

# LDC Program Review – Annual Discipline Update for 2021-2022

## PART A

### SECTION 1: BASIC PROGRAM/DISCIPLINE INFORMATION

**SAC Name: Psychology**

**Disciplines included in this SAC: Psychology**

**SAC Chair(s): Debi Cozzoli** [debra.cozzoli@pcc.edu](mailto:debra.cozzoli@pcc.edu) and **Cynthia Golledge** [Cynthia Golledge](#)

**Faculty Department Chair(s):**

- PCC Cascade: Justin Elardo (Economics) [justin.elardo@pcc.edu](mailto:justin.elardo@pcc.edu)
- Rock Creek: Jamee Kristen (Sociology) [jamee.kristen@pcc.edu](mailto:jamee.kristen@pcc.edu)
- SouthEast: Jessica Beck (Art) [jessica.beck3@pcc.edu](mailto:jessica.beck3@pcc.edu)
- Sylvania and Newberg: Matt Stockton (Philosophy) [mstockto@pcc.edu](mailto:mstockto@pcc.edu)

**Psychology Program Dean: Dana Fuller** [dana.fuller@pcc.edu](mailto:dana.fuller@pcc.edu)

**Pathway Dean: interim Daniel Wenger** [dan.wenger1@pcc.edu](mailto:dan.wenger1@pcc.edu)

*Please highlight where your classes are offered.*

**Classes/Services offered at: CA / RC / SE / SY / NB / HC / WCC / Metro / CLIMB**

- **Other:** PSY 201A and PSY 202A are offered at **Tigard High School** and coordinated through Sylvania, but we don't know whether or not the SFTE for these courses are included with Sylvania campus. THS represents ~150-175 students in PSY 201A and PSY 202A annually.

### SECTION 2: REFLECTING ON DATA [Annual program update profiles | IE](#)

#### 2A.Enrollment (SFTE) per year by Location and Modality 2020-21, 2019-20, 2018-19

SAC Code	Campus	Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total SFTE	Onsite SFTE	Remote SFTE	Online SFTE	Hybrid SFTE	Blended SFTE
PSY	0 - College Wide			2020-21	804.8		508.8	290.7		5.2
PSY	1 - Sylvania			2020-21	382.1		196.0	182.7		3.1
PSY	2 - Cascade			2020-21	163.2		132.7	30.5		
PSY	3 - Rock Creek			2020-21	219.1		151.2	65.8		2.1
PSY	4 - Southeast			2020-21	40.6		28.8	11.8		
SAC Code	Campus	Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total SFTE	Onsite SFTE	Remote SFTE	Online SFTE	Hybrid SFTE	Blended SFTE
PSY	0 - College Wide			2019-20	801.0	346.8	128.0	303.5	11.7	10.8
PSY	1 - Sylvania			2019-20	350.6	114.1	45.8	185.9	3.1	1.6
PSY	2 - Cascade			2019-20	135.9	75.6	29.5	24.8	4.1	1.9
PSY	3 - Rock Creek			2019-20	200.4	101.4	29.4	59.9	2.4	7.3
PSY	4 - Southeast			2019-20	114.1	55.8	23.5	32.6	2.2	
SAC Code	Campus	Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total SFTE	Onsite SFTE	Remote SFTE	Online SFTE	Hybrid SFTE	Blended SFTE
PSY	0 - College Wide			2018-19	811.0	486.4		315.0	9.4	
PSY	1 - Sylvania			2018-19	353.5	169.6		181.7	2.1	
PSY	2 - Cascade			2018-19	147.3	113.2		29.4	4.7	
PSY	3 - Rock Creek			2018-19	206.8	143.5		63.2		
PSY	4 - Southeast			2018-19	103.5	60.1		40.6	2.6	

**2A1. Does this data suggest any questions that the SAC would like to pursue?**

It is difficult to draw conclusions and form questions given:

- 1) the reduction of our FT faculty from twelve to eight members across five years (2016-2021), including the vacancy of our sole FT faculty position at SE campus
- 2) the steady decline in college-wide enrollments over the past eight years
- 3) the impact of COVID-19.

Despite these challenges, the Psychology SFTE has remained fairly high, staying above 800 SFTE for the past three years. (Available IE data goes back to 2016-17, and shows our highest SFTE year was 2017-2018, with 845.7 SFTE.)

**2A2. Do the data suggest adjustments be made in your discipline, such as schedule or course offerings, with regards to enrollment? If yes, what ideas/strategies do you have that you would like to implement or have help with in the upcoming academic year?**

SFTE decline at SE reflects understaffing for all of 2020-21, including not only the vacancy of the sole FT PSY faculty position there, but also the utilization of only two PT faculty members. This resulted in decreased PSY course offerings for 2020-21. The PSY SAC is looking forward to rebuilding our presence at SE with the addition of a FT block hire to be in place F2022, and hiring more PT faculty so that more PSY courses can again be offered at SE campus.

**2A3. Are there other data reports that you would find informative/useful with regards to enrollment? How would this information support decision-making for the SAC/discipline?**

Please see our response to question 2B4, below.

**2A4. Is your program aware of any external influences that strongly affect recent enrollment? For example, state requirements, transferability challenges, other university policies, etc. Please explain.**

Because we do not have any external criteria that we need to meet (aside from accreditation), our program is not particularly impacted by these influences. Psychology course enrollment typically remains strong despite other fluctuations in enrollment. We are participating in the MTM (Map-to-Major) statewide initiative between CCs and OPUs as a result of Oregon HB 2998.

