undergraduate students each year enroll in
the Psychology Honors Program, a year-long program in which students design and carry
out their own research study, including writing the study up at the end of the year; many of
these projects are written up as publications or submitted as posters at local and national
conferences in collaboration with faculty advisors.

**Other High Impact Practices:**
Another high impact practice is our Peer Advising/Mentoring program, in which
Psychology majors provide general advising to their peers as part of the Peer Advising
program (PSY 680), and peer tutoring provided to students in PSY 200. These two
programs provide important opportunities to both the students receiving the
mentoring/advising, as well as those being trained as peer mentors and advisors.
Graduating student exit surveys indicate that more than half of our majors (54%) received
peer advising, and upwards of 80% of those students found it to be helpful.

In yearly exit surveys from 2012 until today, between 21-26% of graduating
undergraduate students report having acted as a research assistant in a research lab; of
those students, 90-97% each year report that the experience was valuable.

One of the most exciting new, high-impact opportunities available to our students is the
Psychology Study Abroad program in China. Assessment data have suggested that student
participation in this program has increased student success in a variety of arenas. The
following reflections come from students who participated in the program:

- “The feeling of being accepted and welcomed into another country is so warming and
  I’d love to do better and give that feeling to others entering my country. ... There are so
  many different customs and traditions that I have discovered and come to learn since
  being in China that I would say I am much more culturally aware then I was before.
  Also, I believe I have changed in that I have learned more about myself and my abilities
  despite a lack of confidence I hold in myself sometimes. This trip has been challenging
  in the classroom as well as learning about specific cultural customs yet it has been
  extremely rewarding as well which I believe has had a great impact on my resilience
and strength as a person. I feel that I will be returning to America as more culturally aware. Also, I am very excited that I have learned so much from this program about working with kids, working with a large group, classroom management, and so much more and will be able to return with this teaching experience, knowledge and advice.”

• “My heart is swelled from this experience. My mind is clearer and simultaneously more confused than ever before. This program has answered a handful of questions I had about myself and the world and dumped a trunkful more into my head. This program has reminded me of my strengths and how to know when they should not always take up space and my weaknesses and how they can be employed as strengths…. Knowing that we can always teach and learn alongside one another even without a common verbal language is a priceless piece of a knowledge. And yet, there is still so much more to know and grow from. This doesn’t feel like I have finished something at all, but like this program has opened me to new ways I can learn and grow with the world.”

• “The discoveries I have made on this trip have prompted me to question my views of different cultures and the stereotypes that have influenced them. I have realized it is important that I continue to travel and learn more about other cultures in the future. Throughout this experience, I think I have grown to better understand myself. This experience has taught me that I am a very adaptable person, and that is one of my greatest strengths. I think I have become more self-aware throughout this trip, by observing others and constantly being observed. In my interactions with other members of our cohort, I have really gotten to see what kinds of people I like to surround myself with, as well as what kind of person I want to be. I have learned to better accept and embrace different perspectives, both within my own culture and in others. Lastly, I have learned that I enjoy traveling and that this will be an important part of my life in the future. I think that traveling will only lead to further self-discovery and allow me to continue to progress toward being the best version of myself.”

• “Because of this experience, I am more confident in myself and my abilities. I pushed myself out of my comfort zone and immersed myself in a culture I did not know a lot about. I am more confident and inclined to keep pushing myself and get out of my comfort zone. I not only made amazing friends but valued the experience of working closely with students who do not speak the same language… I believe that this program will continue to grow and strengthen and those involved in it will also continue to grow and strengthen.”
How can the student experience in the degree program(s) be improved?

In recent conversations related to the self-study, reflecting on our findings, faculty generated a variety of ideas and proposals for improving the student experience in our undergraduate degree program. Some of these ideas put forward by faculty are listed below.

General proposals:
- Provide students with more hands-on experience across a variety of domains, including counseling, community service, teaching, and/or research. This could take the form of expanding our existing offerings (e.g., PSY 558/559 [Field Services]; PSY 699 [Independent Study/Research Assistant]; PSY 685 [Teaching of Psychology/Teaching Assistant]), or by facilitating new service and internship opportunities on campus or in the community. This would require an increase in T/TT faculty resources.
- Provide students with more information about courses that are frequently offered or have been offered recently (to allow them to plan ahead more effectively).
- Provide information to students about PSY 699 (lab research opportunities) and the Honors Program earlier in their undergraduate career, such as during the orientation course, PSY 303.

Curricular proposals:
- Make additional sections of current courses available.
- Offer more online or hybrid courses.
- Develop a culminating experience.
- Develop new courses to address new developments in the field, such as courses on data science to give our students greater job opportunities outside of Psychology.

Improved career advising:
- An exit survey for graduating seniors in 2012 told us that: 81% of graduating students plan to go to graduate school. Of those planning to attend graduate school, 57% hope to receive an M.A. in mental health, 18% are planning to pursue a M.A. in a non-mental health field, 14% are planning a Ph.D. in mental health, 5% are planning a Ph.D. in a non-mental health field, and 8% are planning to get a Psy.D. degree.
- To help students move toward these goals, we provide a number of important resources for students related to their future career opportunities, such as the guidance provided in PSY 690 (a Core course required for graduating seniors), advising available from all faculty members related to career path development, and regular workshops (often hosted by Psi Chi, the Psychology Honor Society) in which faculty members
provide students with information about applying to graduate school, and what to expect after graduation. Some ideas for increased/improved career advising include:

- Develop/provide websites/videos on prepping for various careers.
- Encourage students, particularly during early advising sessions, to engage in extracurricular activities, including acting as a teaching assistant (TA) or engaging in lab work.
- Provide visibility into the graduate school process and/or job applications (e.g., letters of recommendation, interviewing).
- Make students aware of campus resources like Ulink (for identifying internship and volunteer opportunities) and the CoSE Student Success Center, etc.

Plan:

*What are the program’s most pressing needs and challenges in the area of curriculum?*

**Limited resources provide challenges to student success:**

- The clear need, identified in the 6th Cycle report, is an increase in faculty resources. Our undergraduate student-faculty ratio is nearly double most departments in CoSE and well above the campus average. T/TT staffing has been essentially flat from 2002 to present and has declined by 20% since 2016.
- T/TT faculty are needed to adequately to cover, strengthen, and develop required courses to accommodate the needs of students.
- Current courses listed in the bulletin and Psychology Major Roadmap are frequently not offered (or are under-offered) because we do not have enough faculty resources.
- Increased access to advising with additional faculty will improve our student outcomes and experience.
- Limited faculty resources have the effect of decreasing our capacity for curricular innovations.
- The writing ability of our students needs improvement. However, faculty serving such a large number of students are challenged to effectively incorporate meaningful writing assignments.
- Space – we need bigger rooms (and access to bigger rooms) to accommodate more students. Additional space could be utilized for computer labs, larger classrooms to accommodate growing enrollment, and for conducting human subjects research which is space-intensive. The Department’s allocated space is 16,271 square feet less than its entitlement, using CSU space entitlement formulas. This issue is addressed in detail in Section 3.5. In brief, because of the limited space available to the Psychology Department, our majors and their classes are spread all over campus with no central location to congregate, collaborate or to build the type of community explicitly
endorsed by the proposed plans for the new science building (which include an open design intended to foster collaboration). Most students currently come to the EP building for office hours, labs, or to go to departmental offices.

A variety of campus-wide barriers interfere with our ability to support our students most effectively:

- The course development and approval process is burdensome and slow; our students would benefit if this process were aligned/streamlined.
- General Education requirements are confusing to both faculty and students, frequently changing, quite hard to advise, and would benefit from simplification.

We would like to provide increased offerings/opportunities for our students in a variety of areas:

- Provide more quantitative training for the kinds of non-Psychology positions available in the workforce of today.
- Modernize our curriculum even further, and include more courses in neuroscience, technical methods, artificial intelligence.
- Provide more support for our TAs/GTAs; this would improve not only their learning outcomes and training opportunities, but increased GTA/TA involvement has also been shown to dramatically increase student learning in the classes they serve.

We would like to increase or enhance campus-wide collaborations and opportunities to advance student opportunities and success:

- Build proactive bridges with other departments, especially computer science and economics.
- Providing access to internship opportunities, like those listed in ULink.

How will the program revise its curriculum to address those needs and challenges?

The Curriculum Committee continues to meet and review program needs; in addition, the graduating student assessment survey ("exit survey") provides us with information about student needs. We will also continue to build out the program in areas that are reflected in society and that represent the innovative and important directions in which the field is heading. Data science is one of the highest ‘in-demand’ areas with respect to employment opportunities. Psychology, with its emphasis on working with data, statistics, machine learning, and neural networks is ideally positioned to train and place graduates who are proficient in data science. The Department with be developing an “Introduction to Data Science” Course for Psychology majors in 2019. Our hope is that this course will become a
staple for Psychology majors who have the quantitative skills and background to become proficient in this area.

In order to do so, we are forced to engage in a careful balance between maintaining a cutting-edge, current curriculum in an understaffed and under-resourced situation, but consistently place student success at the center of that analysis. When resources allow, we consider adding new courses. We also work to implement revisions within the existing courses. One example is a course we have on the books called “The development of maleness/femaleness”. That clearly needs revision, but we can do that within the course and through a title change. Additional innovations in data science are being incorporated into the methods and stats courses. Similarly, we diligently incorporate new/emerging topics through GWAR (PSY 305) and other variable topics courses (e.g., PSY 300, Current Issues in Psychology).

As a Department, we will continue to advocate for additional hires until we have, at minimum, reached average University-wide Student-to-Faculty ratios.
Section 3.3.2: The Curriculum - Graduate Programs

Psychology Masters Programs: Overview

The Department offers two graduate programs in Psychology, a Master of Arts and a Master of Science, each with three unique concentrations. The M.A. program includes concentrations in Developmental Psychology; Social, Personality and Affective Science Psychology; and Mind, Brain, and Behavior. The M.S. program includes Clinical Psychology, School Psychology, and Industrial/Organizational Psychology. In addition, the Department offers a School Psychology Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program. The credential is offered jointly through our School Psychology program and the College of Extended Learning.

Although there are six concentrations, there is considerable overlap in coursework between them (see Tables 19-21, below). Recently, the Department aligned the concentrations within each Masters program to comply with CSU Executive Order 1071, which mandated that individual concentrations share at least 50% of their units in common courses. This alignment was achieved for the M.A. concentrations, and for the Clinical and School Psychology M.S. concentrations. Alignment of the I/O Psychology concentration is not possible, however, due to external accreditations that require a greater number of units for both Clinical (60 units) and School (57 units) compared to I/O Psychology (37 units) that has no external accreditation requirements. Therefore, the Department has applied to elevate the I/O Psychology concentration to a separate, stand-alone, M.S. program. As of this writing, the proposal has been approved at the University level and is awaiting final approval from the CSU administration. The coursework for each concentration, with overlapping courses required for degree attainment identified, is presented below.

Assignments of T/TT faculty within graduate concentrations are presented in Table 29 of Section 3.4. Some faculty are assigned to more than one concentration, and one faculty member is not assigned to a concentration due to the fact that the Department does not offer a graduate degree in their area of expertise. It should be noted, however, that faculty do not operate in “silos” with relation to course teaching assignments and graduate student supervision. For example, faculty frequently supervise graduate students in concentrations outside the ones to which they are assigned, both in research labs and culminating experiences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Developmental</th>
<th>MBB</th>
<th>SPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSY 730</td>
<td>Seminar in Current Issues in Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 737</td>
<td>Laboratory in Observation of Children's Behavior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 739</td>
<td>Technical Writing for Psychological Journals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 740</td>
<td>Seminar in Social Psychology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 742</td>
<td>Seminar in Survey Research</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 751</td>
<td>Seminar in Current Trends and Issues</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 770</td>
<td>Research Methods and Techniques</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 771</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance and Experimental Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 772</td>
<td>Applications of Multiple Regression to Psychological Research</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 792</td>
<td>Proseminar in Foundations of Contemporary Psychological Research</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 798</td>
<td>Research Colloquium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 799</td>
<td>Supervised Selected Research</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 839</td>
<td>Field Experience in Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 891</td>
<td>Seminar in Selected Problems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 896</td>
<td>Directed Reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 898</td>
<td>Master's Thesis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 20. Master of Science Concentration Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUN 719</td>
<td>Behavior Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 721</td>
<td>Clinical Methods: Assessment of Intel. &amp; Percep./Motor Functioning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 722</td>
<td>Clinical Methods: Personality Appraisal &amp; Projective Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 723</td>
<td>Clinical Methods: Psychological Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 724</td>
<td>Clinical Issues: Drugs, Brain, and Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 728</td>
<td>Conference to Accompany Psychology Practicum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 729</td>
<td>Psychology Practicum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 735</td>
<td>Seminar: Therapeutic and Developmental Change I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 736</td>
<td>Seminar: Therapeutic and Developmental Change II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 770</td>
<td>Research Methods and Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 821</td>
<td>Clinical Methods: Diagnosis and Advanced Psychopathology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 822</td>
<td>Clinical Methods: Marital &amp; Family Systems Theory &amp; Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 828</td>
<td>Conference to Accompany Advanced Psychology Practicum</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 829</td>
<td>Advanced Psychology Practicum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 855</td>
<td>Seminar in Professional School Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 891</td>
<td>Seminar in Selected Problems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 896</td>
<td>Directed Reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; 896EXM</td>
<td>Culminating Experience Examination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or PSY 898</td>
<td>Master's Thesis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 763</td>
<td>Transition Planning for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 772</td>
<td>Assessment, Curriculum, and Instruction for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 788</td>
<td>Law, Ethics, and Instructional Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 801</td>
<td>Development, Diversity, and English Language Learners: Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. Proposed Master of Science Program in Industrial/Organizational Psychology (Currently a Master of Science Concentration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSY 770</td>
<td>Research Methods and Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 772</td>
<td>Applications of Multiple Regression to Psychological Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 760</td>
<td>Seminar in Organizational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 761</td>
<td>Industrial and Organizational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 762</td>
<td>Seminar in Industrial Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 765</td>
<td>Industrial Training Program Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 766</td>
<td>Psychological Foundations of Organizational Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 768</td>
<td>Seminar to Accompany Field Experience in Industrial/Organizational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 769</td>
<td>Field Experience in Industrial/Organizational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives (6 units)</td>
<td>Selected with the approval of an advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 896EXM</td>
<td>Culminating Experience Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or PSY 898</td>
<td>Master's Thesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Coordination
Administration of the graduate concentrations is provided by 1) Concentration Coordinators, 2) the Graduate Services Coordinator, and 3) the Graduate Coordinator. Concentration Coordinators oversee and manage each concentration. The Concentration Coordinator is a faculty member (sometimes two) in each concentration who is responsible for responding to inquiries from prospective graduate students, maintaining the concentration website and alumni contacts, assisting with internship and post-graduate employment opportunities, and coordinating application review and/or interviews for the yearly applicants. Concentration Coordinators are chosen by faculty in the concentration. There is no compensation for the role, aside from its consideration as part of the faculty member’s service responsibilities. The Concentration Coordinators work directly with the Graduate Services Coordinator, a staff member who provides clerical and administrative support to each Concentration Coordinator, including assistance with recruiting and outreach, application intake and management, general inquiries from prospective students,
and Culminating Experience administrative paperwork. In addition, there is a Graduate Coordinator who elected by the Department faculty and acts as a liaison between the six graduate concentrations (and their Concentration Coordinators), the Chair, and the Department at large. The Graduate Coordinator has ex-officio positions on the Curriculum and Advisory Committees, represents the Department at SFSU grad council meetings, and is a designated signer for graduate advising forms (including Culminating Experience forms, IRB applications, and applications for graduation).

Program Recruitment and Admissions
Graduate program recruitment is implemented on a general basis through the Department website, outreach to local universities, and events (e.g., prospective student open house) administered by the Graduate Services Coordinator. Targeted recruitment varies by concentration but includes information disseminated through concentration websites, networking with local universities and employers, and advertising through professional societies. Qualified San Francisco State undergraduates are also recruited through classroom, advising, and research lab contact. Admission requirements vary by concentration but include, at a minimum, a Bachelor’s degree with a GPA of 3.0 or above, the general GRE exam, and three letters of recommendation. The number of applicants, admitted students, and yield rates are presented in more detail in the specific section for each concentration.

Program Standards and Culminating Experiences
As indicated above, there is variability in the courses and the number of units that are required for each concentration.

