

ASSESSMENT REPORT REMOTE/DISTANCE LEARNING

PSYCHOLOGY

ACADEMIC YEAR 2019 - 2020

REPORT DUE DATE: December 4, 2020

This is an alternative template.

Given the unusual circumstances of the 2019-2020 academic year, each program/department/major/minor/certificate has two options of assessment:

(a) Usual assessment report based on attached template OR

(b) Alternative assessment reflections on distance learning pivot based on this template

Every program/department/major/minor/certificate can choose ONE of the two report formats to submit

Please make sure to fill out Page 1 – Questions 1 and 2

-
- **Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences.**
 - **Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated in separate sections. If you choose to submit a remote learning reflections document, it should also have separate segments for major and minor**
 - **Undergraduate, Graduate and Certificate Programs must submit separate reports. An aggregate report is allowed only for major and minor of the same program**
 - **It is recommended that assessment report not exceed 10 pages. Additional materials (optional) can be added as appendices**
 - **Curriculum Map should be submitted along with Assessment Report**

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@usfca.edu

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment>

Email to submit the report: assessment_cas@usfca.edu

Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.

For example: FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor);

FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)

I. LOGISTICS

- 1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).**

Professor Lisa Wagner
Chair, Psychology Department
Mail to: wagnerl@usfca.edu

Professor Aline Hitti
Assistant Professor, Psychology
Copy to: ahitti@usfca.edu

[Report was created by Prof. Aline Hitti]

- 2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) an aggregate report for a Major and Minor (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program.
Please also indicate which report format are you submitting –Standard Report or Reflections Document**

Major and Minor Aggregated Report

We are submitting a reflection document for the 2019-2020 report.

- 3. Have there been any revisions to the Curricular Map in 2019-2020 academic year? If there has been a change, please submit the new/revised Curricular Map document.**

No changes made.

II. MISSION STATEMENT & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2019? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program

No Changes were made.

- **Mission Statement (Major and Minor):**

The Bachelor of Arts in Psychology provides a foundation for traditional and nontraditional students who wish to become psychologists. It also prepares students to become lifelong learners by delivering analytical, quantitative, and problem-solving skills that lead to self-awareness, critical social/cultural engagement as well as employment in a variety of work settings.

3. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2019? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.

Note: Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

No changes were made.

PLOs (Major):

1. Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.
2. Students will respect and use critical thinking, skeptical inquiry and a scientific approach to understanding human behavior and psychological processes.
3. Students will understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.
4. Students will apply psychological theory, methodology and findings to develop a greater understanding of the whole person, as an individual and as a member of a large community, society, and culture.
5. Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats.
6. Students will recognize, understand, and respect the complexity of sociocultural and international diversity.

PLOs (Minor):

1. Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, perspectives,

empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.

2. Students will use critical thinking, skeptical inquiry and/or a scientific approach to understanding human behavior and psychological processes underlying human behavior.
3. Students will apply psychological theory and findings to develop a greater understanding of the whole person, as an individual and as a member of the larger community.

III. REMOTE/DISTANCE LEARNING

We thank the FDCD for the feedback on our 2018-2019 assessment report. This in particular included a recommendation to collect indirect assessment from students. We agree this is another good method to assess our curriculum and courses. Unfortunately, due to COVID-19 and the sudden switch to remote teaching in the Spring we were not able to ask students about their learning experiences. The methodology adopted instead is described below.

Methodology: The reflections reported represent themes and aggregate reflections of 19 faculty members (10/13 Full Time, 9/14 Adjunct) who responded to the following five questions:

1. What elements of your class(es) were adaptable to a remote/distance learning environment?
2. What elements of your class(es) were not adaptable to a remote/distance learning environment?
3. What was the average proportion of synchronous versus asynchronous learning for your class(es) or parts thereof? A rough estimate would suffice.
4. For what aspects of learning is synchronous instruction more effective and for which ones is asynchronous instruction more effective?
5. As remote/distance learning continues in the current environment, what changes have you instituted in your class(es) based on experiences with remote instruction?

1. What elements of the program were adaptable to a remote/distance learning environment?

When asking faculty teaching within our program to reflect on elements of their classes that were adaptable to remote/distance learning, a large minority (42%) of faculty thought all aspects of their courses could be adaptable. A strong majority (95%) thought that lectures were adaptable. This was followed by course assessments (63%) and other class activities (58%, feedback, student presentations, in-class learning activities). The least cited element was discussion (32%). Overall, lectures were viewed as the most adaptable element of the program and discussions the least adaptable (see Table 1).