## 2B. Course Success Rates: % Success By Course and Modality 2020-21, 2019-20, 2018-19

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Onsite Enrollment	Onsite Success Rate (%)	Remote Enrollment	Remote Success Rate (%)	Online Enrollment	Online Success Rate (%)	Hybrid Enrollment	Hybrid Success Rate (%)	Blended Enrollment	Blended Success Rate (%)
PSY		2020-21	9068	80.3			5728	80.2	3283	80.4			57	
PSY	101	2020-21	9068	80.3			5728	80.2	3283	80.4			57	
PSY	201A	2020-21	1795	79.0			1491	79.4	304	77.0				
PSY	202A	2020-21	2480	76.8			1599	76.6	881	77.2				
PSY	213	2020-21	990	83.1			648	82.9	342	83.6				
PSY	214	2020-21	148	86.5					126	87.3			22	
PSY	215	2020-21	398	78.9			212	81.6	186	75.8				
PSY	216	2020-21	1663	82.3			802	82.2	826	82.1			35	
PSY	222	2020-21	246	80.9			214	82.2	32	71.9				
PSY	231	2020-21	185	77.8			185	77.8						
PSY	232	2020-21	308	79.2			143	78.3	165	80.0				
PSY	236	2020-21	51	90.2			51	90.2						
PSY	239	2020-21	105	84.8					105	84.8				
PSY	240	2020-21	587	86.2			271	87.8	316	84.8				
PSY		2020-21	112	90.2			112	90.2						

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Onsite Enrollment	Onsite Success Rate (%)	Remote Enrollment	Remote Success Rate (%)	Online Enrollment	Online Success Rate (%)	Hybrid Enrollment	Hybrid Success Rate (%)	Blended Enrollment	Blended Success Rate (%)
PSY		2019-20	9003	82.2	3847	83.8	1483	78.2	3419	82.3	128	73.4	126	74.6
PSY	101	2019-20	9003	82.2	3847	83.8	1483	78.2	3419	82.3	128	73.4	126	74.6
PSY	201A	2019-20	1863	83.1	1150	85.4	358	76.8	322	82.0			33	
PSY	202A	2019-20	2754	77.5	1277	78.5	443	75.6	937	77.9	48	62.5	49	61.2
PSY	213	2019-20	946	84.4	379	90.5	187	77.5	358	81.3			22	
PSY	214	2019-20	149	82.6					126	82.5	23	82.6		
PSY	215	2019-20	335	78.2	106	80.2	51	82.4	178	75.8				
PSY	216	2019-20	1647	86.1	481	87.7	182	79.7	905	86.7	57	78.9	22	204.5
PSY	222	2019-20	130	81.5	34	88.2	96	79.2						
PSY	231	2019-20	147	91.8	95	93.7	52	88.5						
PSY	232	2019-20	214	85.0	51	86.3	61	80.3	102	87.3				
PSY	236	2019-20	50	84.0	50	84.0								
PSY	239	2019-20	118	82.2					118	82.2				
PSY	240	2019-20	533	84.4	129	82.9	31	80.6	373	85.3				
PSY		2019-20	117	84.6	95	82.1	22	95.5						

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Onsite Enrollment	Onsite Success Rate (%)	Remote Enrollment	Remote Success Rate (%)	Online Enrollment	Online Success Rate (%)	Hybrid Enrollment	Hybrid Success Rate (%)	Blended Enrollment	Blended Success Rate (%)
PSY		2018-19	9110	82.2	5448	83.1			3557	80.7	105	82.9		
PSY	101	2018-19	9110	82.2	5448	83.1			3557	80.7	105	82.9		
PSY	201A	2018-19	1912	83.8	1519	84.0			365	82.5	28	89.3		
PSY	202A	2018-19	2817	76.3	1758	79.0			1035	71.9	24	62.5		
PSY	213	2018-19	916	84.2	532	86.3			384	81.3				
PSY	214	2018-19	145	82.1	12	66.7			133	83.5				
PSY	215	2018-19	304	78.0	113	86.7			191	72.8				
PSY	216	2018-19	1754	87.6	706	86.7			995	88.2	53	88.7		
PSY	222	2018-19	168	85.1	168	85.1								
PSY	231	2018-19	146	86.3	146	86.3								
PSY	232	2018-19	133	86.5	133	86.5								
PSY	236	2018-19	51	90.2	51	90.2								
PSY	239	2018-19	129	76.7					129	76.7				
PSY	240	2018-19	515	86.8	190	84.7			325	88.0				
PSY		2018-19	120	79.2	120	79.2								

### 2B1a. Are there any courses with lower or higher pass rates than others (over time, over many sections, or a notably higher or lower rate)? If so, which ones?

Pass rates across all PSY courses for the past three years range from a low of 76.3% to a high of 91.8% with averages ranging from 82.2% for two years to 80.3% last year (a year of entirely remote or online courses). It should be noted that the courses with the very high end of success rates are typically elective courses (required by no other program at PCC nor for transfer students) with very small enrollments. It's not appropriate to draw conclusions from data when the n is very small.

Our four largest-enrollment courses are required for some PCC majors and are recommended for students who are transferring into Psychology at OPU (typically PSU). Several hundred PCC students transfer to PSU as Psychology majors every year.