Financial Support for Graduate Students
Financial support for students is not guaranteed. Each academic year, the Department has 7-10 Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) positions for the activity sections of the two undergraduate research methods and statistics courses (PSY 371 and 400). The majority of these positions are funded in the instructional budget, and the remainder are funded through the Department’s discretionary funds. Typically, GTA positions are advertised to incoming and current graduate students with the expectation that there is a competitive application process. All psychology graduate students can pursue GTA positions if they meet the skill requirements (e.g., statistics background).

In addition, faculty with active grants are able to fund Graduate Research Assistants. The number of these positions is highly variable and dependent on faculty extramural funding. Finally, the Provost Scholar Award provides one year of in-state tuition to an incoming out-of-state graduate student. The Department must apply for this award and typically receives one per year for a single member of the entire incoming graduate class.
The lack of financial support for graduate students has been a point of concern for students and faculty over many years. This lack of support (particularly the lack of tuition waivers, regular GTA support, and graduate research funding) negatively impacts enrollment overall and frequently results in the loss of top candidates who choose institutions that provide funds to all incoming students. This limitation is a significant barrier to recruiting and impacts all of our graduate concentrations.

Program-Specific Details
In order to provide the most accurate and detailed description of the graduate concentrations, faculty members from each concentration have provided expanded information and highlights about the six programs, below.
**Psychology MS Programs:**

Master of Science in Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology

Table 22. I/O Graduate Program Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted Students</th>
<th>Enrolled Students</th>
<th>% of students admitted</th>
<th>% of students who actually enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/O Psychology</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/O Psychology</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/O Psychology</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/O Psychology</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/O Psychology</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Institutional Research*

**Reflect**

*Please reflect on the application/admission/enrollment information. What do these numbers mean to the program? Do you have enough students (too many? too few?), enough students of sufficient quality, enough diverse students?*

Admission into the I/O graduate program is very competitive. The program consistently turns away students who would successful in our program. From 2014 to 2018, the I/O graduate program received an average of 107 applications per year enrolled, but enrolled an average of 11 students per year. We maintain a cohort size of 10 to 14 to ensure close mentorship relationships and maintain high quality internships.

The high quality applicant pool has led to cohorts rich in diversity. The cohorts are selected to have a diverse set of skills and professional backgrounds so that students can learn from each other. The cohorts generally comprise of in-state, out-of-state, and international students. For example, the Fall 2018 cohort of 12 students included 3 international students.

*What evidence does the program regularly solicit and collect to indicate whether course offerings and schedules address graduate students’ needs?*
The graduate program has three student learning objectives (PLOs) to ensure we are meeting student needs:

- **Program Learning Objective 1** – To develop knowledge of theory-based research on employee selection, performance appraisal, training and development, work motivation, employee attitudes, and teamwork and leadership in organizations.
- **Program Learning Objective 2** – To attain skills in how to conduct a job/task analysis, selection procedures, a training needs assessment, a program evaluation, an organizational change initiative, and surveys in organizations.
- **Program Learning Objective 3** – To develop an understanding of the legal and ethical guidelines relevant to I/O Psychology.

The PLOs were created by reviewing the core topics listed within I/O psychology by APA Division 14’s professional society: Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology (SIOP; www.siop.org). In addition, our course content aligns closely to the course content required by I/O psychology PhD graduate programs, which enables our graduates the option of continuing their education. We evaluate our pursuit of the PLOs using student feedback collected by the Department’s Assessment Committee. This feedback is used to adjust our curriculum to better meet our PLOs.

Courses have been developed and sequenced to ensure we are meeting the student learning objectives. The I/O program was evaluated based on these student learning objectives by the Psychology Department Assessment Committee in AY 2016-2017 and will continue to be evaluated every four years using comprehensive methods, such as surveys and focus groups of students. A copy of the Program’s comprehensive assessment plan is attached as Appendix I. Each course is designed to ensure that the student learning objective is either Introduced, Developed, or Mastered:

- **PLO 1 Introduced:**
  - PSY761 Fall Year 1
  - PSY765 Fall Year 1
- **PLO 1 Developed:**
  - PSY762 Spring Year 1
- **PLO 1 Mastered:**
  - PSY896 w/ PSY896EXM or PSY898 Spring Year 2
- **PLO 2 Introduced:**
  - PSY761 Fall Year 1
  - PSY765 Fall Year 1
  - PSY770 Spring Year 1
  - PSY772 Spring Year 1
- **PLO 2 Developed:**
How well do course offerings and schedules meet students’ needs (particularly those with work or family demands)?

Our program requires 300 hours of internship during the 2nd year. These internships are traditionally paid (ranging from $15 to $30 per hour). Most students complete more than the required 300 hours. This curriculum requirement enables students to mitigate the cost of graduate school while gaining valuable work experience. In addition, students’ schedules become more flexible in the second year because Year 1 of the program is focused on seminar course content, whereas Year 2 is focused on faculty supervised experiences (internship, research). This curriculum design enables students to focus primarily on working experience and the Culminating Experience project during their 2nd year.

Our courses are primarily structured as once a week during 3-hour blocks. Courses generally fall between Monday and Thursday. This scheduling enables greater flexibility for students with long commutes and non-school demands.

How are graduate culminating experiences managed by the program (by topic, faculty supervision, WTU’s)?

Students have a choice between a comprehensive exam or a thesis. Students who choose the comprehensive exam option are managed/advised collectively by the three (3) I/O faculty. Students taking the exam are enrolled in PSY 896 Direct Reading and PSY 896EXM. Student enrollment (WTU) is distributed evenly among the three (3) I/O faculty.
Students who choose the thesis option are managed based on the primary thesis advisor. The primary thesis advisor is established by faculty - student meetings, but students generally request a faculty member based on topic of interest and mentoring style. The student will enroll in PSY 898 Master Thesis with their primary thesis advisor.

Students select a thesis advisor of their choosing, but the advisor must be an I/O faculty member. Students are encouraged to consider both faculty expertise and mentorship style when making their decision. Students must complete an Oral Proposal Defense to demonstrate they are prepared to pursue a thesis, which is evaluated by both the primary and secondary thesis advisors.

The number of students choosing between the comprehensive exam and thesis varies because students are often influenced by what is currently popular amongst employers. For example, in 2013 we had 6 of 10 students complete the comprehensive exam, whereas in 2019 we had 1 of 11 students complete the comprehensive exam. The recent shift toward the thesis option is likely because businesses are hiring for research-oriented jobs.

The exam and thesis both require the demonstration of expertise in I/O psychology. We advise students of the benefits to both options. Although some employers may have a preference between an exam or thesis during hiring, there is no industry-wide advantage of either option for students seeking employment within a business. We encourage students to choose between the exam and thesis option based on their future job-specific duties. For example, students seeking a research-based position within an organization would likely benefit from a thesis whereas students seeking a human resource generalist position would likely benefit from the comprehensive exam. Students interested in PhD programs are encouraged to complete a thesis because other institutions may count the thesis toward their degree requirements.

*What mechanisms does the program maintain for tracking, assessing, and responding to graduate students’ goals before graduation and success in meeting them afterwards? Performance on professional exams for licensure, credentials, entry to doctoral programs? What are the results of this tracking?*

New I/O graduate students are assigned a second-year student mentor. In addition, new students become members of IOPSA, the I/O Psychology student association which included enrollment in a listserv. That listserv, along with a LinkedIn database, allows us to track alums and maintain an employment network for internships and full-time positions. First year students also receive a performance review from faculty at the end of the first semester which involves a self-rating and in-person meeting with a faculty member (see
Appendix K). A summary of alumni job placement for the last 5 years is included below (see Table 23). As demonstrated in Table 23, 47 of 48 students are working in an I/O-related field.

How effectively does the program achieve the university’s standards for graduate programs? How well does the program assess the effectiveness of its response?

Data supporting program excellence and effectiveness are provided below.

What short or long-term trends affect graduate admission and enrollment? Explain the factors behind these trends. Do trends in the program’s graduate admissions reflect a sustainable level of demand?

Admission trends of I/O Psychology have been primarily influenced by:

- A burgeoning economy in the Bay Area that provides internship and job opportunities for our current students and alumni. Our program requires 300 hours of internships so economic factor can impact attractiveness of the program. In addition, many applicants seek to work and live in the Bay Area after graduation due to the burgeoning economy.
- A growing awareness of the impact I/O psychologist can have in a business setting. Between 2012 and 2022, the Bureau of Labor Statistics forecasts that Industrial/Organizational Psychology will be the fastest growing occupation in the United States [Source: BLS 2014 Report]. The expected level of growth for I/O is 53%, compared to the outlook for growth across all jobs of only 11%. The growth in I/O Psychology career opportunities is evident by the high ratio of recent graduates obtaining employment in the Bay Area in the private (Google, Genentech, PG&E, Twitter, Salesforce, LinkedIn), public (City and County of San Francisco, City of Oakland, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, San Francisco Department of Public Health), and consulting (Gallup, KPMG, McKinsey & Company, Willis Towers Watson, Accenture) sectors.
- Programmatic excellence is demonstrated by two 2018 studies conducted by our flagship professional society (SIOP). The SFSU I/O program was ranked as one of the top 7 masters programs in I/O Psychology in North America and #1 in the entire Pacific Time Zone on the metric of curriculum and student opportunities [Source: Vodanovich, et al. (2018). Ranking I-O master’s programs using objective data from I-O coordinators. TIP: The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 55(4)]. Rankings using student and alumni perceptions also rank the SFSU I/O program among the top six in program culture and top 12 in alumni satisfaction [Source: Acikgoz, et al. (2018). The cream of the crop: Student and alumni perceptions of I-O Psychology
master’s degree program quality. *TIP: The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 55*(4)]. The prior ranking from 2006 also included the program among the top 15 in North America, which demonstrates the long standing success of the I/O program at SF State [Source: Kraiger & Abalos (2004). Ranking graduate programs in I-O Psychology based on student ratings of quality. *TIP: The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 42*(1)].

The application rate and admission ratio for the I/O Graduate Program at SF State reflects these positive factors. From 2004-2011 we received an average of 77 applications per year for 10-12 openings. From 2014-2018 the average number of applications was 107, which represents a 39% increase. A larger applicant pool allows us to be more selective in choosing the top applicants. For example, the average undergraduate GPA for our Fall 2017 cohort is 3.5, and average GRE scores fall in the 49th percentile for quantitative reasoning, 76th percentile for verbal reasoning, and 70th percentile for analytical writing. At least one of our out-of-state students was a recipient of the Provost Scholar non-resident fee waiver for three years in a row, from 2014-2016.

*How are expectations for graduate students set at an appropriate level and distinct from those for undergraduates?*

All required coursework is graduate level. In addition, our students are required to complete a 300-hour internship experience and either a research thesis or comprehensive examinations.

*How do graduate culminating experiences follow clear and consistent guidelines and represent adequate levels of achievement?*

We provide two options for the Culminating Experience: a comprehensive exam or thesis. Both options are overseen and evaluated by multiple faculty. The comprehensive exam is a reading list and exam questions developed by the faculty and graded by all three I/O faculty members. The thesis must be approved and supervised by two faculty thesis committee members (thesis chair and second reader). The supervision and evaluation by multiple faculty members ensures that both projects require a similar minimum requirement and adequate level of achievement.

Students have the option to work closely with a faculty member in the idea generation stage of a thesis or they can work independently. Several steps are taken to ensure the thesis topic is defined appropriately, both in topic and in breadth.
• Students entering the program are given our Thesis Milestone Checklist, which gives students guidance about thesis expectations and the ability to monitor their own progress.
• 1st year students are encouraged to complete their course assignments in PSY 770 Research Methods and Techniques includes several idea generation / design assignments. We encourage students to complete these assignments with their thesis in mind.
• 1st year students have the opportunity to watch the thesis proposal defenses of 2nd year students to learn of the expectations for the thesis.
• 1st year students have the opportunity to work in faculty research labs for elective course credit. Lab experience provides students the opportunity to generate topic ideas directly with a professor.
• Students are required to complete an oral proposal defense. The proposal defense is used to evaluate the student progress, but is also an opportunity to provide feedback and guidance to keep the project in scope.

Both projects provide an opportunity for unlimited overachievement and effort depending upon student goals. For example, thesis overachievement is evident by multiple publications based on student theses in the past 5 years (bold indicates student), and other recent publications including multiple student co-authors:


Both Culminating Experience options also follow clearly outlined deadlines that have been established in prior years to ensure adequate levels of achievement:
Comprehensive Exam
- Declaration of Culminating Experience choice in October of 2nd Year
- Reading list received in November of 2nd Year
- Exam administered over two days in Spring of 2nd Year
- Exam revisions (if necessary) administered over one day in Spring of 2nd Year

Thesis
- Declaration of Culminating Experience choice in October of 2nd Year
- Thesis proposal defense in Fall of 2nd Year
- Ethics review paperwork submitted Fall of 2nd Year
- Final document submitted in Spring of 2nd Year
- Final document revisions (if necessary) submitted in Spring of 2nd Year

How does the program manage the supervision of graduate culminating experiences in a way that maintains both their quality and consistency in faculty workload?

Students choose between thesis and comps. Thesis projects are distributed equitably among faculty to allow for quality and workload balance.

How are graduate students achieving their academic and professional goals?

See Table 23, below.

How effectively does the program balance the needs of its graduate students and undergraduates in its curriculum development, planning, and resource allocation? Is one being served at the expense of the other? How does the Department decide on the appropriate balance?

Our graduate program in I/O psychology requires a minimum of 37 units to graduate. Our course offerings are as follows:

- Fall graduate courses (12 units + elective units):
  - PSY 761 Industrial/Organizational Psychology (3 units)
  - PSY 765 Industrial Training Program Development (3 units)
  - PSY 769 Field Experience in I/O Psychology (3 units)
  - PSY 768 Seminar to Accompany Internship (3 units)
  - Elective Courses (1 to 6 units)
- Spring graduate courses (19 units + elective units)
  - PSY 760 Seminar in Organizational Psychology (3 units)
  - PSY 762 Seminar in Industrial Psychology (3 units)
I/O faculty are responsible for teaching all of the graduate courses in the concentration being offered in any semester. In addition, I/O faculty also teach a section of regression (PSY 772 Applications of Multiple Regression (4 units)) each year, to accommodate and serve the I/O students.

Our undergraduate major program has approximately 5 courses that are specific to the I/O area and are most often taught by I/O faculty (PSY 461 Intro to I/O; PSY 462 Personnel Psychology; PSY 463 Human Factors; PSY 465 Psychology of Work Life Stress; PSY 466 Training and Development in Organizations). All five of these courses are in "Area 3", which means they are part of a longer list of courses from which students must choose at least 2 in order to graduate.

I/O faculty also teach PSY 305GW on a rotating basis. In addition, our Core Courses covering career development are often taught by I/O faculty members: PSY 303 Psychology: The Major and Profession (1 unit) and PSY 690 Future Directions for Psychology Majors (1 unit).

Allocation of Resources:

The I/O faculty teach courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels each semester. Research opportunities (PSY 899, PSY 799, PSY 699) are offered each semester. Dr. Eschleman has taught at least 1 graduate course and 1 undergraduate course each semester during his 6+ years at SFSU. Dr. Sanchez has taught at least 1 graduate course and 1 undergraduate course each semester during her 1+ year at SFSU. Dr. Wright primarily teaches at the graduate level and currently serves as Department Chair. In addition, all of our I/O faculty consistently offer undergraduate courses during Summer and Winter sessions in Online format to better serve the growing undergraduate interest in I/O Psychology.

We ensure that graduate courses are staffed first then seek to meet the demand of undergraduate courses. The I/O faculty are unable to teach all required courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. As a result, we recruit alumni of our graduate program
to serve as adjunct faculty for undergraduate I/O courses. Each semester we have 1-2 graduate alumni teaching undergraduate courses.

Additional Supervision and Teaching Responsibilities:

Both the undergraduate Psychology program and I/O graduate program emphasize the scientific method and research within the curriculum. Our three I/O faculty maintain active research labs that have both graduate (PSY 899, PSY 799) and undergraduate (PSY 699) students earning course credit for their participation. These courses help fulfill required elective units for both degree levels. Graduate students serve as mentors for undergraduate research assistants within the labs to ensure an integrated learning experience.

Plan

*How does the program plan to attract and recruit sustainable cohorts of graduate students?*

Data provided above indicate sufficiently large application pools over time and linear increases since 2011. Application pools are robust enough to maintain selective acceptance rate and were deemed sufficient to elevate the I/O concentration to a stand-alone program.