2. What elements of the program were not adaptable to a remote/distance learning environment?

Psychology program faculty reflected on several elements of their courses that they viewed were not adaptable to a remote/learning environment. The most frequently

mentioned element included in-class activities and experiential learning activities (52%). Four out of the 10 faculty (40%) who cited difficulties with experiential learning and in-class activities blamed technology issues for these difficulties. Second, faculty found it sometimes challenging to adapt assessments such as quizzes and exams to a remote/distance learning environment (37%). Four out of 7 faculty (57%) documented that challenges with assessments were due to technology glitches. 21% of faculty thought that there was no element of their courses that could not be adaptable to a remote/distance learning environment. 11% referred to professor-student dynamics and ability to establish class community suffered due to transitioning to online learning environments and 11% referenced difficulty with discussion portions of their course (see Table 2). Overall, adapting experiential learning and in-class activities as well as assessments to the remote learning environment were viewed as most challenging. Notably, 47% of faculty viewed these challenges to be due to problems with technology. Solutions to these challenges should be addressed by ITS and ETS.

3. What was the average proportion of synchronous versus asynchronous learning for your program or parts thereof? A rough estimate would suffice.

Program faculty responded with their own proportions of synchronous and asynchronous learning and these were averaged out across the 19 respondents. On average faculty reported 75% synchronous instruction and 25% asynchronous. Thus, on average faculty implemented most learning in a synchronous format and relied less on asynchronous formats.

4. For what aspects of learning is synchronous instruction effective and for which ones is asynchronous instruction more effective?

Program faculty reflected on several aspects of learning when comparing synchronous and asynchronous learning. These included, lectures, discussion, learning activities (student presentations, group work, readings, labs), and inclusivity. When reflecting on lectures and discussions there was a slight

preference for carrying out these aspects of learning synchronously (Lectures: 42%, Discussions: 26%) versus asynchronously (Lectures: 37%, Discussions: 16%). Additionally, an array of learning activities was mentioned, including, student presentations, group work, readings, labs, and problem solving. Faculty reported a preference for conducting these activities asynchronously (42%) versus synchronously (37%). A handful of faculty members (26%) referenced inclusivity when reflecting on this question and 4 out of the 5 faculty members thought that asynchronous learning was more inclusive, in that it provided students of many backgrounds flexibility in accessing the same content. Finally, 5 faculty members (26%) made broad statements about their preferences for either modality and 3 out of the 5 preferred synchronous instruction over asynchronous, 1 out of 5 reflected no modality offers an advantage over the other, and 2 out of 5 preferred asynchronous over synchronous instruction. Overall, a preference for synchronous over asynchronous instructions was expressed, with some showing a slight preference for carrying out specific learning activities asynchronously.

5. As remote/distance learning continues in the current environment, what changes has the program instituted based on experiences with remote instruction?

In response to the question about changes faculty members would make based on their experiences with remote instruction; faculty members reflected on changes to lectures, assessments, creating class community, amount of group work, amount of discussion time, course format, and other learning aspects. In particular, faculty reflected on changes to their lectures (32%) with many referring to creating shorter, more streamlined, and more engaging lectures. This was followed by changes to assessment types and content, and was mentioned by 26 % of program faculty members. 21% of faculty members thought it was important to focus on establishing class community, and another 21% mentioned they would like to increase opportunities for discussion in their course. 16 % reflected about changes to their class format, namely discussing changing to a

flipped classroom format or making adjustments to a flipped classroom format. A small proportion (11%) mentioned they would like to provide more opportunities for problem-based learning. Finally, 6 faculty mentioned other changes they would like to implement, such as better communication of course expectations, focusing on netiquette, more attention to student participation, providing students with more strategies for presentations, providing flexible due dates, and becoming more competent in Zoom.

Responses to this question and the several preceding questions indicate that our program faculty members are reflecting deeply about their remote/distance learning experiences. In addition, many responses mentioned lessons learned from spring 2020 that were already being incorporated within classes in fall 2020. For example, one faculty member reflected *"[I changed] A lot! I now use a flipped classroom model, an interactive online textbook and shorter and more engaging recorded lectures."* Other faculty are looking forward to continued improvements and reflected on changes that need to be done in the future, for instance one faculty member wrote: *"I am still trying to figure this [changes to aspects of learning] out and will have to make a lot of changes for the Spring 2021 semester."* Overall, the findings highlight a strong commitment to delivering quality and meaningful learning experiences that are in line with our program learning outcomes.

OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Table 1.

Percent of faculty citing program element adaptable to remote/distance learning environment

Program Element	Percentage
Lectures	95%
Assessments	63%
Other class activities	58%
Discussions	32%
All the course elements	42%

Table 2.

Percent of faculty citing program element not adaptable to remote/distance learning environment

Program Element	Percentage
Experiential Learning	53%
Assessments	37%
All the course elements	21%
Discussion	11%
Teacher-student dynamics	11%