- PSY 101: Psychology and Human Relations.** Required for some PCC majors, often the only course that PCC non-Social Science Pathway students will take. This course also is typically populated by the most academically underprepared students. Overall success rate across three years was 79% (a year of entirely remote or online courses) to 83.8%

- **PSY 201A: Introduction to Psychology Pt 1.** Required for some PCC majors and recommended for transfer students. This course includes research methods, brain anatomy and physiology, memory systems and functions, and other STEM-based topics, and students are often surprised by the emphasis on biology, since they have misconceptions about psychology courses. Overall success rate across three years was 76.3% to 77.5%
- **PSY 202A: Introduction to Psychology Pt 2.** Recommended for transfer students to complete their Intro Psychology sequence, and usually only taken by those students who intend to major in Psychology or a related field. Overall success rate across three years was 76.3% to 77.5%
- **PSY 215: Human Development.** Although this course is taken for a variety of reasons, a large portion of these students are taking PSY 215 in order to meet requirements to apply for statewide Nursing Programs (PCC and elsewhere). Overall success rate across three years was 87.6% to 80.9%, with the latter occurring last year, consisting of entirely remote or online courses.

**2B1b. Are there any modalities with lower or higher pass rates than others (over time, over many sections, or a notably higher or lower rate)? If so, which ones?**

For many PSY courses, regardless of whether the course was offered remotely or online, success rates saw a drop in 2020-2021, and given the impact of COVID-19, it's impossible to draw conclusions as to whether that had anything to do with modality or was primarily a consequence of numerous external factors related to the pandemic. The one term for 2019-2020 that was entirely remote (Sp2020) shows a drop in success rates across all courses except for one section of one course. This data only reflects one term, but suggests that the quick switch from onsite to remote teaching and learning was difficult for both teachers and students. Remote learning success rates weren't hugely different from online success rates in 2020-2021 (statistical significance is difficult to calculate in small enrollment courses), but as mentioned, remained lower than in previous years.

**2B2. Strategy Insights**

**What strategies have you used to maintain high success rates? What can be learned that might be applied to courses with lower success rates? What are possible actions to be taken to understand/address lower success rates? Please clearly explain how your discipline intends to explore content/curriculum, pedagogy/teaching, course material selection, etc. using culturally responsive teaching approaches throughout the next year. Try to identify a realistic one year goal.**

The PSY SAC faculty are focused on using course resources that support student success, including providing support for Course Intended Outcomes, and for presenting students with non-prejudicial and culturally responsive content. We have had, and continue to have, conversations about some textbooks that include some problematic (inaccurate and/or prejudiced) content. While some PSY faculty believe that those textbooks should be abandoned in favor of resources that do not contain those problematic references, others prefer to address those examples where they occur in the resource, citing excellence in other areas of the resource. The PSY SAC faculty has not come to an agreed-upon policy to address these types of problems in resource content.

The PSY SAC noted that not providing any resource to students outside of lecture-content is neither fair nor equitable to students, and penalizes those who may not always be able to attend lectures or who may need more content support. This is particularly important as all of our courses were remote from Spring 2020 to Fall 2021, will be in Winter 2022, and will continue to be remote for many sections in the future. In February of 2021, the PSY SAC approved this policy: ***To promote student success and achievement of course outcomes, it is required that all Psychology courses at PCC 1) assign course materials that 2) align substantially (90% or more) with the class CCOG.*** However, this policy remains only a recommendation, since SACs have no authority to enforce SAC policy.

The PSY SAC formed a standing committee in September 2021: The ***Equitable & Inclusive Teaching in Psychology*** subcommittee will help us identify and adopt more effective resources and andragogy. Again, as noted above, any policy only remains a recommendation, since SACs have no authority to enforce SAC policy.

This year (2021-2022) we will be implementing an Integration Year for LAC Assessment, which will focus on improving success rates on the PSY 201A Signature Assignment, specifically focusing on those gender and race populations noted in our 2020-21 report. Please see 3A1.