*How will the program adjust the graduate curriculum to meet changes in the discipline and ensure appropriate levels of rigor?*

The I/O program hired Dr. Diana Sanchez in 2017 to be the 3rd member of the I/O faculty. Dr. Sanchez has expertise and research interests in the application of technology in the workplace, which is a workplace trend within the popular technology sector of the Bay Area.

The internship requirement also enables the program to adapt to changes in the field or needs of local industry. The internship requirement enables students to find employment in a wide range of industries and applications of I/O. Industry and market trends will dictate the jobs available to our students, thus ensuring our students get the most current and necessary real-world experience.

Graduate students are also required to take 6 units of electives (2 courses). The flexibility in the courses students take enables them to self-select curriculum that meets their needs and the changes within their desired workplace industry. For example, recent students have fulfilled electives and gain valuable experience tailored to their career needs by enrolling in faculty guided research courses, advanced statistics courses, business courses, or computer science courses.
How can the program ensure graduate students’ outcomes?

The program will continue to ensure graduate students’ outcomes by adhering to the previously referenced learning objectives, maintaining open dialogue with internship and employment providers through alumni and faculty networks, and increasing staffing levels to ensure quality instruction and Culminating Experience project supervision.

How will the program balance the needs of graduates and undergraduates in its curriculum development and planning?

All course staffing decisions are balanced to assure graduate curriculum needs are met while at the same time providing access to I/O courses at the undergraduate level. It is not currently possible to implement the entire graduate and undergraduate curriculum due to staffing shortages. Undergraduate courses are offered less frequently and staffing in those courses is supplemented with lecturer faculty.

Table 23. I/O Alumni Outcome Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Cohort Graduation Year</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carucci</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Human Resources Analyst II</td>
<td>Placer County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Senior Human Resources Analyst</td>
<td>San Francisco Department of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherr</td>
<td>Trevor</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>HR Systems Manager</td>
<td>Vista Outdoor Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cui</td>
<td>Dai Xi</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Senior Customer Experience Specialist</td>
<td>Intuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeGennaro</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Senior Human Resources Analyst</td>
<td>Oxnard Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guzman-Pederson</td>
<td>J.R.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Human Resources Generalist</td>
<td>Wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>360 Degree Feedback Specialist</td>
<td>Learning as Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurath</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Senior Associate, Talent Insights</td>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Athalie</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Lead Associate, Employee Insights</td>
<td>Willis Towers Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Manager, Employee Experience</td>
<td>Dignity Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>Kenson</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Senior Human Resources Analyst</td>
<td>City and County of San Francisco Department of Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization/Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzel</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Senior Human Resources Analyst</td>
<td>San Francisco Department of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Program Analyst</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doan</td>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>User Experience Researcher</td>
<td>Google</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaur</td>
<td>Amanpreet</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Human Resources Analyst III</td>
<td>City of Petaluma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Organizational Specialist</td>
<td>McKinsey &amp; Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Honta</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Operations and Accounting Administrator</td>
<td>Nike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathieu</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Learning Experience Researcher</td>
<td>Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortiz</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>HR Operations Supervisor</td>
<td>City and County of San Francisco Human Services Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poh</td>
<td>Wan Ying (Felicia)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Human Resources Specialist</td>
<td>Government of Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aborida</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Recruitment and Selection Analyst</td>
<td>AC Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>Rylan</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeRossette</td>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Career Coach</td>
<td>Independent Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddy</td>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Human Resources Specialist</td>
<td>Staffing Solutions Organization LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind-Smith</td>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Human Resources Associate</td>
<td>IPMA-HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Talent Acquisition &amp; Development Specialist</td>
<td>Poll Everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Jocelyn</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager, Learning &amp; Development</td>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romero</td>
<td>Kristopher</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Technical Recruiting Coordinator</td>
<td>FabFitFun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Senior Talent Analytics Lead</td>
<td>Owens Corning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vu</td>
<td>Alyssa</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Workforce Planning Analyst</td>
<td>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisholm</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Software Test Engineer III</td>
<td>Bracket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curran</td>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Global Talent Acquisition Partner</td>
<td>Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fethe</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Generalist</td>
<td>UCSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>People Analytics Analyst</td>
<td>Nutanix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mast</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Research Specialist Consultant</td>
<td>Genentech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestingen</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Human Resource Analytics Assistant</td>
<td>Agero, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Employee Engagement Project Manager</td>
<td>Comcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Personnel Specialist</td>
<td>Santa Monica College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppler</td>
<td>Quentin</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Rewards Analyst</td>
<td>Rakuten USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herring</td>
<td>Jeana</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Training Programs Coordinator</td>
<td>Gilead Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntley</td>
<td>Brenna</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Koff &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenta</td>
<td>Jacquelyn</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Digital Learning Specialist</td>
<td>Fonteva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavick</td>
<td>Hydie</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Development Program Associate</td>
<td>Udemy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upadhyay</td>
<td>Sarita</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Technology Assessment Consultant</td>
<td>3D Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Institutional Research Analyst</td>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>Ruoying (Lara)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen</td>
<td>Lea Lynn</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 24. Clinical Psychology Graduate Program Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted Students</th>
<th>Enrolled Students</th>
<th>% of students admitted</th>
<th>% of students who actually enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institutional Research

Reflect

*Please reflect on the application/admission/enrollment information. What do these numbers mean to the program? Does your program have enough students (too many? too few?), enough students of sufficient quality, enough diverse students?*

For the last several decades we have attracted a large number of applicants for this program (usually over 100 students for our 8 spots). We set the upper limit of the program to eight, as it corresponds to the number of faculty available to train individual students as therapists in clinical supervision. Although the applicant pool, broadly speaking, is not always reflective of the diversity of the Bay Area and beyond (with a higher number of women and white applicants), we are able to select a diverse group of students into the graduate program each year that is roughly equivalent to the demographics of the Bay Area (in terms of gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, etc.) given the large number of solid applicants. The quality of the students that we select is consistently impressive, and the placements where students work often acknowledge our students as among the best clinical psychology graduate students in the area.

The clinical psychology concentration requires 60 units of study over the two-year enrollment period (per the California Board of Behavioral Sciences regulations). Thus, it is rare that clinical students work as GTAs, as they have little time to devote to work outside
of their training. However, all students are given the option to apply for a GTA position should they have the relevant experience and the time to do this work.

**What evidence does the program regularly solicit and collect to indicate whether course offerings and schedules address graduate students' needs?**

The Clinical Program was designed to meet the curricular requirements of the California Board of Behavioral Sciences Master in Family Therapy (MFT) licensure. We have worked to ensure that all aspects of the content that are required for licensure are covered in the program courses. In addition, we regularly solicit feedback from students at multiple points in the program to obtain feedback on the course offerings and schedules. For example, mid-semester course evaluations allow for immediate changes to address unfolding graduate student needs. We also collect feedback in regard to the clinical training experiences that occur outside of the classroom. During a full meeting of 1st and 2nd year students at the end of Year 1, we solicit feedback from students who have had a 2nd year community placement – this informs both the faculty and new students who will be applying to those placements. We also solicit feedback each year (at the mid and endpoints of the year) in regard to the 1st year practicum placement at Edgewood Center for Children and Families and the Psychology Clinic. We also solicit midyear evaluations from all supervisees about their supervision training experience in the clinic in the first year.

**How well do course offerings and schedules meet students’ needs (particularly those with work or family demands)?**

We have consistently scheduled courses so that students are not burdened by too many classes falling back to back. At most, students have 2 courses in one day – but most days students have just one course scheduled. We also leave Fridays open to allow for students to work and to be with their families. Finally, we schedule most of our classes during regular business hours to allow students (especially those with families/family demands) time to be home.

**How are graduate culminating experiences managed by the program (by topic, faculty supervision, WTU’s)?**

The Culminating Experience in the Clinical Psychology program involves completion of a substantial independent project in which students complete a significant independent writing project which essentially involves three major pieces in the final written product: 1) an extensive literature review on a clinically-related issue (e.g., a new treatment, differential diagnosis, application of a treatment to a new population), 2) a comprehensive case formulation detailing the presenting issues and treatment course of a current or
former therapy client, and 3) integration of the theoretical and empirical literature review with the case illustration. In addition to this writing portion, graduate students are also required to give a presentation of the material in the paper to all clinical faculty members and the first- and second-year students in the program.

Based on student and faculty input, we have made changes to the Culminating Experience process in the last few years that have led to nearly all students completing the project on time. Specifically, we have clear deadlines throughout the year to help scaffold their progress (e.g., 10 pages due at the end of the fall semester, and case presentations on their paper to faculty and students in February).

At the end of Year 1, students list their top three preferred readers of their Culminating Experience, along with a description of their topic. Currently all 4.5 faculty members are available to act as readers; however, this will be substantially reduced in the next year given upcoming retirements. Faculty meet together at the end of Year 1 and assign students readers based on the student’s interest, the expertise of the faculty, and the faculty’s availability. We are usually able to assign the student’s first or second choice for their reader. Regarding WTU’s – each student enrolls in 1 unit of PSY 899 in the Fall with their reader and 3 units of PSY 896 for the Spring in Year 2.

*What mechanisms does the program maintain for tracking, assessing, and responding to graduate students’ goals before graduation and success in meeting them afterwards? Performance on professional exams for licensure, credentials, entry to doctoral programs? What are the results of this tracking?*

The program offers sessions to assist students in identifying second year practicum placements that match their goals, and offers similar opportunities for students preparing for post degree clinical experience. The pathways to post-degree employment and licensure are varied, hence tracking is typically more informal based on contacts with members of each cohort. This informal tracking suggests that, for students who choose to pursue licensure as an MFT, the time to license typically ranges from 2 to 4 years post-degree (students must complete at least 2000 clinical hours post-degree, and time to do this varies based on time of post-degree employment).

*How effectively does the program achieve the university’s standards for graduate programs? How well does the program assess the effectiveness of its response?*

The Clinical Psychology graduate program consistently receives a large number of applications (between 70 and 120 over the past several years), with an acceptance rate between 5-12% and a graduation rate of more than 95% over the past five years.
What short or long-term trends affect graduate admission and enrollment? Explain the factors behind these trends. Do trends in the program’s graduate admissions reflect a sustainable level of demand?

There has been a high level of demand for the Clinical graduate concentration, with applications numbers between 70-100 in the last 4 years. Between 80-100% of students offered admission actually enroll. Trends that might impact graduate student admission and enrollment include faculty attrition, availability of graduate tuition remission at other state universities (e.g., San Jose State University), and increased housing costs in the Bay Area. Faculty attrition is particularly likely to affect admission/enrollment in the upcoming years if new faculty are not hired: 40% of clinical faculty who provide required clinical supervision will retire, leaving too few faculty to supervise master’s students’ clinical work.

How are expectations for graduate students set at an appropriate level and distinct from those for undergraduates?

The graduate Clinical concentration is designed such that graduate students receive two years of full-time training in clinical service provision that meets the guidelines established by the California Board of Behavior Sciences. The expectations for graduate students are commensurate with what would be expected of practicing licensed therapists, and therefore is quite distinct from the expectations we have for undergraduates.

How do graduate culminating experiences follow clear and consistent guidelines and represent adequate levels of achievement?

First year graduate students are given clear and consistent guidelines for completing their cumulative experience project (which are revisited again at the beginning of their second year). The guidelines lay out the expected product (a comprehensive written manuscript and case presentation) and what classes should be taken to support their project efforts. The guidelines also outline the entire process from choosing a topic to preparing a case presentation to completing the final written product, thereby offering students a “road map” to their final project.

How does the program manage the supervision of graduate culminating experiences in a way that maintains both their quality and consistency in faculty workload?

Full-time Clinical faculty members are each assigned between 1-2 Clinical master’s student projects per year based on a “best possible” match between the student’s thesis topic and faculty expertise. This process ensures that no faculty member takes on an unequal number
of the projects, and that the quality of mentorship throughout the writing process remains high.

**How are graduate students achieving their academic and professional goals?**

Graduate students engage in master's level coursework focused on theoretical and applied material that is essential to engaging in exceptional clinical practice. In addition to this coursework, graduate students participate in a weekly case conference, which offers professional development opportunities, early experience in group clinical supervision and exposure to visiting experts in cutting-edge fields of psychotherapy. Case conference also offers a time for the students to “check in” with faculty about their progress. In terms of clinical practice, students receive supervised clinical experiences in the on-campus Psychology Clinic and at Edgewood Center for Children and Families. Given the Clinical Psychology program’s exceptional reputation in the local community, students have access to a variety of community-based placements during their second year. These placements often transform into employment opportunities post-graduation and provide training opportunities that are commensurate with PhD clinical programs. After graduation, students go on to complete post-graduate clinical hours required for licensure as a therapist and eventually earn licensure.

**How effectively does the program balance the needs of its graduate students and undergraduates in its curriculum development, planning, and resource allocation? Is one being served at the expense of the other? How does the Department decide on the appropriate balance?**

The Clinical Psychology concentration has decreased from 5.5 full time faculty to 3.5 full time faculty and two (2) members in the Faculty Early Retirement Program. Thus, the majority of the undergraduate courses for Clinical Psychology have been covered by lecturers of late. The Clinical concentration is in dire need of a hire to maintain a balance of graduate and undergraduate teaching.

The Clinical Psychology concentration has ten courses that are in the graduate concentration (not including supervision and Culminating Experience courses). These include 60 units taught each year including two year-long theories classes, an assessment class, a drugs brain and behavior class, two year-long practica seminars and 12 units per semester of individual clinical supervision courses.

In terms of undergraduate courses, Clinical concentration faculty are generally responsible for teaching Abnormal Psychology, Intro to Clinical Psychology, Child Behavior Problems, Theories of Personality, the 558/559 Field Services (internship course), and in the past
Health Psychology and Community Psychology. These are all part of the undergraduate curriculum (some core classes and some electives).

The Clinical concentration has trained countless mental health professionals since the 1950’s, and is recognized for its role in supplying the Bay Area and beyond with well-trained clinicians. Note that the program is intensive and requires a number of faculty to train these students. However, there has not been a consistent replenishment of faculty as clinical faculty have retired. The program has been able to continue by utilizing the work of lectures to cover the undergraduate curriculum. Thus, the Clinical concentration is in dire need of at least 2 hires to maintain a balance of graduate and undergraduate teaching, and this is before two faculty members are set to retire in the next few years.

Plan

**How does the program plan to attract and recruit sustainable cohorts of graduate students?**

The program has undertaken updates to our website (assessment data with current graduate students indicates this is the main source of information for prospective students); expanded outreach in the local area; and revised key features of the admissions process to attract and admit strong cohorts.

**How will the program adjust the graduate curriculum to meet changes in the discipline and ensure appropriate levels of rigor?**

In response to feedback, and as part of our new outreach efforts, the program has introduced more research opportunities for those students who wish to obtain both strong clinical training and experience in clinical research. In recent years, we have introduced a course in Drugs, Brain, and Behavior and incorporated training in evidence-based and trauma informed interventions, resilience models and expanded coverage of sociocultural issues (e.g., immigration, elder care, economic adversity, housing) in mental health to reflect changes in the discipline and educational requirements for licensure. Periodic evaluation data helps us to ensure appropriate rigor.

**How can the program ensure graduate students’ outcomes?**

Formative and summative evaluation of student outcomes are embedded in our intensive supervision model used in our training program—each student’s performance is closely monitored, with ample opportunities for students to address any areas of weakness. Additionally, in their last semester in the program all students do an oral presentation demonstrating their mastery of clinical concepts and applications with clients.
How will the program balance the needs of graduates and undergraduates in its curriculum development and planning?

Balancing the needs of undergraduates and graduates has become increasingly difficult with faculty retirements, and the program has sought (but not received) a new hire to be better able to address new areas of interest of students at both levels, particularly in culturally sensitive and appropriate interventions. The program continues to offer essential courses (i.e., Theories of Personality, Abnormal Psychology) at the undergraduate level, and with additional resources may be able to expand offerings in such areas as Drugs, Brain, and Behavior.
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Table 25. School Psychology Graduate Program Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted Students</th>
<th>Enrolled Students</th>
<th>% of students admitted</th>
<th>% of students who actually enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Institutional Research*

**Reflect**

*Please reflect on the application/admission/enrollment information. What do these numbers mean to the program? Do you have enough students (too many? too few?), enough students of sufficient quality, enough diverse students?*

The School Psychology program’s foundation is multiculturalism. The cohort of students and faculty reflect this mission of providing training to a broad range of students who reflect the University’s mission and the community’s diverse needs for multicultural school psychologists.