## Enrollment and % Passing By Course and Student Demographics (Gender, Race, and Pell)

### Gender: 2020-21, 2019-20

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Female Enrollment	Female Success Rate (%)	Male Enrollment	Male Success Rate (%)	Nonbinary Enrollment	Nonbinary Success Rate (%)	Unknown Enrollment	Unknown Success Rate (%)
		2020-21	9068	80.3	6031	80.8	2605	79.0	159	78.0	273	83.2
PSY		2020-21	9068	80.3	6031	80.8	2605	79.0	159	78.0	273	83.2
PSY	101	2020-21	1795	79.0	1039	78.7	686	78.4	19	84.2	51	90.2
PSY	201A	2020-21	2480	76.8	1540	77.6	791	75.9	68	75.0	81	72.8
PSY	202A	2020-21	990	83.1	677	84.0	273	79.5	18	94.4	22	90.9
PSY	213	2020-21	148	86.5	108	86.1	31	93.5	3		6	83.3
PSY	214	2020-21	398	78.9	281	79.7	100	75.0	5		12	91.7
PSY	215	2020-21	1663	82.3	1240	81.4	353	85.6	23	78.3	47	83.0
PSY	216	2020-21	246	80.9	157	81.5	83	78.3			6	100.0
PSY	222	2020-21	185	77.8	139	79.9	36	66.7	1		9	88.9
PSY	231	2020-21	308	79.2	238	80.3	49	75.5	9	66.7	12	83.3
PSY	232	2020-21	51	90.2	34	94.1	11	81.8	2		4	
PSY	236	2020-21	105	84.8	78	87.2	22	81.8			5	
PSY	239	2020-21	587	86.2	412	86.7	151	85.4	9	77.8	15	86.7
PSY	240	2020-21	112	90.2	88	90.9	19	84.2	2		3	
Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Female Enrollment	Female Success Rate (%)	Male Enrollment	Male Success Rate (%)	Nonbinary Enrollment	Nonbinary Success Rate (%)	Unknown Enrollment	Unknown Success Rate (%)
		2019-20	9003	82.2	5658	83.0	2889	80.5	73	80.8	383	82.2
PSY		2019-20	9003	82.2	5658	83.0	2889	80.5	73	80.8	383	82.2
PSY	101	2019-20	1863	83.1	1013	84.4	771	81.1	11	81.8	68	88.2
PSY	201A	2019-20	2754	77.5	1643	79.2	976	74.9	26	73.1	109	76.1
PSY	202A	2019-20	946	84.4	578	84.6	314	83.4	8	87.5	46	87.0
PSY	213	2019-20	149	82.6	106	80.2	34	94.1	1		8	62.5
PSY	214	2019-20	335	78.2	226	79.6	92	77.2	1		16	68.8
PSY	215	2019-20	1647	86.1	1186	85.8	377	87.3	9	88.9	75	84.0
PSY	216	2019-20	130	81.5	88	79.5	36	86.1	2		4	
PSY	222	2019-20	147	91.8	109	92.7	31	90.3	1		6	83.3
PSY	231	2019-20	214	85.0	152	85.5	50	82.0	5		7	100.0
PSY	232	2019-20	50	84.0	38	86.8	10	70.0	1		1	
PSY	236	2019-20	118	82.2	84	82.1	25	76.0			9	100.0
PSY	239	2019-20	533	84.4	366	84.2	132	86.4	7	85.7	28	78.6
PSY	240	2019-20	117	84.6	69	82.6	41	85.4	1		6	100.0



## Gender: 2018-19

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Female Enrollment	Female Success Rate (%)	Male Enrollment	Male Success Rate (%)	Nonbinary Enrollment	Nonbinary Success Rate (%)	Unknown Enrollment	Unknown Success Rate (%)
		2018-19	9110	82.2	5776	82.7	2965	80.9	12	58.3	357	84.3
PSY		2018-19	9110	82.2	5776	82.7	2965	80.9	12	58.3	357	84.3
PSY	101	2018-19	1912	83.8	980	85.5	839	81.6	2		91	85.7
PSY	201A	2018-19	2817	76.3	1707	76.7	987	75.6	7	42.9	116	77.6
PSY	202A	2018-19	916	84.2	624	83.7	260	85.8	1		31	80.6
PSY	213	2018-19	145	82.1	104	79.8	37	86.5			4	
PSY	214	2018-19	304	78.0	220	74.5	79	87.3			5	
PSY	215	2018-19	1754	87.6	1272	88.2	412	85.4	1		69	89.9
PSY	216	2018-19	168	85.1	109	85.3	57	86.0			2	
PSY	222	2018-19	146	86.3	95	88.4	45	80.0			6	100.0
PSY	231	2018-19	133	86.5	84	86.9	43	86.0			6	83.3
PSY	232	2018-19	51	90.2	31	83.9	17	100.0			3	
PSY	236	2018-19	129	76.7	105	76.2	21	76.2			3	
PSY	239	2018-19	515	86.8	368	87.5	129	83.7	1		17	94.1
PSY	240	2018-19	120	79.2	77	79.2	39	76.9			4	

## Race - 2020-21

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Native American Enrollment	Native American Success Rate (%)	Asian Enrollment	Asian Success Rate (%)	Black Enrollment	Black Success Rate (%)	Latinx Enrollment	Latinx Success Rate (%)
		2020-21	9068	80.3	67	80.6	640	85.3	450	68.2	1739	74.3
PSY		2020-21	9068	80.3	67	80.6	640	85.3	450	68.2	1739	74.3
PSY	101	2020-21	1795	79.0	17	82.4	137	82.5	104	70.2	370	74.9
PSY	201A	2020-21	2480	76.8	14	78.6	181	84.5	124	62.9	500	73.6
PSY	202A	2020-21	990	83.1	9	66.7	53	92.5	38	71.1	233	72.5
PSY	213	2020-21	148	86.5	1		8	100.0	2		26	76.9
PSY	214	2020-21	398	78.9	3		27	92.6	21	47.6	54	66.7
PSY	215	2020-21	1663	82.3	10	80.0	141	85.1	95	71.6	293	78.2
PSY	216	2020-21	246	80.9	1		16	87.5	9	77.8	37	75.7
PSY	222	2020-21	185	77.8	4		17	88.2	11	63.6	44	56.8
PSY	231	2020-21	308	79.2	2		16	56.3	12	58.3	51	76.5
PSY	232	2020-21	51	90.2	1		1		1		10	70.0
PSY	236	2020-21	105	84.8			5		5		12	66.7
PSY	239	2020-21	587	86.2	4		31	96.8	21	81.0	98	78.6
PSY	240	2020-21	112	90.2	1		7	85.7	7	100.0	11	81.8

NHoPI Enrollment	NHoPI Success Rate (%)	International Enrollment	International Success Rate (%)	White Enrollment	White Success Rate (%)	Multiracial Enrollment	Multiracial Success Rate (%)	Unknown Enrollment	Unknown Success Rate (%)
59	66.1	70	88.6	4915	83.4	708	74.7	420	84.8
59	66.1	70	88.6	4915	83.4	708	74.7	420	84.8
17	76.5	15	86.7	913	80.4	142	76.8	80	90.0
19	57.9	12	83.3	1317	79.6	192	69.3	121	76.9
3		5		527	89.0	71	73.2	51	88.2
		2		98	88.8	6	83.3	5	
4		5		229	84.3	37	64.9	18	83.3
8	62.5	17	94.1	914	84.6	115	79.1	70	82.9
1		3		149	82.6	23	73.9	7	85.7
2		1		84	89.3	16	75.0	6	83.3
		4		180	82.8	30	80.0	13	84.6
		1		27	96.3	6	100.0	4	
1		1		64	89.1	10	80.0	7	85.7
4		3		350	88.0	49	79.6	27	96.3
		1		63	92.1	11	81.8	11	90.9

## Race - 2019-20

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Native American Enrollment	Native American Success Rate (%)	Asian Enrollment	Asian Success Rate (%)	Black Enrollment	Black Success Rate (%)	Latinx Enrollment	Latinx Success Rate (%)
		2019-20	9003	82.2	81	71.6	654	87.0	499	68.1	1569	77.7
PSY		2019-20	9003	82.2	81	71.6	654	87.0	499	68.1	1569	77.7
PSY	101	2019-20	1863	83.1	19	68.4	144	88.9	134	68.7	358	80.4
PSY	201A	2019-20	2754	77.5	29	65.5	206	83.5	149	61.7	518	71.6
PSY	202A	2019-20	946	84.4	7	71.4	84	90.5	35	65.7	167	78.4
PSY	213	2019-20	149	82.6			8	100.0	3		14	50.0
PSY	214	2019-20	335	78.2	2		17	88.2	17	41.2	54	72.2
PSY	215	2019-20	1647	86.1	8	75.0	124	87.1	86	74.4	275	82.5
PSY	216	2019-20	130	81.5	1		10	90.0	6	83.3	18	88.9
PSY	222	2019-20	147	91.8	1		9	88.9	8	87.5	28	96.4
PSY	231	2019-20	214	85.0	2		8	100.0	9	88.9	40	75.0
PSY	232	2019-20	50	84.0	1		3		5		6	83.3
PSY	236	2019-20	118	82.2	1		9	88.9	13	69.2	14	85.7
PSY	239	2019-20	533	84.4	10	80.0	23	82.6	25	80.0	60	85.0
PSY	240	2019-20	117	84.6			9	77.8	9	77.8	17	88.2

NHoPI Enrollment	NHoPI Success Rate (%)	International Enrollment	International Success Rate (%)	White Enrollment	White Success Rate (%)	Multiracial Enrollment	Multiracial Success Rate (%)	Unknown Enrollment	Unknown Success Rate (%)
53	77.4	151	86.8	4734	84.1	749	82.6	513	85.0
53	77.4	151	86.8	4734	84.1	749	82.6	513	85.0
8	75.0	43	90.7	882	84.5	154	83.1	121	90.9
17	58.8	45	86.7	1419	80.1	211	79.6	160	80.0
5		17	82.4	500	88.0	82	80.5	49	83.7
2				100	85.0	15	73.3	7	100.0
		7	100.0	184	81.5	39	76.9	15	80.0
15	100.0	26	84.6	894	87.4	122	88.5	97	89.7
		2		70	72.9	15	100.0	8	87.5
		3		79	92.4	14	92.9	5	
		2		120	89.2	24	75.0	9	88.9
				30	90.0	3		2	
2				55	81.8	13	92.3	11	72.7
4		5		338	86.1	44	79.5	24	75.0
		1		63	82.5	13	100.0	5	

## Race - 2018-19

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Native American Enrollment	Native American Success Rate (%)	Asian Enrollment	Asian Success Rate (%)	Black Enrollment	Black Success Rate (%)	Latinx Enrollment	Latinx Success Rate (%)
		2018-19	9110	82.2	74	73.0	662	86.7	465	74.6	1288	80.2
PSY		2018-19	9110	82.2	74	73.0	662	86.7	465	74.6	1288	80.2
PSY	101	2018-19	1912	83.8	18	77.8	169	88.8	94	73.4	300	83.7
PSY	201A	2018-19	2817	76.3	26	50.0	219	84.5	141	67.4	407	71.7
PSY	202A	2018-19	916	84.2	5		72	84.7	47	85.1	114	79.8
PSY	213	2018-19	145	82.1			11	81.8	4		15	86.7
PSY	214	2018-19	304	78.0	3		12	83.3	15	73.3	46	78.3
PSY	215	2018-19	1754	87.6	13	84.6	133	91.0	106	80.2	231	87.0
PSY	216	2018-19	168	85.1			7	71.4	4		33	75.8
PSY	222	2018-19	146	86.3	1		7	85.7	14	71.4	24	95.8
PSY	231	2018-19	133	86.5	1		4		3		20	85.0
PSY	232	2018-19	51	90.2	1		1		3		9	100.0
PSY	236	2018-19	129	76.7	1		5		8	75.0	16	87.5
PSY	239	2018-19	515	86.8	5		16	75.0	16	68.8	53	84.9
PSY	240	2018-19	120	79.2			6	100.0	10	80.0	20	80.0