Each year the concentration selects approximately eight students, which aligns with the enrollments of the other graduate concentrations in the Psychology Department. This acceptance rate represents approximately 38% of the students each year who applied to the program between 2014 and 2018. While the number of students may place a burden on the one and a half faculty assigned to the School Psychology concentration, the sharing of courses with other concentrations allows for a manageable load of eight students.

The cohort of approximately eight students per year is a strong cohort size for a School Psychology Program. The program is a three-year program; there are approximately 24 students in the program. However, the number of students in the program only partially
responds to the shortage of school psychologists and the critical need for more school psychologists within school districts.

While the program accepts an academically prepared cohort, there are a few students who need significant support with academic skill development, particularly graduate-level writing, during the second year of the program. The Department and program faculty understand that these writing concerns require extra support for students who are hardworking, eager, and committed but who may not have had access to a more rigorous academic preparation required for such a demanding and time-intensive graduate program. The program and Department are working to put the necessary academic supports in place so that all admitted students have the tools they need to succeed in program coursework.

The School Psychology Program contributes to the diverse school psychology workforce and the multiculturalism of communities by accepting and training a multicultural cohort of students each year.

**How are GTAs deployed within your program?**

Given the demands of this rigorous program which include fieldwork placements for the first year, practica for the second year, and internships for the third year, students do not have the opportunity to become GTAs. Although the graduate students do not engage in becoming GTAs while they are matriculating through the program, the majority of lecturers and instructors of the program are former graduate students of the program.

**What are the Program Learning Objectives (PLOs)?**

The goal of the School Psychology Program is to prepare competent professional psychologists who function effectively in the school setting, trained to work skillfully with children and families representing multicultural, socio-economic, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation, and with teachers and other education and mental health professionals, around the issues of learning, development and growth. The program emphasizes diverse theoretical orientations grounded in a cultural context.

The learning objectives provide the directions to accomplishing the goal:

- Appreciation for valuing diversity and an ability to provide services that are culturally relevant;
- Knowledge of psychological and educational foundations in the standards of data based decision making and accountability, consultation and collaboration, effective instruction and development of cognitive/academic skills, socialization and development of life skills, student diversity in development and learning, schools and system organizations, prevention, crisis intervention and mental health,
home/school community collaboration, research and program evaluation, ethical and legal codes of conduct and information technology;

- Knowledge and skill to identify children who may reside in risk inducing environments, to provide careful and appropriate assessment of children and their families, and to offer appropriate interventions for children and their families;
- Ability to plan, carry out, and evaluate clinical and educational interventions to promote school progress and academic success, both within the school and family, and within the larger community;
- Skill to execute methods of consultation;
- Knowledge of the legal mandates and constraints in public education as well as the other services available to children and families in the community;
- Skill to perform data-based research for determining appropriate placements of children, and to evaluate the appropriateness of programs;
- Skill to make data-based decisions in each aspect of the profession for purposes of appropriate services to children in schools.

To accomplish these goals and objectives, the program is designed as a carefully monitored and closely articulated three year planned sequence of didactic theory and methods courses, community based, professionally supervised practicum/field placement experiences, and accompanying seminars oriented toward the integration of theory and practice that meet the program goals. This approach to training permits a close integration of theoretical knowledge and the methods for applying that knowledge with the insights gained from an examined personal experience of participating directly as a service provider with a multicultural population. Basic theories and skills are first presented in seminars during the early stages of the training program, and later are extended and elaborated at levels of greater depth and complexity as the student progresses through the graduated set of learning and training experiences.

Due to the coordinated nature of the School Psychology Program, only full-time students are admitted. Full time students are students who are enrolled, attend and complete all required classes for each semester. The student success of the program: Students enter the three-year program as a cohort and, with very few exceptions, they graduate three years later with the same cohort of students.

What evidence does the program regularly solicit and collect to indicate whether course offerings and schedules address graduate students’ needs?

The School Psychology program is regularly reviewed by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). This mandated evaluation involves the submission of an extensive report and participation in onsite visits by representatives from CTC. The
The purpose for this evaluation is to ensure that the Program is in compliance with all CTC Standards. Additionally, the program maintains membership on the CTC Accreditation Steering Committee with the College of Education. A Key Assessment survey of individual students in the program is completed each semester, a requirement for all credentialed programs at SF State. Historically, the Program also has participated in a volunteer review by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) for program training. While the Program no longer voluntarily participates in this review, the Program complies with all of the domains and requirements of a training program in School Psychology. When students have completed the three-year program, they are eligible and apply for the Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) credential issued by NASP. As reported by our graduate students, all of the students who have submitted applications have been successful in receiving their credential.

**How well do course offerings and schedules meet students’ needs (particularly those with work or family demands)?**

Students are informed that this program is a full-time three-year program before they are admitted to the Program. They are not allowed to carry full time jobs while enrolled in the program. This requirement is necessary to allow students the time and focus for successfully completing all course requirements and three years of placement (field work, practica, and internships), necessary for the completion of the three-year program and eligibility to receive the PPS credential in School Psychology issued by CTC. Students are compensated for this financial commitment through paid internships and some paid practica and first year field work placements. Classes are consolidated to approximately one to two days on campus to meet the needs of district/agency placements and personal demands of students.

**What is the graduate culminating experience for the School Psychology Program? How are graduate culminating experiences managed by the program (by topic, faculty supervision, WTU's)?**

The Culminating Experience is a comprehensive written examination (PSY 896). To meet the university requirement for graduation under *Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations*, the final demonstration of competence in scholarly and professional work for School Psychology graduate students is the satisfactory completion of the Culminating Experience. This requirement also meets the second level writing proficiency for graduate programs at SF State.
Specifically, the Culminating Experience for the School Psychology concentration involves a thesis paper that includes a review of theory and current literature, an applied case study, and practice applications.

The Culminating Experience is conducted during the second year of the student’s tenure in the School Psychology Graduate Program. All students in their second year are required to write and produce a quality culminating experience paper. The written paper, of approximately 80 to 100 pages in length, must include a theoretical foundation acquired from the two years of course preparation, and an application of the theoretical foundation to practice and best practices for interventions. Specifically, the student formulates specific questions with theoretical, clinical and educational implications regarding a particular issue within the School Psychology Profession. In particular, the culminating experience must include an extensive review of an issue related to schools and children, literature review of the topic, development of a new and creative theoretical approach for understanding and addressing the issue, an application of theory to practice in the schools, a critical examination of the topic in relation to current interventions, “best practices” for effectively addressing the issue in schools, cultural considerations, limitations to the culminating experience, and recommendations for future directions to address the issue.

The supervision of this culminating experience is conducted by the coordinator and School Psychology faculty. Progress is monitored through classes (PSY 829 and PSY 896) by the coordinator of the program.

Prior to 2015, students were provided the opportunity to work with professionals within the discipline. These professional leaders served as readers and mentors who supervised student progress for completing the culminating experience. The quality of the culminating experience reflected the expertise and experience of the readers/mentors who supervised the students. This experience was transformative; students were able to fully embrace the application of theory to best practice in schools.

After 2015, this practice was discontinued. As a result, the coordinator and School Psychology faculty were designated as solely responsible for supervising the completion of all culminating experiences. Due to limited resources of available faculty, the timeframe for completing the culminating experiences was impacted. A few students did not complete this culminating experience by the expected final semester of the second year. As a result, the coordinator, a faculty member and students worked during the summer to complete the culminating experience. The completion of this requirement is significant since this requirement is a prerequisite for admission into the third year internship program. Neither the coordinator nor the faculty member who supervise the culminating experience are compensated for any work during the summer.
All Culminating Experiences are measured by the successful completion of a written paper of approximately 80 to 100 pages in length. These papers are read by the Program Coordinator and are a part of the year long course requirements for PSY 829 (3 units per semester/6 units for the year) and PSY 896 (3 units per semester/6 units for the year). Historically, faculty in the Program have supervised the completion of these papers. However, with the limited number of faculty resources in the Program (1.5 T/TT faculty members), the Coordinator has assumed responsibility for the completion of these Culminating Experiences for all students in the Program.

With a new faculty member (Dr. Shasta Ihorn) and the expectation of hiring more faculty, this workload will become more balanced across the Program faculty in the coming years. A recent modification to this Culminating Experience process is the inclusion of first year course assignments (e.g., APA-style research papers and written case formulations) that support and prepare first year students for their second-year Culminating Experiences. Specifically, student support for writing is being scaffolded across the curriculum, starting with assignments in the first year courses (e.g., PSY 728). This pilot approach of beginning the Culminating Experience in the first year started Fall 2018 and its success will be determined by the second year students’ progress (2019-2020).

**What mechanisms does the program maintain for tracking, assessing, and responding to graduate students’ goals before graduation and success in meeting them afterwards? Performance on professional exams for licensure, credentials, entry to doctoral programs? What are the results of this tracking?**

Student progress is monitored by successful completion of required courses for first, second, and third-year students. A lecturer identified as a “university supervisor” monitors the success of students in their placements at local schools for each year through supervision courses: PSY 729 (first year), PSY 829 (second year) and PSY 859 (third year). The placements provide opportunities for the students to participate in a range of school psychology services such as varying types of assessment linked to intervention for academic, behavioral and social/emotional issues; consultation; behavior analysis and intervention; counseling; prevention at varying levels; research and program evaluation; and other activities which are consistent with the duties of school psychologists.

The lecturers/university supervisors hold weekly classes with these students. One aspect of this position is the continued and consistent contact with on-site supervisors, who supervise the students in the schools, to monitor progress and ensure student success. In addition to the continuous contact with site supervisors, at all three levels, summative and cumulative written evaluations are conducted. On-site supervisors are required to complete and discuss their evaluations of student progress with the students and the
university supervisor. The university supervisor reviews these evaluations and also discusses student progress with the student and the on-site supervisor. If there are concerns, the student is informed and participates in the development of a plan developed by the on-site supervisor and university supervisor to address these concerns. Compensation to the university supervisors (first, second and third year) is provided through courses where the lecturers (supervisors) are the instructors of record.

In addition to these best practices for monitoring student success, third year interns also are required to successfully pass the Praxis Exam, a national School Psychology exam. Passing the exam is a requirement for enrollment in PSY 858. With this requirement and the written case study assignment, we prepare the students for the Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) credential.

100% of the students who complete the three-year program will have successfully completed all requirements for eligibility to receive a PPS credential, School Psychology emphasis, within the State of California. The post-graduate success of former students also is indicated by the number of current supervisors and instructors of the Program who are former students of the Program.

Student progress also is monitored. As described above, upon completion of their first and second years in the Program, students receive their MS and are eligible for a PPS Internship credential, which is a requirement for many school districts to hire interns for their third year. Student academic success is monitored throughout the third year of the Program.

*How effectively does the program achieve the university’s standards for graduate programs? How well does the program assess the effectiveness of its response?*

The Program is effective in meeting the University’s standards for the completion of the Culminating Experience and the requirements of a graduate program at SF State. The graduation rate from the MS program is at least 90% and from the School Psychology internship credential program, approximately 99% of the students complete the Program. The coordinator has served for many years on the Graduate Council and is currently the Graduate Coordinator for the Department.

*What short or long-term trends affect graduate admission and enrollment? Explain the factors behind these trends. Do trends in the program’s graduate admissions reflect a sustainable level of demand?*

There continues to be a shortage of school psychologists in the State of California and nationwide. With the lack of School Psychology training programs, there is a great demand
for school psychologists in local communities to meet the needs of school districts, specifically the legal requirements of Special Education service provision. These needs and demands contribute to the long-term trend for training and preparing graduate students for a successful career in School Psychology. A goal for the program, and for the Department as a whole, is to improve outreach to attract larger applicant pools to meet these needs.

**How are expectations for graduate students set at an appropriate level and distinct from those for undergraduates?**

Specific graduate courses are assigned to graduate students in the Program. All course work is in the service of real world applications, and in adherence with the standards for graduate School Psychologist training set by CTC and NASP. There are also several undergraduate prerequisite courses that applicants must complete before admission considerations into the Program are made.

**How do graduate culminating experiences follow clear and consistent guidelines and represent adequate levels of achievement?**

There are several methods that serve as guidelines for the Culminating Experience: CTC standards, NASP domains, Program handbook, class syllabi, rubrics, assignments and handouts that provide clear and consistent guidelines for academic success in the Program.

**How does the program manage the supervision of graduate culminating experiences in a way that maintains both their quality and consistency in faculty workload?**

The Program Coordinator and Program faculty member meet regularly with the second-year students to supervise the Culminating Experiences. With the addition of new faculty, the process of creating a more equitable balance of supervision is in process. The need for new faculty members is imperative to meet the academic needs of the students for successful completion of the Culminating Experience.

**How are graduate students achieving their academic and professional goals?**

Successful completion of courses and placements are indicators of academic success. The program prepares all students for eligibility to receive a PPS credential, School Psychology from the State of California and to apply and successfully receive the NCSP credential from NASP. These accomplishments result in the successful hiring of all students who complete the program as School Psychologists in school districts in California and throughout the United States.
The School Psychology Graduate Program and the Pupil Personnel Services Credential Internship Program are accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). When the student successfully completes the School Psychology Graduate Program, the student receives a Master of Science Degree in Psychology with a concentration in School Psychology. Upon successful completion of the master’s degree with other prerequisites (passing the CBEST state exam), the student is eligible for the third year Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) Credential Internship Program. The completion of the Credential Internship Program leads to the awarding of the California Pupil Personnel Services Credential with an emphasis in School Psychology by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC).

No program deviation is offered with respect to the requirements of a full-time (third year) School Psychology Internship. While the location (e.g. San Francisco, Marin, the Peninsula, the East Bay) of the internships vary, all students are required to take the same courses. Students who are admitted complete the program within the expected one year.

Data regarding program completion are also available through CTC. Most recently, the program submitted data regarding the completion of the credential program to the CTC Annual Data Submission Questions (ADS) for the PathwayReport. In addition to CTC data submission, the College of Education, Accreditation unit, monitors all credentialed programs on campus.

In addition to the CTC requirements for School Psychology Programs, the program adheres and complies with the National Association of School Psychologists’ (NASP) Standards for Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology (2010). There are requirements and documents that a student must maintain and submit with the national certification application to NASP to be considered for a National Certification in School Psychology (NCSP). These requirements also are requirements to complete the third Internship Program. For example, the National Teachers Examination Praxis II Examination in School Psychology (PRAXIS II exam) is a requirement for the NCSP. During the third-year internship, the student is required to take the exam and pass it at or above NASP’s passing score to complete the course, PSY 858, and the program. Another example of NCSP eligibility is a case study which is a requirement for the course, PSY 899, during the third-year internship program.

Upon completion of the program and the awarding of the PPS-School Psychology, graduates of the program may apply for the NCSP through NASP. However, this application is not a requirement of the program. The program is aware of those graduates who are applying for the NCSP, as the coordinator must complete the NCSP form, Verification of
Completion of School Psychology Program that is included in the graduate’s application for the NCSP. However, the program does not receive any further confirmation from NASP regarding a graduate’s certification. Only the graduate provides information regarding the awarding of an NCSP.

It should be noted that the NCSP is not required for a credential by the State of California, nor do many school districts offer financial incentives for maintaining the NCSP. Since the program follows the guidelines for a NASP training program, the program participates in preparing a student to become eligible for an NCSP. The student chooses to apply for the NCSP after completing the program and receiving a PPS Credential-School Psychology.

How effectively does the program balance the needs of its graduate students and undergraduates in its curriculum development, planning, and resource allocation? Is one being served at the expense of the other? How does the Department decide on the appropriate balance?

Undergraduate courses that are aligned with the Program are courses in Learning and Motivation, frequently taught by School Psychology faculty and alumni. One additional contribution to resource allocation is the offering of the third-year internship through the College of Extended Learning (CEL). The financial allocations from CEL contribute to the Department’s budget and subsequent offering of courses.

Plan
How does the program plan to attract and recruit sustainable cohorts of graduate students?

Faculty attend recruiting events and open house, and engage in continuous collaboration and outreach to current school districts and placements. Relationships with school districts, former students, and school staff are maintained.

How will the program adjust the graduate curriculum to meet changes in the discipline and ensure appropriate levels of rigor?