NHoPI Enrollment	NHoPI Success Rate (%)	International Enrollment	International Success Rate (%)	White Enrollment	White Success Rate (%)	Multiracial Enrollment	Multiracial Success Rate (%)	Unknown Enrollment	Unknown Success Rate (%)
55	70.9	165	85.5	5004	83.1	782	81.8	615	81.5
55	70.9	165	85.5	5004	83.1	782	81.8	615	81.5
10	60.0	65	84.6	950	84.5	152	82.9	154	83.1
18	55.6	49	83.7	1523	77.5	248	73.8	186	80.1
4		9	100.0	502	84.7	88	88.6	75	77.3
1		3		88	80.7	15	86.7	8	87.5
2		2		179	77.7	23	82.6	22	77.3
14	85.7	16	100.0	992	88.9	144	84.0	105	83.8
1		5		96	88.5	12	91.7	10	100.0
3		5		65	84.6	15	86.7	12	91.7
		3		75	86.7	20	85.0	7	71.4
				29	86.2	5		3	
				87	74.7	8	100.0	4	
1		6	83.3	354	88.1	40	92.5	24	79.2
1		2		64	76.6	12	83.3	5	

## Pell eligibility: 2020-21, 2019-20, 2018-19

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Offered Enrollment	Offered Success Rate (%)	Not Offered Enrollment	Not Offered Success Rate (%)
		2020-21	9068	80.3	3621	77.3	5447	82.4
PSY		2020-21	9068	80.3	3621	77.3	5447	82.4
PSY	101	2020-21	1795	79.0	738	75.7	1057	81.3
PSY	201A	2020-21	2480	76.8	1010	73.2	1470	79.3
PSY	202A	2020-21	990	83.1	409	82.6	581	83.5
PSY	213	2020-21	148	86.5	61	83.6	87	88.5
PSY	214	2020-21	398	78.9	158	81.0	240	77.5
PSY	215	2020-21	1663	82.3	571	77.4	1092	84.8
PSY	216	2020-21	246	80.9	94	77.7	152	82.9
PSY	222	2020-21	185	77.8	101	73.3	84	83.3
PSY	231	2020-21	308	79.2	140	76.4	168	81.5
PSY	232	2020-21	51	90.2	30	90.0	21	90.5
PSY	236	2020-21	105	84.8	38	73.7	67	91.0
PSY	239	2020-21	587	86.2	217	84.8	370	87.0
PSY	240	2020-21	112	90.2	54	90.7	58	89.7

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Offered Enrollment	Offered Success Rate (%)	Not Offered Enrollment	Not Offered Success Rate (%)
		2019-20	9003	82.2	3821	78.8	5182	84.6
PSY		2019-20	9003	82.2	3821	78.8	5182	84.6
PSY	101	2019-20	1863	83.1	853	81.2	1010	84.8
PSY	201A	2019-20	2754	77.5	1171	73.5	1583	80.5
PSY	202A	2019-20	946	84.4	385	80.3	561	87.2
PSY	213	2019-20	149	82.6	65	75.4	84	88.1
PSY	214	2019-20	335	78.2	147	72.8	188	82.4
PSY	215	2019-20	1647	86.1	620	82.4	1027	88.3
PSY	216	2019-20	130	81.5	61	82.0	69	81.2
PSY	222	2019-20	147	91.8	76	89.5	71	94.4
PSY	231	2019-20	214	85.0	97	84.5	117	85.5
PSY	232	2019-20	50	84.0	21	81.0	29	86.2
PSY	236	2019-20	118	82.2	49	75.5	69	87.0
PSY	239	2019-20	533	84.4	227	82.4	306	85.9
PSY	240	2019-20	117	84.6	49	83.7	68	85.3

Subject Code	Course Number	Academic Year	Total Enrollment	Total Success Rate (%)	Offered Enrollment	Offered Success Rate (%)	Not Offered Enrollment	Not Offered Success Rate (%)
		2018-19	9110	82.2	3708	80.3	5402	83.4
PSY		2018-19	9110	82.2	3708	80.3	5402	83.4
PSY	101	2018-19	1912	83.8	824	81.1	1088	85.8
PSY	201A	2018-19	2817	76.3	1142	74.8	1675	77.3
PSY	202A	2018-19	916	84.2	403	80.1	513	87.3
PSY	213	2018-19	145	82.1	57	80.7	88	83.0
PSY	214	2018-19	304	78.0	142	77.5	162	78.4
PSY	215	2018-19	1754	87.6	606	86.0	1148	88.5
PSY	216	2018-19	168	85.1	54	87.0	114	84.2
PSY	222	2018-19	146	86.3	57	86.0	89	86.5
PSY	231	2018-19	133	86.5	58	89.7	75	84.0
PSY	232	2018-19	51	90.2	28	96.4	23	82.6
PSY	236	2018-19	129	76.7	60	78.3	69	75.4
PSY	239	2018-19	515	86.8	214	86.0	301	87.4
PSY	240	2018-19	120	79.2	63	81.0	57	77.2



**2B3. The data may indicate a pattern of inequities (in gender, race, or Pell eligibility) in student enrollment or success. Please clearly explain how your program intends to explore content/curriculum, pedagogy/teaching, course material selection, etc. using culturally responsive teaching approaches throughout the next year. Try to identify a realistic one year goal.**

The patterns observed here indicate differences in performance by groups that are likely the result of institutional (societal) inequities, and we ruefully acknowledge that we as faculty are not going to be able to correct the consequences of societal inequities solely through our teaching practices in one course. We do believe that we can help make a difference, and we seek to do all we can to support students and to help them feel valued and that they belong. This includes acknowledging and responding appropriately to the challenges that our students encounter, for example, by reaching out to them early when it seems that the student might be struggling, and by extending flexibility with due dates. We are also working continuously toward improving our andragogical strategies and using resources that are inclusive and equitable.

As indicated in response to 2B2, we have created an internal ***Equitable & Inclusive Teaching in Psychology*** subcommittee to help us identify and adopt more equitable and inclusive resources and andragogy.

Strategies that the PSY SAC discusses and implements to increase student effectiveness include, but are not limited to:

- Assessing early and assessing often, including many formative and low-stakes assessments. Formative (such as homework and discussions) and low-stakes (small quizzes and assignments) assessments should be part of the curriculum starting no later than the second week of a regular 11-week term.
- Students who are not doing well on those early assessments should be privately contacted immediately and offered support. Students who *are* doing well should also be recognized by the instructor. We make use of CPNs and/or private emails to communicate these messages to students.
- Encouraging our faculty to use suggestions such as “What Works Well in Online Teaching” for all modalities (where applicable). [What Works Well](#)
- Course assessments varied in format and weight toward final grade. We strongly discourage relying only on 2-3 large exams as the source of the student’s final grade.
- Including diverse content as a regular part of the course, not special boxes or sections.
- Allowing flexibility in deadlines when extenuating factors make these extensions reasonable (eg, illness, caretaking responsibilities for others, etc).
- Making use of announcements, emails, Zoom chat, breakout rooms, etc. All of these ways that we connect our students with each other, with us, and with the content works toward learner-learner, learner-instructor, and learner-content interaction. These connections are key for students to feel that they belong in college, at PCC, in our specific class, and that they have valuable contributions.

This year (2021-2022) we will be implementing an Integration Year for LAC Assessment, which will focus on improving success rates on the PSY 201A Signature Assignment, specifically focusing on those gender and race populations noted in our 2020-21 report. Please see 3A.

In addition to our Integration Plan, a realistic goal that the entire SAC has adopted will be the creation of a Statement of Respect across all Psychology course syllabi. As noted in [Defining Respect in the Classroom | Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#)

*A key way to create an inclusive classroom is to establish a set of community norms (Tanner 2017). This can take the form of a syllabus statement or a spoken assertion made on the first day of class and repeated throughout the semester.*

Please also see our response to 2B4, below.

**2B4. What support does your SAC need to fully explore inequities in enrollment or student success? For example, are there any other data reports you would find useful to have related to student success?**

The PSY SAC notes that Pell grant eligibility indicates financial need, which is important, but is only one component of SES. SES has been shown to be the most significant predictor of academic success.

#### **[Education and Socioeconomic Status](#)** (<[link to American Psychological Association](#))

Socioeconomic status (SES) encompasses not just income but also educational attainment, financial security, and subjective perceptions of social status and social class. Socioeconomic status can encompass quality of life attributes as well as the opportunities and privileges afforded to people within society. Poverty, specifically, is not a single factor but rather is characterized by multiple physical and psychosocial stressors. Further, SES is a consistent and reliable predictor of a vast array of outcomes across the life span, including physical and psychological health. Thus, SES is relevant to all realms of behavioral and social science, including research, practice, education and advocacy.

#### ***Excerpt from page:***

Research continues to link lower SES to lower academic achievement and slower rates of academic progress as compared with higher SES communities.

- Children from low-SES families enter high school with average literacy skills five years behind those of high-income students (Reardon, Valentino, Kalogrides, Shores, & Greenberg, 2013).
- In 2014, the high school dropout rate among persons 16–24 years old was highest in low-income families (11.6 percent) as compared to high-income families (2.8 percent; National Center for Education Statistics, 2014).
- The success rate of low-income students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics disciplines is much lower than that of students who do not come from underrepresented backgrounds (Doerschuk et al., 2016).
- According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2014), individuals within the top family income quartile are 8 times more likely to obtain a bachelor's degree by age 24 as compared to individuals from the lowest family income quartile.

Lower SES is disproportionately represented in BIPOC communities as a result of institutional (societal) racism, but what the evidence shows is that it is not race *per se* that is impacting student success, **it is SES level**. PCC does not currently appear to be collecting enough data that would better indicate students' SES and preparedness levels for college success. In addition to financial need (as measured by Pell Grant eligibility), PCC would increase its effectiveness in targeting YESS

initiatives by also **gathering data about High School grades, 1st Gen college, parental educational achievement, parental income, prior college course credit, and prior college GPA.** Identifying at-risk students by these factors at the start of their college career and having an intervention in place at the outset and during the students' first year of college would, we predict, help raise success and completion rates for PCC. Absolutely, anti-racist and anti-sexist policies and andragogy is vitally important, but race and gender are not the most predictive factors of college success, so it behooves us as an institution to not focus our efforts solely on those factors.

Gathering this data to make better-informed decisions about at-risk students is not something the PSY SAC faculty can do. This information could be gathered by IE and used to direct a program to support PCC's vulnerable students. The PSY SAC faculty look forward to engaging in such a program.