The Program will continue to monitor and comply with CTC standards and NASP domains, and to modify the Program to maintain compliance.
**How can the program ensure graduate students’ outcomes?**

We have hired a new faculty member (Dr. Shasta Ihorn) and plan to hire another faculty in the near future to expand the Program and enhance the training of students through research opportunities. Additional faculty also will support the NASP accreditation process.

**How will the program balance the needs of graduates and undergraduates in its curriculum development and planning?**

As the Program expands, there are plans to develop new courses and strengthen the frequency for offering current course curriculum.

With increasing issues and urgent needs within the profession, the program curriculum must expand to continue to offer a quality cutting edge training program. The following graduate courses are recommended for expanding the curriculum:

- Neuropsychological assessment and functioning for School Psychologists (e.g., emotion dysregulation, learning disorders, developmental disorders)
- Strategies for addressing neurocognitive development of children living in risk inducing environments
- Effective interventions that address contextual factors such as racism, homelessness, insecure housing, gentrification, school violence and human (adolescent) trafficking
- Wellness (Mental health and academic) by promoting culturally-informed, early intervention, crisis prevention and group interventions in schools.

At the undergraduate level, courses would include the introduction to the practice of School Psychology and an increase in the frequency of offering the undergraduate courses, Learning and Motivation which currently are the only two undergraduate courses taught by School Psychology faculty.

To maintain the quality of currency in training and to respond to the increasing demand for training more students in the School Psychology profession, the program must expand the number of designated School Psychology faculty. To consider increasing the number of students admitted to the Program, there is a need for additional faculty.

A new faculty member in School Psychology would address the program’s urgent need to remain current and viable, and to provide opportunities for programmatic growth. In addition to offering new courses, a new hire would enhance current graduate courses, including supervision of the Culminating Experience.
Any opportunity to expand the program must be driven by the foundation of multiculturalism for effective training and innovative services provided to the schools by well-trained School Psychologists. A new hire would reflect the department’s mission of embracing culture and diversity in the professional and successful training of our students.

Finally, expanding the program requires increasing the number of faculty who can assume different roles of program leadership. The coordination of the program should be a collaborative effort of designated School Psychology faculty members. A new faculty member together with existing faculty members would be able to share in the coordination of the program.
Psychology MA Programs:

Master of Arts in Psychology, Concentration in Developmental Psychology

Table 26. Developmental Psychology Graduate Program Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted Students</th>
<th>Enrolled Students</th>
<th>% of students admitted</th>
<th>% of students who actually enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institutional Research

Reflect

Please reflect on the application/admission/enrollment information. What do these numbers mean to the program? Do you have enough students (too many? too few?), enough students of sufficient quality, enough diverse students?

We receive a good number of high-quality applicants (between 10-20) each year; however, because we have only two full-time faculty it is difficult for us to accept as many students as we would like each semester. Our applicant pool is diverse in both the representation of females and members of ethnically diverse groups.

Indicate the Program Learning Objectives.

Program Learning Objectives:

- To acquire a broad knowledge of life span development in each of the areas of cognitive, social and emotional development, to develop theoretical sophistication, to become familiar with current issues in the field, and to learn to critique research studies.
- To learn strategies and techniques of current developmental research and statistical analyses.
- To experience practical laboratory training in research techniques including naturalistic observation.
- To develop technical (scientific) writing skills for journal publication.
e. To gain experiences in the field of Developmental Psychology.
f. To apply research design skills and statistical analyses by conducting an independent research project, and to demonstrate intellectual self-reliance.
g. To gain experience in presentation of research and content relevant to developmental psychology.

**How are GTAs deployed within your concentration?**

We encourage our students to apply for the paid GTA positions as befits their availability and expertise, and developmental students have worked as the PSY 200 GTA for the past six years. Students are encouraged to work with faculty in both developmental and non-developmental undergraduate courses to gain experience that will help them with their professional development. With the exception of PSY 737, graduate students rarely serve as GTAs for our graduate courses.

**What evidence does the program regularly solicit and collect to indicate whether course offerings and schedules address graduate students’ needs?**

Each fall semester we hold an orientation attended by both the first- and second-year students and tailored to their respective needs. We also use weekly brown bag meetings to touch base with students about their needs.

We work closely with the Department Chair and AOC to ensure our students can take classes with students in the other graduate concentrations, consistent with alignment efforts described above. Because we have been under-staffed in developmental and need to teach undergraduate courses, we have not always had the staff available to offer sections of 891, therefore, students have completed sections of 891 offered by other concentrations (e.g., Social). We do not foresee this as a concern in the coming years.

In addition to these considerations, we have changed when classes are offered to accommodate student schedules as needed.

**How well do course offerings and schedules meet students’ needs (particularly those with work or family demands)?**

Due to our coordination and communication efforts, students rarely have concerns, and we view this as evidence that our course offerings and schedules are meeting their needs.

As much as possible, we attempt to hold classes on no more than three days per week, with a goal of only two days on campus. By limiting classroom days, students are free to allot time to their research efforts or paid work off-campus.
How are graduate culminating experiences managed by the program (by topic, faculty supervision, WTU's)?

We equitably distribute supervision among our core and affiliated faculty based on fit with student research interests. Because graduate student supervision in PSY 839, 799, and 898 result in WTUs that place demands on faculty time, we attempt to have each core faculty member supervise no more than six graduate students at any time, but this is a challenge with only two core faculty at this time.

Presently, ten faculty are listed as affiliated faculty. When a student works with a faculty affiliate, the student completes units of 839, 899, and 989 with those faculty; typically attends the lab meetings of those faculty; and completes their thesis with that person. Current affiliated faculty include David Gard, Melissa Hagan, Diana Sanchez, Sarah Holley, Amy Smith, Shasta Ihorn, Rav Suri, Ryan Howell, Ezequiel Morsella, and Avi Ben-Zeev.

What mechanisms does the program maintain for tracking, assessing, and responding to graduate students’ goals before graduation and success in meeting them afterwards? Performance on professional exams for licensure, credentials, entry to doctoral programs? What are the results of this tracking?

Each semester they are in the program, students complete one unit of PSY 839; this involves weekly meetings and consultation with their primary faculty advisor. Student progress and effort is regularly discussed and calibrated in these meetings.

We also hold regular brown bag meetings when we meet with students to discuss how to have success at research conferences, how to apply to graduate school, and regular presentations on student and faculty research.

For many years, a special topic of PSY 891 has been offered to students from all concentrations to offer insights on professional development in the field of Psychology.

The student theses, PSY 799/899 and PSY 898, allow for individualized professional development for our graduate students as they pursue a research topic of their own interest.

We regularly encourage our students to disseminate their work via participation in campus events (e.g., Graduate Student Research Showcase, CoSE Research Conference), regional events (e.g., CSU competitions, Western Psychological Association), and national
conferences (e.g., Society for Research on Adolescence, Society for Research on Child Development).

*How effectively does the program achieve the university’s standards for graduate programs? How well does the program assess the effectiveness of its response?*

We believe we achieve this goal exceptionally. Ours are the only students in the Department required to complete a technical writing course (PSY 739), and our students conduct independent research that is an accurate simulacrum of the work they will perform with an MA in Developmental Psychology.

*What short or long-term trends affect graduate admission and enrollment? Explain the factors behind these trends. Do trends in the program’s graduate admissions reflect a sustainable level of demand?*

One recent trend is that we have nurtured our “Affiliated Faculty Supervisors” list. By encouraging student applicants to work with faculty in the other graduate concentrations, students are trained by qualified faculty while accommodating the fact that we have two core faculty.

We actively recruit students who are seeking a Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology and have increased our web presence to accurately represent the non-academic jobs that our graduates obtain.

When students were asked about what makes our program unique, students emphasized the strength of us being a stand-alone developmental concentration (versus a general degree in Psychology). They also strongly emphasized our mentorship model, which allows for students to do research early in the program. Because of the specialized training we provide, it is not surprising that we receive fewer applications, but a large percentage of our applicants are well-suited to our program. Whether a student will be successful in the program is often a matter of finding the right mentor for the student.

Students who need to change mentors are thoughtfully counseled, and it is rare that a student will make such a change (approximately 10% of students).

*How are expectations for graduate students set at an appropriate level and distinct from those for undergraduates?*

Our graduate students are participating in and are frequently leading research efforts. The statistical, methodological, theoretical, and technical writing training our students receive
is state of the art and does a good job preparing our students for academic and non-academic jobs.

**How do graduate culminating experiences follow clear and consistent guidelines and represent adequate levels of achievement?**

Thesis preparation guidance is offered for all students in PSY 737, 739, and 770, and students work closely with their advisors in PSY 899 to prepare an appropriate thesis. Additionally, we hold both preliminary and final thesis meetings with the full committee before advancement to candidacy and before submission of the final document to ensure the project is adequate. Additionally, students meet weekly with their advisor over two semesters prior to the completion of PSY 898.

Before beginning data collection, all students must write a proposal that is defended in a meeting with the thesis supervision committee. Before the thesis can be approved, the final results are defended in a meeting with the thesis supervision committee. The protocol we follow is very similar to Ph.D. programs, and we are the only graduate program in the Department that holds a meeting of the full committee before data collection and before the final document is submitted to the University.

**How does the program manage the supervision of graduate culminating experiences in a way that maintains both their quality and consistency in faculty workload?**

Ideally, each faculty member mentors no more than three new students each year, which generally means we are each supervising no more than six graduate students at one time.

This does have the effect of limiting our enrollment, which is why we have relied on affiliate faculty. The three new students annually policy is in line with the Psychology Department expectations for graduate student supervision.

**How are graduate students achieving their academic and professional goals?**

Students accomplish their goals through completion of coursework, participation in labs, regular consultation with faculty mentors, preparation of a thesis proposal, presentations conferences, manuscript preparation, and participation as teaching assistants.

In their first month in the program, students complete PSY 737, a course which puts them in the data collection role immediately.
How effectively does the program balance the needs of its graduate students and undergraduates in its curriculum development, planning, and resource allocation? Is one being served at the expense of the other? How does the Department decide on the appropriate balance?

Undergraduate courses generally taught by Developmental faculty include PSY 330 (Child Development), 430 (Adolescent Psychology), 431 (Developmental Psychology), 432 (Cognitive Development), 433 (Social, Emotional and Personality Development), and 436 (Development of Femaleness and Maleness), and PSY 435 (Behavior Problems of Children). Some of these courses are cross-offered between Developmental and Clinical (e.g., PSY 435) or Social psychology (e.g., PSY 430) faculty. The graduate-level Developmental courses include PSY 730 (Seminar in Current Issues), 737 (Observation of Children’s Behavior), 739 (Technical Writing), and 839 (Field Experience) with special sections of PSY 891 (Seminar in Selected Problems) offered at least once each year.

Core Developmental faculty tend to teach one graduate section and one large undergraduate course each semester in addition to supervising student research. Within staffing limitations and constraints, the balance between undergraduate and graduate teaching befits the needs of our students.

Although demand for Developmental courses is great, they aren’t offered as often (or in as large a format) as needed to meet that demand. Most of the undergraduate courses involving developmental expertise are offered by T/T/T faculty and lecturers.

Plan
How does the program plan to attract and recruit sustainable cohorts of graduate students?

Maintaining our unique brand of research-focused pathways to professional development is key for recruiting qualified, motivated students who are a good match for the program. Furthermore, we have a transparent website that is very clear about what students can do with their degrees. Maintaining the website is a top priority.

In addition, as of Fall 2019, we have joined the SF State Scholars program which provides undergraduate students an accelerated pathway to a graduate degree. There has been considerable interest in this opportunity, and we plan to provide informational sessions about this program each semester.

By recruiting and working with affiliated faculty, we provide pathways for student-faculty collaboration beyond our two, core faculty.
We have recently partnered with universities in China to create a 3+1+G program that will ease the pathway for international students to obtain a graduate degree in Developmental Psychology.

**How will the program adjust the graduate curriculum to meet changes in the discipline and ensure appropriate levels of rigor?**

As active scholars, the core faculty take the issue of reflecting a changing discipline and maintaining high levels of scholarship for our students very seriously. We seek to offer a state-of-the-art Developmental Psychology program.

Two mechanisms for addressing changes in the field come in PSY 737 (Lab in Observation of Children’s Behavior), a core course, regularly responds to new developments in the discipline and PSY 730 (Seminar in Current Issues in Developmental Psychology) offers ground-breaking developmental thought.

**How can the program ensure graduate students’ outcomes?**

Overwhelmingly (approximately 80%), our graduate students complete the program in two years (or in the summer after the second year). Approximately 10% of students will leave the program during or following the first semester.

Enrollment is low in the graduate program for the reasons described above regarding expectations to mentor no more than three new students each year for each full time faculty member. This limitation on supervision expectations for faculty is necessary to ensure that each graduate student receives the sort of mentoring and one-on-one support that will allow them to thrive both in the program and after graduation.

**How will the program balance the needs of graduates and undergraduates in its curriculum development and planning?**

To meet the high level of student demand for our undergraduate developmental courses, we need two additional faculty.

Although we are currently able to offer enough courses to maintain minimum course offerings for graduate and undergraduate students, we tend to hire many lecturers to teach undergraduate courses. If we offered more courses, they would fill.
Master of Arts in Psychology, Concentration in Mind, Brain, & Behavior (MBB)

Table 27. Mind, Brain, and Behavior Graduate Program Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted Students</th>
<th>Enrolled students</th>
<th>% of students admitted</th>
<th>% of students who actually enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mind, Brain, and Behavior</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind, Brain, and Behavior</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind, Brain, and Behavior</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind, Brain, and Behavior</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind, Brain, and Behavior</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institutional Research

Reflect

*Please reflect on the application/admission/enrollment information. What do these numbers mean to the program? Do you have enough students (too many? too few?), enough students of sufficient quality, enough diverse students?*

The number of program applications has been relatively stable since 2015. In order to maintain appropriately-sized cohorts in which we can provide appropriate levels of faculty supervision, we extend offers of admission based on fit with a faculty's research lab and availability to mentor (i.e., size of lab). The resulting average enrollment is just right as most students accept our offer. With the exception of 2016, acceptance rates hover from 70%-90%.

Program Learning Objectives:

MBB’s Learning objectives are to enable students to:
- develop theory-based knowledge that students can then translate into empirical designs
- hone and expand expertise in statistics, including in using Jamovi and R
- understand and follow ethical guideline in conducting research
**What evidence does the program regularly solicit and collect to indicate whether course offerings and schedules address graduate students’ needs?**

The MBB program’s course offerings are geared maximally to provide students with the research and statistics skills needed to pursue high-level Ph.D. programs. To this end, we offer statistical and methods training in PSY 571 (Intermediate Psych Stats), 771 (Analysis of Variance and Experimental Design), and 770 (Research Methods and Techniques), and our PSY 891 offerings center on social cognitive neuroscience themes with emphasis on converging methodologies (behavioral, EEG, and computational). We have the opportunity to speak with our students regularly as part of our orientation in PSY792, during advising/office hours and in PSY 798 as their Culminating Experience. Most of our students express an explicit interest in pursuing Ph.Ds in cognition, social cognition or neuroscience. The involvement of all of our faculty in national and international research and publication, networking, and continued interactions with colleagues across the country inform our understanding of the expectations for such programs: all these fields right now require high level statistics, programming in R, and cognition as well as neuroscience/physio expertise.

**How well do course offerings and schedules meet students’ needs (particularly those with work or family demands)?**

In order to accommodate student work schedules, we try to have students come in to classes no more than 2-3 times a week. Many of our offerings are afternoon/evening courses. Please bear in mind, though, that students do research/lab work and data collection, so students do not come in only for courses.

**How are graduate culminating experiences managed by the program (by topic, faculty supervision, WTU’s)?**

Students conduct a Master’s Thesis for their Culminating Experience with direct supervision from the faculty member they are working with. Each thesis requires a minimum of one chairperson and one reader.

Current MBB faculty include: Drs. Ben-Zeev, Geisler, Morsella, Paap, Howell, Kim, and Monteiro. Although lab membership size varies, MBB faculty generally supervise between 1-4 graduate students per mentor.

**What mechanisms does the program maintain for tracking, assessing, and responding to graduate students’ goals before graduation and success in meeting them**
A high percentage of our students are accepted into Ph.D. programs. We also place many of our students in Research Lab coordinator positions at institutions such as UCSF and Stanford. While we have not officially tracked these numbers, each year we celebrate successes and typically there are at least 4 students who are Ph.D. bound. This year these students came from the following faculty labs: Paap, Morsella, Geisler and Ben-Zeev. This average (4/10 students, or 40%) is a high acceptance rate into Ph.D. programs within our subfield.

**How effectively does the program achieve the university’s standards for graduate programs? How well does the program assess the effectiveness of its response?**

Extremely effectively. The faculty have direct contact with students post-graduation and acceptance into Ph.D. programs.

Students usually take 2-3 years to complete the program. If they elect to go into neuroscience PhDs or careers, then they typically take 3.

**What short or long-term trends affect graduate admission and enrollment? Explain the factors behind these trends. Do trends in the program’s graduate admissions reflect a sustainable level of demand?**

Our enrollments have been steady over the years.

**How are expectations for graduate students set at an appropriate level and distinct from those for undergraduates?**

Each graduate student is expected to excel at high-level statistics and research courses (PSY 571, 771, and 770), learn R (a statistical software program), defend one’s thesis in PSY 798, and write the thesis to be publication-ready.

**How do graduate culminating experiences follow clear and consistent guidelines and represent adequate levels of achievement?**

Guidelines for expectations for the scope of a thesis project are provided verbally by each mentor to each student.
One strong indication of the high quality of these Culminating Experiences is the fact that many of the thesis projects are subsequently submitted for publication with only minor rewording or requests from reviewers that a small amount of additional data be collected.

**How does the program manage the supervision of graduate culminating experiences in a way that maintains both their quality and consistency in faculty workload?**

Each of our faculty is responsible for supervision of the culminating master's thesis experience (PSY 899) of their lab members. Each student is encouraged to approach a potential second reader for this thesis, often another MBB faculty member, with similar lines of expertise. All faculty encourage students to conduct at least one or possibly two experiments, and generally require that the thesis be publication-ready when completed. In PSY 798, the graduate colloquium (spring semester of second year), Dr. Ben-Zeev gives additional feedback that helps students to deepen their theses, practice giving multiple talks about their work, and provides a timeline for thesis completion in conjunction with their primary advisor.

**How are graduate students achieving their academic and professional goals?**

Learning high-level research and statistics skills, pursuing intra- and inter-disciplinary research, presenting at conferences, and publishing are all skills that position our graduates to succeed in both further academic work and within the field.

**How effectively does the program balance the needs of its graduate students and undergraduates in its curriculum development, planning, and resource allocation? Is one being served at the expense of the other? How does the Department decide on the appropriate balance?**

Most MBB faculty teach one graduate and one undergraduate courses each semester. Initial course assignments are made according to faculty preferences and requests; frequently faculty members teach the same courses each semester or each year to decrease the burden of new course preparation.

**How many courses belong to this area at the UG and Grad level? How many are taught each semester at both levels? Who teaches them - T/TT faculty, lecturers, GTAs? Are enough UG courses offered to meet demand in the BA?**

In general, MBB faculty teach the following large undergrad courses: Core courses -- PSY 371 (Statistics), PSY 400 (Research Methods) as well as Area I courses: PSY 300 (Current Issues in Psychology), PSY 494 (Cognitive Psychology), PSY 492 (Perception), and PSY 581
(Physiological Psychology) PSY 582 (Physiological Psychology II), and PSY 531 (Psycholinguistics).

MBB faculty are also generally responsible for teaching at least one section of PSY 571 (Intermediate Psych Stats), PSY 770 (Research Methods and Techniques), and PSY 771 (Analysis of Variance and Experimental Design)—these are advanced or graduate-level statistics and research methods courses. We also offer PSY 891 (Seminar in Selected Problems) and PSY 896 (Directed Reading), open also to SPA and other graduate students. Finally, we teach the Proseminar in Foundations of Contemporary Psychological Research, PSY 792, which is open to SPA students as well.

In addition, MBB faculty supervise PSY 699 (undergraduate Independent Research), PSY 685 (Projects in Teaching Psychology) and PSY 697-698 (Honors student projects at the undergraduate level) and PSY 799s and 899s (graduate Independent Research) at the graduate level. Labs vary. Some of us split those equally, some of us favor grad vs. undergrad supervision. The program does not monitor or enforce guidelines. According to Departmental policies, supervision courses result in WTUs in the amount of .33 for each undergraduate and .5 for graduate students; the expectation is that supervision will yield 3 WTUs total, per semester, for each faculty member, to ensure workload equity, fairness and accountability.

Plan

How does the program plan to attract and recruit sustainable cohorts of graduate students?

Recruitment of graduate students comes primarily from the program website (accessible through the Department website), word of mouth, and faculty and student attendance at national conferences. In addition, we recruit current SFSU undergraduate students who work with us in labs (Honors and 699s).

How will the program adjust the graduate curriculum to meet changes in the discipline and ensure appropriate levels of rigor?

Keep doing what we are doing – staying current and demanding excellence.

How can the program ensure graduate students’ outcomes?

The MBB program seeks to support our students by offering challenging courses and lab experiences. We are also committed to practicing multicultural teaching skills in our
courses and classrooms that signal belonging to all students, and especially women and/or people of color.

*How will the program balance the needs of graduates and undergraduates in its curriculum development and planning?*

Please see above.
Master of Arts in Psychology, Concentration in Social, Personality & Affective Science (SPA)

Table 28. Social, Personality, and Affective Science Graduate Program Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted Students</th>
<th>Enrolled Students</th>
<th>% of students admitted</th>
<th>% of students who actually enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institutional Research

Reflect

Please reflect on the application/admission/enrollment information. What do these numbers mean to the program? Do you have enough students (too many? too few?), enough students of sufficient quality, enough diverse students?

Enrollment numbers align with Department MA/MS concentration statistics. A goal for the program, and for the Department as a whole, is to improve outreach to attract larger applicant pools.

What evidence does the program regularly solicit and collect to indicate whether course offerings and schedules address graduate students’ needs?

We routinely examine the requirements of Ph.D. programs in Social/Personality Psychology for offerings; we solicit faculty for schedules; we indicate to students that their first year is focused on classes and research (not outside monetary work); we follow up with past graduates to understand how the program prepared them for either a Ph.D. program or for private sector jobs; we follow up with second-year students to see how well their first year course sequence supported their ability to work independently on research.
How well do course offerings and schedules meet students’ needs (particularly those with work or family demands)?

We try to structure the program flexibly across 2 years. The first year is course-intensive and we encourage on-campus work to maximize the time spent on campus. The second year is less course intensive, which allows for more outside work (to pay the bills).

How are graduate culminating experiences managed by the program (by topic, faculty supervision, WTU’s)?

We manage the Culminating Experiences using a mentor-model in which a specific faculty member is in charge of a student’s thesis and attendant IRB proposal. The second reader for the thesis helps to advise as the student and first reader see fit. The student also gets feedback on research ideas and practice with oral presentation and writing skills via lab meetings and the brownbag speaker series for the Social, Personality and Affective Science (SPA) and Mind, Brain and Behavior (MBB) programs.

What mechanisms does the program maintain for tracking, assessing, and responding to graduate students’ goals before graduation and success in meeting them afterwards? Performance on professional exams for licensure, credentials, entry to doctoral programs? What are the results of this tracking?

We have consistent contact with students before they graduate in the form of weekly or bi-weekly (every 2 weeks) individual meetings to assess their goals while in the program. After they graduate, we reach out to them to invite them to share their experiences with us, and in rarer cases to come back and present at a brownbag meeting or a lab meeting. (Licensure is not applicable to our program.)

How effectively does the program achieve the university’s standards for graduate programs? How well does the program assess the effectiveness of its response?

We have an excellent graduation rate of those who remain for 2-3 years (near 100%). We also provide close mentoring for all graduate students. We assess the meeting of University standards by informally examining our graduation rate and also monitoring student matriculation through the program. If we identify students who express a desire to leave the program (for whatever reason), we consult with the students and counsel them appropriate to the specific situation presented.
What short or long-term trends affect graduate admission and enrollment? Explain the factors behind these trends. Do trends in the program’s graduate admissions reflect a sustainable level of demand?

Trends that affect graduate admission are the number of total applicants recruited; the total number of faculty in the concentration; the number of faculty leaves any year; and, the popularity of Social/Personality and Affective Science Psychology in the mainstream media. The trends do reflect a substantial level of demand; we often have a decent size applicant pool given our program (terminal MA) and the demand in the field at large.

How are expectations for graduate students set at an appropriate level and distinct from those for undergraduates?

We tell the students explicitly—in written forms and in conversations—that we treat their first 2 years in our program like the first 2 years of a Ph.D. program. This sets the expectation as a higher level of scholarship and work than their undergraduate training. We sequence their courses as they would be in a Ph.D. program and we hold students to the same standards other universities would hold Ph.D. students in terms of their academic conduct, ethics, and knowledge base.

How do graduate culminating experiences follow clear and consistent guidelines and represent adequate levels of achievement?

The Culminating Experiences follow the clear and consistent guidelines laid out by both graduate division and our curricular change for the program in 2009-2010. They represent adequate levels of achievement in coordination with both Graduate Studies’ standards and the program’s curricular standards.

How does the program manage the supervision of graduate culminating experiences in a way that maintains both their quality and consistency in faculty workload?

The program manages the supervision of Culminating Experiences in a way that maintains both quality and consistency in faculty workload by: setting the same standards of practice for graduate students in terms of their knowledge and skill sets from courses; allowing faculty to choose their own projects for graduate students (which ensures equitable workload); allowing faculty to choose the total number of graduate students in their lab at any one time (which ensures equitable workload, to the extent that the faculty are honest with themselves about how many projects they can realistically manage).
How are graduate students achieving their academic and professional goals?

The graduate students are achieving their professional goals by (as clearly as possible) indicating what those goals are to faculty; by faculty continually checking in on those goals; and by students continually working toward and maintaining the high standards of the program. In this regard, most of the students who wish to move to Ph.D. do, and most of the students who wish to work in the private sector in the Bay Area achieve that goal as well.

How effectively does the program balance the needs of its graduate students and undergraduates in its curriculum development, planning, and resource allocation? Is one being served at the expense of the other? How does the Department decide on the appropriate balance?

The program effectively balances the needs of graduate and undergraduate training by making sure that the 3:3 course-load consistently translates (where possible) to a teaching load each semester of 1 undergraduate course taught by the faculty member (with graduate student TAs), 1 graduate course taught by the faculty member, and 1 set of supervision courses that bring together undergraduate and graduate students in the faculty member’s research lab. In this way, there is a consistency and continuity of teaching load and expectations for the performance of undergraduate and graduate students, with the added bonus that graduate students can help undergraduates achieve at the next level (i.e., post-bacc training).

Plan
How does the program plan to attract and recruit sustainable cohorts of graduate students?

We plan to recruit substantial cohorts of graduate students by advertising both regionally, nationally, and internationally. We already have this model in place. This allows us to achieve the dual goal of having good number of enrolled graduate students who are also high-quality students.

How will the program adjust the graduate curriculum to meet changes in the discipline and ensure appropriate levels of rigor?

We evaluate the needs of Ph.D. programs and private industry and will continue to respond to those needs via appropriate curricular changes. Given the cohesion of the faculty within the program, the rigor will remain high.
**How can the program ensure graduate students’ outcomes?**

We can better ensure graduate students’ outcomes by providing financial assistance to them in the form of graduate stipends and/or free graduate tuition. This would help ensure not only that students would accept our offers of admissions, but also that they would not have to worry as much as about the financial burdens of paying tuition.

**How will the program balance the needs of graduates and undergraduates in its curriculum development and planning?**

We will continue to understand the needs of our graduate students and eventual Ph.D. students to direct how we teach content to the undergraduates. We will also continue to use the model of faculty teaching one (1) undergraduate course, one (1) graduate course, and supervising both undergraduates and graduate students in their research labs each semester.
Section 3.4: Faculty

Collect

What is the distribution of rank, gender, and ethnicity across the faculty?

Of 25 current T/TT faculty members (21 Full Time; 4 FERP), 13 identify as male, 11 as female and 1 as a woman of trans experience. 50% of T/TT faculty identify as white or Caucasian. 17% (4/24) identify as Asian; 3/24 identify as mixed; 3 identify as African American; one identifies as European and another as Hispanic/South American. Twenty-eight percent (28%; 7/25) of T/TT faculty members are white men.

Sixty-four percent (64%) of faculty are full professors (16/25); 5/25 are tenured associate professors and 4/25 are pre-tenured assistant professors. Notably, 4 of the 5 associate professors are women and 3 of the 4 assistant professors are women; the gender disparity is particularly heavy in the category of full professors. Our distribution is consistent with Psychology within academia, an imbalance recently identified as problematic by the APA.

Our higher percentage of male faculty is particularly striking within the field: the gender distribution in the field of Psychology more generally is 76% female (new Psychology doctorates); women make up 58% of APA membership.

Provide CVs for all tenure/tenure track faculty and full time lecturers and summarize the research and publication, creative works and activities, grant writing and awards of faculty in the past 5 years.

Please see Appendix A and Appendix U.

Outline the distribution of faculty across different disciplines, concentrations, or emphases.

See Table 29, below.

4 “Women in academia face particular challenges... It typically takes women a year longer to achieve tenure than men, for example. And even though women are flooding into the discipline, they are still underrepresented as associate professors, full professors and institutional leaders. According to CWS data, 46 percent of all male Psychology faculty in the academic year 2013–14 were full professors compared with 28 percent of female faculty, for instance. Just 16 percent of male academics were assistant professors compared with almost 28 percent of female academics. Women were also overrepresented among adjunct, nontenure-track lecturer and other temporary positions, with almost 17 percent of female faculty in these roles compared with 11 percent of male faculty. These patterns have held steady over the last two decades despite the influx of women into Psychology Departments.” Clay, R. A. (2017). Women outnumber men in Psychology, but not in the field’s top echelons. Monitor on Psychology, 48(7), 18-21.
Table 29. Distribution of Psychology Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Developmental</th>
<th>Industrial/Organizational</th>
<th>Mind Brain Behavior</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Social Personality and Affective Science</th>
<th>Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacha Bunge*</td>
<td>Jeff Cookston</td>
<td>Kevin Eschleman</td>
<td>Avi Ben-Zeev</td>
<td>Diane Harris (also Clinical)</td>
<td>David Matsumoto (also MBB)</td>
<td>Amy Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gard</td>
<td>Jae Paik</td>
<td>Diana Sanchez</td>
<td>Mark Geisler</td>
<td>Shasta Ihorn</td>
<td>Zena Mello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Hagan</td>
<td>Christian Wright</td>
<td>Ryan Howell (also SPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezequiel Morsella (also MBB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Holley</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Kim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaurav Suri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Lewis†</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Monteiro†</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte Tate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Terrell†</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Paap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*serving in University Administration; retiring July 2019.
†Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP)

Create a teaching assignment matrix for faculty, including lecturers, that lists the number of graduate and undergraduate students enrolled in each course (on average in the most recent 4 semesters), and what part each course plays in the major, GE, and GWAR curriculum requirements. Teaching Assignment Matrix Template.

Please see Appendix L.

Create a table summarizing faculty service activities over the past 5 years. Distinguish between department, college, and university committee work and service activities off campus.

Please see Appendix M.

Summarize the department, college, and university mechanisms in place to evaluate teaching effectiveness for all faculty teaching in the Department.

Departmental review of faculty teaching effectiveness occurs in a variety of ways:
• Student evaluations and SETE scores are collected for all faculty members in all non-supervision courses (as part of the University’s electronic SETE collection process). These evaluations are reviewed as part of our RTP process.
• All T/TT faculty members are observed by peers while teaching, in an effort coordinated by our RTP committee. Observations are conducted more frequently for pre-tenure faculty. See Appendix N for the Peer Observation Form.
• All lecturers undergo review by a small faculty committee in collaboration with the Department Chair each year; during this process, student evaluations and any other relevant evidence are reviewed. Those lecturers facing an extended contract also have peer observations conducted, using the same process as described above for T/TT faculty.

Detail the program’s support for new and untenured faculty in assuming the responsibilities of a tenure track position, including any written guidelines for RTP standards that are provided to pre-tenure faculty and any mentorship activities conducted within the Department.

All new tenure track faculty have a 2-2 teaching assignment (CoSE buyout of one course) for the first three years and a 2-3 teaching assignment in their last two years before promotion and tenure evaluation, so that they have adequate time and energy to get their research program started. In addition, CoSE provides summer salary for the first two summers with the expectation that the funded time will be devoted to research.