## **SECTION 3: REFLECTION ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING**

### **3A. Assessment Reports**

*Please note: The following questions link directly to your Annual Learning Assessment Reports for the Learning Assessment Council. Feel free to cut and paste between this document and your other assessment documentation.*

#### **3A1. Which student learning outcomes from your SAC's available courses will you assess this year and will you use direct assessment strategies?**

Our 2020-21 Assessment investigated the Social Inquiry and Analysis rubric to assess the PSY 201 Signature Assignment.

- Benchmark attainment percentages were not met on any dimension (benchmark was level 2 on the rubric)
  - The Diversity dimension is particularly problematic with only 23% of students meeting level 2 or higher
- Significant percentages of students dropped the course or did not submit an assignment
  - There were higher drops and non-submission levels in multi-race, Hispanic, and female groups
- Students who placed into and completed RD115 prior to taking PSY 201 performed at a lower level on all dimensions of the rubric, relative to students who placed into or completed WR 121
- Males noticeably underperformed compared to Females on 3 of the dimensions (Information Literacy, Social Context, and Diversity)
- Mixed-race students performed worse than Hispanic or Caucasian students on 3 criteria (Information Literacy, Method of Inquiry, and Social Context; very small n)
  - Mixed-race students performed better on the Diversity criteria compared to other students

The PSY SAC will be making use of an Integration year, with the goal that we can better understand the needs of our students and create interventions that facilitate 75% of students (regardless of background) performing at benchmark (level 2 or higher on each rubric criteria) on the 201 signature assignment in future terms.

We plan to meet this goal by:

- Conducting a mini-reassessment of artifacts from Fall term to evaluate impact of revisions to the SA that occurred summer 2021
- Collecting additional feedback from students and faculty on SA process
- Using the above to inform changes in the teaching and delivery processes as well as appropriate professional development opportunities

**3A2. Which courses do you plan to assess this year; how and why will your SAC choose the sections?**

PSY 201: Introduction to Psychology Pt 1. We are choosing this course because it is our highest-enrolled course (2500+ annually) and we have spent more time revising and improving the Signature Assignment for this course than our other two Gen Ed courses.

**3A3. In general terms, describe the assessment project for the year from implementation to data collection. What steps will you take in carrying out the project?**

We plan to meet this goal by:

- Conducting a mini-reassessment of artifacts from Fall term to evaluate impact of revisions to the SA that occurred summer 2021
- Collecting additional feedback from students and faculty on SA process
- Using the above to inform changes in the teaching and delivery processes as well as appropriate professional development opportunities

**3B. Response to LAC Assessment Question**

**Please respond to the question below, which relates to your SAC's 2020-2021 Learning Assessment Report to the Learning Assessment Council (LAC).**

*Psychology did not submit a learning assessment report in 2021.*

Question: We know you were working on an assessment report. The following is the question shared with all SACs that did not submit their learning assessment reports. Please adjust your response accordingly based on what you may have learned from the work you did but did not submit.

SACs have experienced a range of challenges in assessing outcomes in 2020-2021. As you think about the next academic year and the many ways you already assess students, how might you share that information with others and learn from it? The LAC has coaches ready to help you translate that into a learning assessment project.

## **SAC Response:**

We did submit our report late (October 2021) and it was reviewed favorably. We will be implementing an Integration Year Plan for this coming year to address what we discovered in the past year's assessment.

### **SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES or OPPORTUNITIES**

#### **4A. Is there anything further you would like to share about your program's achievements at this time?**

Aside from the Herculean effort to transition our in-person courses to remote learning, and our ongoing efforts to maintain high andragical standards... no. It should be noted that the PT and FT psychology faculty have worked tirelessly to ensure quality engagement with their students, in spite of the challenges of incorporating Signature Assignments into three of our four most highly-enrolled courses, on top of the challenges of remote teaching and learning.

#### **4B. Are there any challenges not described above that you would like to note here?**

The PSY SAC notes that, as we move from a "facilitative and assessment-oriented" model of teaching to a more "coaching" model of teaching -- which we embrace -- section enrollment caps must be reduced. There are not enough hours in the day or week for one instructor to provide more intense support to 100+ students per term.

Becoming more equitable and inclusive in our teaching andragogy means:

1. Providing more formative and summative assessments throughout the term in order to give earlier and more proactive feedback and support to students
2. Providing more *varied* forms of formative assessment and summative assessment in order to provide multiple and alternative ways for students to demonstrate competence

Additionally:

3. Three of our four largest-enrolled courses are now Gen Ed courses, which means there is an extensive Signature Assignment that is a required part of those courses (PSY 101, PSY 201A, PSY 202A). We have already learned in the past year that coaching toward and facilitating student success on these Signature Assignments requires more direct one-on-one instructor support for students.

'Lower enrollment caps' has been a request of the PSY SAC for many Program Review cycles, and our most recent Program Dean, Dana Fuller, successfully negotiated those enrollment caps down from 35 to 30 students per class starting in January 2022. This is a welcome step in the right direction, but if PCC wants instructors to be more proactive and more intensive in their efforts to help individual students, then the enrollment cap needs to be lower still.

**In order to effectively meet the demands of the three points listed above, enrollment caps must be reduced to 25 students per class.**



**4C. Do you see any opportunities in the near or long term that you would like to share?**

We anticipate that, as the college cautiously begins to offer more onsite teaching and learning again, we will continue to offer some sections of our courses as remote (synchronous) and possibly as a hybrid of onsite and remote. These new modalities can be added to our traditional and newer modalities of onsite, online, and hybrid onsite/online sections.