As a general rule, faculty in their first year are “protected” from the majority of departmental service obligations. Exceptions include service on departmental hiring committees, which is often viewed as an opportunity to assimilate with faculty from other sub-disciplines.

Informal mentoring of pre-tenure faculty takes place within the Department, particularly around research issues. Within some of the six graduate concentrations/content areas, more formal mentoring occurs. See more extensive description in “Reflect” section, below.

Please see Appendix O for RTP criteria.

Describe any mechanisms or strategies the Department uses to support post-tenure faculty

An informal “research fund” is available for faculty to support a small aspect of their research program ($400/year in 2018-19). In addition, course releases (the equivalent of 3 FTEs) are informally distributed to some faculty members who have engaged in excess
supervision over several semesters, taught an overload, or completed special projects for the Department.

Reflect:

How does the program maintain a faculty in adequate numbers and balance to teach the curriculum and maintain program quality? If not, what adjustments are necessary? Given the difficulty of adding tenure-line faculty, how might adjustments to the curriculum make best use of existing faculty?

We have essentially the same number of T/TT line faculty today as we did in 2002, despite increases in enrollment. For context, Student Credit Units (SCUs) have increased 25% in the past three years, FTES has increased 40%, and enrollment has increased 37%.

Although the Department has managed to effectively maintain the major over this time (primarily due to impaction), faculty across the board report being over-extended, with too large a teaching, advising, and supervision load. This is an issue that was clearly identified in the 6th cycle APRC report and has not been alleviated. To the 6th Cycle report, “Faculty workload, as reflected in an excessively high student faculty ratio, is the overarching challenge that affects every other aspect of this report’s evaluation: the curriculum, faculty and student experience, program-specific standards, the culminating student experience, and strategic planning.”

In addition, the report referred to our student faculty ratio at that time as “shocking” and added, “The Department’s SFR is an outrageous 42:1 and needs to be reduced immediately. An acceptable target is 25:1.” As noted above, our Department is still far from reaching this target.

Our major curriculum has been drastically modified in recent years to make it easier for students to move effectively through major requirements, while making sure that those major requirements remain in line with national standards.

The primary tool that has allowed the program to graduate students in a reasonable time with our small faculty has been our impaction status. Since declaring impaction, as described in Section 3.3.1 (Undergraduate Curriculum), the Department has improved management of student enrollments, and has improved on every metric related to student success and graduation rates, despite the fact that our SFR continues to be one of the largest in the University.
In addition, we rely heavily on lecturers to staff our major course offerings. Faculty in different areas have worked to develop/generate a lecturer pool to help cover departmental teaching needs.

**Are the program’s faculty sufficiently diverse in rank, gender, ethnicity, and stage of professional development?**

As described above, the Department is “top-heavy,” with a majority of faculty having achieved the rank of full professor (T/TT density is 80%). While having the experience and institutional memory of so many faculty members is valuable, this imbalance has the potential to create two issues:

- First, it potentially indicates that there may be a large number of faculty who plan to retire in the next few years (20% are eligible now) – this will result in a serious dearth of faculty and will make it difficult if not impossible to offer our major and to provide appropriate advising to all students. This is particularly problematic if retiring faculty are not replaced separate from departmental growth hires.

- Second, it is worth noting that 69% (11 of 16) of the full professors in the Department are male, which is quite disparate from the gender composition of the profession and SFSU Psychology majors, which are both approximately 70% female.

As mentioned above, this imbalance is consistent with national rates for Psychology faculty in academia, according to a recent APA study (see Clay, above). The CWS report indicated that 46% of male Psychology faculty were full professors compared with 28% women. Just 16% were assistant professors, compared to 28% of females; females are similarly overrepresented among adjunct and non-tenure track lecturer positions. (17% women versus 11% men).

Since 2015, two faculty members went up for and did not receive tenure. Both of these faculty members were women of color.

**Discussions about faculty diversity during the self-survey process raised a number of questions that we seek to explore in the future. These include the following:**

- What are the percentages of student representation and how do these relate to faculty diversity? (Student Demographic data are included in Table 30, below).

- How do we compare in diversity of faculty across the college and university?
• Do we have more racial balance in higher ranks, and will we be as diverse when we lose retiring faculty members?

• This discussion and analysis raised additional considerations for understanding our faculty's diversity in context. Specifically, we want to consider representation and diversity in recruitment, hiring, and retention:
  • Are we recruiting and extending announcements to a broad base?
  • What is the diversity of our applicants? From whom do we get applications?
  • To whom we have made offers?

• Does our RTP process treat faculty equally?

• How and why do faculty leave our Department? Do we maintain a graph/record of faculty losses?

In response to these inquiries, the Department is exploring the possibility of implementing a formal exit interview process. We have begun the process of obtaining feedback about departmental culture from former faculty members; information from that process will be summarized and provided to the Department for consideration and implications for policy development. In general terms, the following patterns and themes emerged from these exit interviews:

• Most former faculty members generally felt supported within their areas of concentration.
• Most individuals indicated that additional information about how to conduct academic advising would have been useful.
• Several former faculty members reported feeling that all faculty members were not treated equally, or valued in the same way, within the Department.
• Several former faculty members indicated that different types of research were less valued within the Department.
• At least one individual reported that their decision to leave was in large part due to the cost of living in the Bay Area, and the difficulty of doing so in their current position.
• All individuals reported that transparency around distribution of resources across faculty members, and decision-making within the Department and within individual concentrations, could have been improved.
• All individuals indicated that more formal mentoring would have been useful.
Table 30. Degrees Awarded by Student Gender and Ethnicity, 2014-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity #</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Latino</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Total</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are all faculty engaged in appropriate forms of professional achievement and growth?

Psychology Department faculty are engaged in a wide range of activities related to professional achievement and growth, as demonstrated by the exceptional and extensive table listing publications, presentations, and other indicators of professional achievement (see Appendix A).

In addition to their publication records, Psychology faculty are frequently cited in national and international news as experts and commentators. Many Psychology Department faculty members provide an exceptional level of professional service by contributing to the journal review process; while all faculty members provide some degree of service to the field by completing peer reviews, Dr. Ken Paap in particular is nationally recognized for his work in this capacity.
Departmental opportunities for professional development also include two colloquia per semester, at which nationally and internationally recognized experts speak and engage in conversation with students and faculty members. Colloquia speakers in recent years have included Professors Michael Merzenich, Jay McClelland, Phil Shaver, James Gross, Roy Baumeister, Adam Gazzaley, Rex Wright, Serena Chen, and many others. In addition, there are two “brown bag” sessions each week (one hosted by the Developmental concentration, the other jointly hosted by the MBB and SAR concentrations), in which graduate students, faculty, and invited speakers present their research.

**How is faculty workload balanced, in the ratio of large and small-enrollment courses, required and elective, undergraduate and graduate, lower and upper division? If there is a graduate program, how is the workload balanced across culminating experiences and advising?**

Our current Department criteria do not include a specific description of workload balance expectations; efforts are currently underway in the Advisory Committee to address this issue and develop more robust guidelines and descriptions of expectations.

Equity is desirable; the Department is currently considering ways to make the workload balance more transparent. Initial conversations about workload identified the following points related to Teaching and Service in particular:

**Teaching:**
- Some faculty expressed concern that teaching load is not balanced across faculty, both teaching load generally and the distribution of graduate v. undergraduate courses.
- Teaching assignments are in large part bottom-up; however, the process for teaching assignments varies across programs and the size of different programs and accreditation or other requirements can have a significant impact on teaching assignments. For example, some programs rotate required courses; some require one grad and one undergrad course per faculty member, per semester; some areas allow faculty to express their interests every semester; small programs (i.e., school) are required to teach courses required for accreditation, not much flexibility; in other small programs (I/O), overload teaching is frequent because not sufficient faculty to carry burden (esp. w/ supervision).
- Frequently assignments for teaching are based on need and history (classes faculty have taught before).
- Some areas have been able to build up a lecturer pool – others have found this to be more difficult (often this is related to the field/area in question).
• Some faculty recommended that specific requests for teaching assignments every semester and increased transparency would be desirable.

Service:
• Most faculty agreed that we could do a better job of defining, incentivizing, and quantifying service.
• It seems clear that service load is not well balanced across faculty, not only in relation to number of service activities, but also in the qualitative nature of particular assignments.
• Discussions raised by self-study have highlighted service expectations and workload as a priority for clarification. Please see our proposals for developing such guidelines, outlined in more detail below.

How does the program plan its course offerings to avoid overreliance on lecturers?

Currently, the number of undergraduate and graduate courses exceeds the capacity of T/TT faculty. To reduce reliance on lecturers, the administration must commit the necessary resources to our Department. Every new T/TT faculty member constitutes a five course per year reduction in lecturers needed (before tenure and promotion). Post-tenure, each new T/TT faculty member represents a six course per year reduction in lecturers.

How does the program take care to foster, assess, and support teaching quality?

The Department encourages and supports faculty who seek out teaching development on their own; many of our faculty members have attended trainings or workshops conducted by the Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CEETL), and one of our faculty members served as a CEETL Fellow during the 17-18 academic year.

The Department has used Department meeting times to expose faculty to new or useful teaching and grading strategies; at least two of the faculty meetings during our 2017-18 academic year were dedicated to workshops or presentations related to teaching.

Faculty members are encouraged to seek the support of other faculty in the Department for feedback on their teaching, and all instructors go through peer evaluations at various points in their career.

How does the program mentor untenured faculty and support the continued professional growth of post-tenure faculty? How does it support its lecturers and where does it integrate them into the program’s structure?
Although no formal Department-wide mentoring program is in place for untenured faculty members, several of the concentrations within the Department assign mentors to new faculty hires; senior researchers in the Department have provided ad hoc opportunities for untenured faculty members to receive mentoring and guidance in grant writing, structuring a research lab, and other areas. Many faculty members report that the culture in the Department is one that allows for and encourages seeking help and support from other Department members, with high levels of openness and collegiality.

Lecturers are invited to attend faculty meetings.

*How does the program’s RTP criteria reflect current professional activities and opportunities in the discipline? How do they adequately balance and value the full range of faculty commitments in teaching, research, and service?*

The most recent revisions of our RTP criteria were explicitly designed to recognize a broad range of research areas and activities that represent meaningful professional activities for faculty members in many different fields that emphasize and value different things (e.g., quantitative and qualitative data and analysis; laboratory and community-engaged research; basic and applied research).

One of our plans for the future, based on conversations emerging from this self-study, is to explicate more clearly the expectations and guidelines for service; we believe that providing faculty members with more guidance about what is appropriate and expected will help to create more balance and equity in the distribution of service workload, and alleviate stress or concern about decisions around service.

**Plan:**

*How will the program recruit and retain faculty to meet its future needs?*

Continued departmental collaboration and conversation around a hiring plan based on current dynamics in the field of Psychology, in combination with awareness of our curricular and programmatic needs, will contribute to continued departmental commitment to hiring recommendations and proposals.

Based on lessons from this self-study, we are implementing a more systemic approach to understanding diversity of faculty at all stages of recruitment, hiring, and retention.
How will the program support faculty at all ranks – tenured, pre-tenure, lecturer, and adjunct – in the areas of teaching, service, and professional development?

Based on discussions emerging as part of this self-study, we are planning to develop a more structured mentoring program for faculty members. As described above, moving forward we plan to develop a clearer structure relating to expectations of faculty service.
Section 3.5: Resources

Reflect:
*How effectively does the program use existing space? (office space, classrooms, meeting areas, laboratories, other)* How might it use it more effectively?

The Psychology Department is housed in the Ethnic Studies and Psychology building and occupies the majority of the 2nd, 3rd, and 5th floors. The Department has only four (4) spaces in the building that are large enough for classroom instruction. The remainder of the spaces are used for faculty offices, research laboratories, and the Psychology Clinic. It is important to note that ample laboratory space is essential for social science research, which requires human participants. Current space allocations are attached (see Appendix P).

The equitable assignment and utilization of space is a recurring issue in the Department. The Department’s allocated space is 16,271 square feet less than its entitlement, using CSU space entitlement formulas. A CoSE-wide analysis is attached (Appendix Q). This inequity is second worst in the College, after Engineering.

Mode Associates, the architecture firm hired by SFSU to conduct planning studies for the new science building, concluded that the Psychology Department is underserved and needs its own building to effectively serve students, faculty, and staff.

The Department created a new standing committee (Space Committee) to manage space allocation. The committee conducted a survey of faculty space needs and established a set of guiding principles for space assignments and reassignments. They are:

- As part of their teaching and research mission, all T/TT faculty need single offices.
- Clear communication about space options to incoming faculty, including showing them space that is representative of what space they may be assigned.
- Conveying to new faculty and in instances of reassignments that the default assumption in the assignment of research space is that it will be sharable space. If the nature of the research prevents sharing, the space assignment may be smaller. Further, new assignments of space are not permanent, i.e. they may change over time as faculty member’s needs and Department’s needs change.
- In seeking grants, it is important to take a creative and collaborative approach in considering current space, particularly multipurpose spaces and applied spaces.
- While grants may be leveraged for “upsizing” of space, loss of grant funding may also trigger reassignments or downsizing of space.
• The mission of teaching needs to be considered in space assignments, for example having adequate space for lecturers who teach many students and having appropriate work spaces for students.

• Consider cultural shifts in attitudes toward space:
  • Move from a concentration or program-based model (which tends to place emphasis on needs of grad students/programs) to looking at how Department space can be allocated, shared, used to benefit the Department as a whole.
  • Incentivize effective collaborations and creation of shared research labs through infrastructure upgrades.
  • Acknowledge the perspectives of those who do not wish to or are not able to share space.
  • Prioritize upgrades that benefit Department as a whole (e.g., recent renovations in EP 304a, 304, and 207).

How is the space maintained? How does the space allow for alternative learning styles/universal design?

When resources allow, the Department has initiated capital improvement projects to modernize available classroom spaces. In the last five years, three classrooms have been renovated (EP 304, 304a, and 207). Improvements included reconfiguration of space to enhance pedagogy, installation of flat screen monitors, upgraded computers, purchase of configurable tables to facilitate small group discussion, and replacement of chalkboards with whiteboards.

How do the program’s scheduling practices make full use of existing teaching spaces and times in order to meet student demand?

The Department controls four (4) small classroom spaces (max enrollment - 25) for the third largest department (by enrollment) on campus. This ensures that virtually no undergraduate psychology courses are held in the building that houses the Psychology Department. These classroom spaces are at full utilization each semester for small section undergraduate classes, graduate seminars, faculty meetings, colloquia, and Department events. See Appendix R for sample semester Summary of Internal Classroom Usage. This lack of space limits our ability to establish a sense of community among our psychology students which is an important element of student retention and success. It also restricts the extent to which we can 1) Provide a common physical space for students to interact with each other and with faculty and 2) Host programs that emphasize collaboration in support of academic and career success such as career fairs, student support clubs, honor society chapters, undergraduate conferences, and faculty/student meet-and-greets.
Furthermore, we have only one small space for all of our lecturer faculty. Given the fact that lecturers teach approximately half of our undergraduate curriculum, this limits their ability to serve students outside of the classroom.

The lab space allotted to faculty members for use in their research activities is heavily utilized. Faculty estimates of usage range from 3-72 hours per week, with an average of 34 hours/week that the lab space is in use. Activity in the labs includes lab meetings; running participants; collaborative activity and group work; coding and programming; data entry, collection, cleaning, and analysis; student work involving research, reading, and writing; student presentations; TA office hours; and telephone recruitment of participants.

How effective is department level academic advising for students?

The Psychology Department takes a multi-faceted approach to academic advising that includes faculty, staff, peers, mandatory courses, and university resources. Faculty are required to hold weekly office hours, with 30 minutes per teaching WTU, for both academic and general advising. Peer Advisors serve as academic advisors to supplement faculty advising. Peer Advisors are advanced Psychology majors who register for a course (PSY 680) that counts as an elective in the major. They are trained and supervised by the PSY 303 instructor. A schedule of Faculty and Peer Advisor availability that attempts to provide blanket coverage of the work week is created (see Appendix S for sample Fall 2018 semester advising schedule).

In addition to faculty and peer advising, the Department employs a full-time position targeted to student outreach and contact (Student Services Coordinator). The Department also utilizes the CoSE Student Success Center to assist with student advising.

Beyond these personal advising mechanisms, the Department developed a roadmap for incoming freshman and transfer students. All majors must take PSY 303 (Psychology the Major and Profession) in their first semester of the major. This course includes information about the major and the Psychology roadmap. Students in this course are required to meet with a faculty advisor to review the roadmap and plan their schedule. PSY 690 is taken in the last semester and helps with the graduation process ensuring students are on track with the roadmap.

Graduate students are advised by faculty in their specific concentrations, by research and thesis advisors, and by the Graduate Services Coordinator.
How do faculty use technology effectively to advance student learning?

Faculty use technology to advance student learning in myriad ways. Several faculty members have completed Academic Technology’s training for teaching online courses, and 10 courses are currently offered as online courses at least once a year, including 3 Core courses (303, 305GW, and 690). Other courses incorporate technology with Powerpoint, iClickers, and other classroom tools. Students access and use iLearn in almost all courses, increasing student exposure to online communication, blogs, and electronic collaboration. All students enrolled in Psychology courses have the opportunity to use our online study participation system (SONA) to find out about opportunities related to psychological research.

Some specific courses incorporate particular technologies. For example, each GWAR course provides opportunities for students to learn basic tools for online searches and library research. Similarly, all Psychology majors receive training in basic spreadsheets (e.g., Excel, Google Sheets) and statistical software programs (SPSS, SAS, R) in PSY 371 and PSY 400, both Core courses. In addition, students may obtain specialized technical training in advanced statistical programs, qualitative analysis software, and other technologies in PSY 571 and other content courses, and in individual research labs (PSY 699).

- Approximately half of our faculty members indicated in a recent survey that they teach technology skills in at least one of their classes or labs.
- Table 18 in Section 3.3.1 provides a list of specific programs/technologies utilized by students in research labs and classes.

A variety of other technologies are also utilized across the Department. For example, many faculty members utilize technology to facilitate student signups for advising appointments.

How does the program maintain a supportive and collegial environment for staff? How does it assess and meet staff needs for support and professional development?

There are four staff positions in the Psychology Department office and one front desk student assistant. The four positions are:

- Assistant to the Chair
- Academic Office Coordinator
- Graduate Services Coordinator
- Student Services Coordinator
The Student Services Coordinator is half time and the other three positions are full time. Office staff meet weekly to review weekly tasks, plan for upcoming projects and events, and discuss any communication or coordination issues.

Staff receive annual performance appraisals that outline strengths and developmental areas. Staff development opportunities are provided through on- and off-campus learning and development conferences, classes, and training sessions. Off-campus opportunities are funded by CoSE and are subject to the approval of the Dean. Staff regularly utilize these opportunities and are encouraged by the Chair to do so. For example, the Assistant to the Chair will be starting the SFSU MBA program in the Fall of 2019 through the course fee waiver program.

A recent Staff Job Analysis is included as Appendix T. It includes a detailed report of the essential job tasks and required competencies for each position.

Plan:

*Given the program’s existing resources, how might it make best use of them to meet the needs of students, faculty, and staff?*

All metrics demonstrate that every available resource (room space, staff, faculty availability, funding, lab space, etc.) is being utilized and over-utilized.

Regarding Department financial resources, Tables 31 and 32 provide a summary of Psychology Department allocations and expenses.

Allocations are unpredictable and variable which necessitates careful fiscal planning and conservative budgeting. For example:

- IDC allocations from grants are dependent on faculty obtaining external funding, which varies from year to year.
- Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) resources must be applied for each year and are allocated by an external committee. The Department currently receives IRA funds for the student research and thesis support, student presentation of research at conferences, the faculty-led study abroad program, and the social and the cognitive preschooler program. An unexpected loss of these funds, as can be seen in FY 17-18 in Table X, essentially eliminates most of the support of that we are able to provide for students.
- Revenues are often specific to particular programs. For example, the Psychology Clinic generates revenue, but the revenue is rolled back into funding clinic operations.

Revenue also includes ticket sales from end of year undergraduate recognition and
graduate hooding ceremonies which, after costs, are typically net zero for the Department.

Table 31. Non-Personnel Budget Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Personnel Allocations</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$3,747.00</td>
<td>$3,747.00</td>
<td>$3,118.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$3,163.00</td>
<td>$3,163.00</td>
<td>$2,836.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>$16,279.00</td>
<td>$16,279.00</td>
<td>$15,730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$7,107.00</td>
<td>$7,107.00</td>
<td>$7,192.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$24,528.00</td>
<td>$30,836.50</td>
<td>$19,983.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructionally Related Activities Allocation</td>
<td>$21,228.38</td>
<td>$18,315.00</td>
<td>$880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC Allocation (From Grants)</td>
<td>$28,691.00</td>
<td>$23,219.00</td>
<td>$30,536.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEL Open University</td>
<td>$39,675.00</td>
<td>$56,614.00</td>
<td>$19,213.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$144,418.38</td>
<td>$159,280.50</td>
<td>$99,488.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenses included both fixed and variable items including:

- Instructional Equipment, which must be applied for each year and is allocated by the College. For example, in 2018 the Department received $1,941 for the specific equipment that had been requested.
- IT expenses include Department purchases for classroom technology and faculty IT purchases.
- Repairs and Maintenance includes any capital improvements and any installation or repairs to Department space (e.g., lockbox installation, bookshelf removal).
- Student assistant expenses include the front desk assistant and Graduate Teaching Assistants not paid for through Administration instructional funds (e.g., GTAs for PSY 200, 400, and 320).
- Supplies and Service includes printing and maintenance contracts for two copiers, landline telephone service, postage, shredding, and office supplies. This line item also includes expenses for end of year undergraduate recognition and graduate hooding ceremonies such as program printing, venue rental, and food. As indicated above, after factoring ticket sales these events are typically net zero for the Department.
Table 32. Total Departmental Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Type</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acct/Adm Fees</td>
<td>$224.61</td>
<td>$87.50</td>
<td>$220.33</td>
<td>$837.57</td>
<td>$934.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$3,614.69</td>
<td>$3,914.42</td>
<td>$3,955.37</td>
<td>$3,623.04</td>
<td>$3,709.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Equipment</td>
<td>$11,864.63</td>
<td>$9,338.50</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$1,941.99</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT expenses</td>
<td>$10,014.05</td>
<td>$7,140.60</td>
<td>$2,323.17</td>
<td>$18,806.36</td>
<td>$17,405.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs/Maintenance</td>
<td>$8,775.47</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,261.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistant</td>
<td>$23,673.17</td>
<td>$20,519.41</td>
<td>$24,497.00</td>
<td>$27,344.45</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Service</td>
<td>$92,259.32</td>
<td>$78,504.76</td>
<td>$59,070.46</td>
<td>$48,303.32</td>
<td>$52,615.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$4,493.03</td>
<td>$6,630.93</td>
<td>$5,240.90</td>
<td>$6,176.64</td>
<td>$6,583.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$154,918.97</td>
<td>$126,136.12</td>
<td>$119,068.23</td>
<td>$107,033.36</td>
<td>$143,249.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will the program improve student learning and achievement through advising?

As described extensively above, our students receive advising from faculty, staff, peers, and additional advising tools. PSY 303 and 690, both of which are Core courses, require mandatory faculty advising in addition to informing students about available campus resources. Undergraduates are trained extensively and given the opportunity to provide Peer Advising support (PSY 680) and peer tutoring (PSY 685 and as tutors for PSY 200). This opportunity increases the experience of both the students receiving the support as well as those being trained to administer it.

Several additional resources are vital to supporting our students. The Department’s newly hired Student Services Coordinator will provide invaluable support to students in relation to every aspect of their advising needs. Finally, the new CoSE Student Success Center is providing important support to our students, and we are working to increase exposure to and awareness of this important college-wide campus resource.
What changes will the program undertake (to its curriculum, scheduling, resource allocation, or other) to make best use of existing resources?

As described above, every resource in the Department is fully utilized and, in most cases, over-utilized.

Our Department is working toward creating an online signup system for spaces over which it has control to increase transparency.
Section 4.0: Conclusions, Plans, and Goals

Which indicators and outcomes would the program single out as evidence of its signature strengths and most pressing challenges? Which attest to the program’s most important achievements in recent years, and which indicate areas for growth and development in years to come?

Most Important Achievements

• The ability to support such a large number of students successfully, in a way that makes their timely completion of the major and graduation possible. This success, one of our Department’s greatest documented strengths, is facilitated by impaction status. We have managed impaction well despite a faculty/student ratio that is far out of balance with the rest of the College and University, and with fewer faculty than comparable impacted programs with similar enrollments (see Table 33, below). The first table compared SFSU to similar institutions in the CSU. The second table represents data collected via a survey conducted by the Council of Graduate Departments in Psychology. Response to the survey was voluntary and unscientific, but represented Psychology Departments across North America. Four CSU institutions were included for context, including SFSU.

Impaction removal resulting in sustainable student success rates is possible only with increased resources.

• Innovative curricular and programmatic innovations that provide unparalleled experiences for our students (e.g., SF Build program; China Study Abroad Program, and Developmental Psychology 3+1+G program).
• Focus on student success. Examples include the successful development of student advising tools such as online bookend courses (PSY 303 and PSY 690), strategic course sequencing (PSY 371 and PSY 400), mandatory faculty advising, and the Peer Advising program.
• Development of new strategies to improve student success. For example, D/F/W rates in PSY 371 have decreased with the addition of GTAs to the course.
• Extracurricular opportunities for students. Students have broad access to independent research opportunities (PSY 699), community service learning (PSY 558/559), and academic poster and paper presentation opportunities.
Table 33. Similar Institution Faculty/Student Ratio Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Fall 2018 Psychology Department FTES</th>
<th>Full-Time T/TT Faculty Head Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State</td>
<td>953.5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach State</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Data Source – Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology survey (n = 26), CSU data added for context.

- Exemplary graduate school acceptance rates and alumni job outcomes, as indicated by exit survey data. Our undergraduate and graduate students continue their education in numerous top tier graduate programs, including Ivy League schools. This is increased/facilitated by the fact that we have a very high student/faculty publication rate, especially student presentations and posters at national conferences.
- Utilization of feedback from our student exit surveys to implement changes in our program.
- Significant representation of underrepresented groups and first-generation college students in our major.
• Faculty doing cutting edge research and participating in the national and international scientific conversation.
• Faculty research productivity that is linked with student success. In the previous five years, ending in Fall 2018, faculty publications have generated over 29,000 Google Scholar citations. During that same time period, faculty published 309 peer-reviewed papers, 43% of which were co-authored by students. This averages to 3.09 papers per year per faculty member. Faculty delivered 142 presentations (1.42 per year average), 28% of which included students, and participated in 355 conference poster sessions (3.55 per year average), 80% of which included student co-authors. By way of comparison, the publication rate at San Diego State University (the flagship CSU Psychology Department) for 2017-2018 was 5.09. However, the SDSU Psychology Department has 33 T/TT faculty with similar FTES and is much more heavily resourced. (See: SDSU Highlight Data).

Most Pressing Challenges

• T/TT faculty resources. Throughout this report it is apparent that our most pressing challenge is the need for T/TT resources. T/TT head count is essentially flat from 2002 to the present.
• Space resources. We have far fewer classrooms than we need to assign for courses and for other vital uses such as research meetings, lecturer housing, and student functions. Recent assessments at the University level (related to the new science building plans) and by outside consultants (Mode Associates) documented this shortage.
• Our ability to serve our current students and to take on more students post-impaction is directly inhibited by these resource challenges.
• Organizational Culture. Throughout the preparation of this report, faculty expressed concern about the challenges of shifts in University priorities and difficulties in meeting expectations (e.g., shift from teaching to research, back to teaching)/clarity around expectations and requirements from the University.

Areas for Growth and Development

• Increased faculty diversity. Assess and address possible issues related to gender or race/ethnicity inequity in hiring, mentoring, evaluation, or resource allocation. Improve Department culture related to these issues.
• Implementation of formal mentoring, particularly for T/TT faculty members early in their career prior to impactful RTP reviews. The goal is to provide support before it is too late.
• Increased transparency around allocation of resources.
• Increased guidance for faculty relating to service obligations and expectations.
Top Priorities

Student Learning & Achievement

- Maintain exceptional student retention, time to graduation, and graduation rates.
- Continue mandatory faculty advising through PSY 303. Improve advising training for new faculty.
- Improve online resources for access to faculty for students seeking advising.
- Coordinate advising efforts with the CoSE Student Success Center.
- Improve evaluation of student writing and investigate strategies to enhance student writing ability across the curriculum, including non-GWAR courses.
- Improve D/F/W rates in PSY 171 and 371. Among all courses offered by the Psychology Department, these two courses comprise 58.2% of courses with DFW rates 15% or greater. Improving student success in just these two courses could have a significant impact on both time to graduation and overall graduation rates.
- Expand student engagement through research experiences in the curriculum, faculty labs, and Department events, colloquia, etc.
- Expand access to community service learning and internship experiences for students.
- Enhance collection of achievement/assessment information and distribution of that information.
- Examine student achievement more systematically through increased alumni contact and collection of feedback. This includes assessing the link between the curriculum and career success.
- Develop tracking system for long term student success in career (for example, more regular alumni surveys), for both graduate and undergraduate students.
- Implement a more systematic compilation of yearly undergraduate exit survey data, and provide these data to faculty for review regularly.

Curriculum

- Continue adherence to APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology major and adjust as those guidelines change.
- Develop and implement a “Culminating Experience” for undergraduates.
- Update the curriculum in currently offered courses, and develop new courses in emerging areas of the field including data science, technical methods, neuroscience, and artificial intelligence.
- Provide/incorporate more quantitative training to prepare students for careers both in and out of the field of Psychology. Implement and assess the effectiveness of the “Introduction to Data Science” course.
• Implement and assess the effectiveness of the First Year Experience course (PSY 205).
• Evaluate PSY 303 and PSY 690 to determine their value in introducing students to the rigor of the major and preparing them for post-graduation endeavors.
• Evaluate the impact of the elimination of remedial courses on student success in the major. For example, work with the Mathematics Department to coordinate success strategies for students concurrently enrolled in MATH 122.
• Develop and implement a standardized training program for Graduate Teaching Assistants for all undergraduate statistics courses with activity sections.
• Respond to student needs and desire for online classes by incorporating more online and hybrid courses into the curriculum. This helps to address space issues as well.

Faculty Development

• Increase diversity in hiring with a target for faculty diversity that aligns with the demographic distribution of the available labor pool of Ph.D. Psychologists and the profile of SFSU Psychology students. The initiative to increase diversity should include:
  o Gathering and evaluating information about lecturer diversity and representation.
  o Collecting data related to recruitment and hiring to evaluate diversity of applicant pools, applicants invited to campus, offered positions, etc.
  o Targeted recruitment, including assessment of targeted outreach yield.
  o Formal inclusion of diversity initiative in hiring plan.
• Improve new faculty onboarding, including creating an onboarding document with access to Department information and a training program for advising.
• Create a faculty mentoring program to improve faculty engagement and retention.
• Implement an exit interview process for faculty separating from the University and incorporate the feedback from exit interviews into Department structure and priorities.
• Continued support for faculty in developing and putting forward innovative programs and ideas that provide ongoing opportunities for our students; Making sure that the Department maintains a culture that allows for and encourages this sort of development
• Increase transparency and set clear expectations. This includes:
  o Establishing equitable and reasonable expectations for all areas of workload (teaching, research, and service).
  o Formalizing information to faculty about service expectations to allow them to make decisions about time allocation/priorities.
  o Defining, incentivizing, and quantifying service activities and expectations.
  o Increasing information/transparency around financial support available within the Department for faculty development
Resource Allocation

- Increase T/TT faculty head count. It is readily apparent that increased T/TT faculty resources are needed to:
  - Maintain current student success outcomes.
  - Adequately implement, maintain, and strengthen required course offerings.
  - Innovate and expand the curriculum.
  - Improve student writing ability.
  - Provide one-on-one advising to students.
  - Maintain graduate program excellence.
  - Consider impaction removal.

- Enhance space allocation. The space allocated to our Department is over 16,000 square feet less than its CSU entitlement. Obtaining space commensurate with the size of our Department is a priority.

- Improve transparency and collaboration in Department resource distribution. This includes:
  - Creating a budget committee to increase awareness of the Department financials.
  - Empowering the budget committee to advise the Chair on large Department expenditures such as research infrastructure, office equipment, and capital improvements.
  - Collaborating on review and approval of applications for release time.
  - Establishing a process for distributing Instructionally Related Activity resources.