PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT EVALUATION

The following is a report from the Evaluation Committee of the Psychology
Department. The report includes five sections: I. Faculty Evaluation of
Chairman; II. Faculty Opinion Concerning Research, Teaching, and Allocation of
Funds; III. Faculty and Student Evaluation of the Graduate and Undergraduate
Programs; IV. Professional Activities of Faculty Members; and V. Recommendations.

I. Faculty Evaluation of Chairman

A total of 11 statements were chosen to describe the various aspects of
the duties of a Chairman. Each faculty member was asked to rate the chairman
on each of these statements on a 3-point scale (strong, satisfactory, weak).
Out of 21 forms given to the faculty members, 17 rating forms were returned.
Care was taken to assure the anonymity of the raters. The results are briefly
given below.

Overall, faculty members of this Department are very supportive of the
chairman. Most notably, over 70% of the faculty feel that he is strong on
being fair, congenial and friendly, concerned, available to faculty members
and students and giving assistance to them. There are only three areas where
20% or less of the faculty feel he is weak, and these areas are: making
efforts to improve the Department, in arousing esprit de corps and in conduct-
ing faculty meetings. No more than 15% of the faculty perceive the chairman
as weak on any other aspect.

At the end of the 3-point rating scale, there was one last item asking
for general comments. Here again the comments were most favorable. Six sets
of positive comments, and two faculty members suggested that the chairman may
be too rigid about rules sometimes, that he needs to do something about the
two or three professors who do not prepare for their courses, and that he
should take a stand and not try to please everyone.

In conclusion, the great majority of the faculty members feel that the
Chairman is doing a very good job.

Table 1

Percentage of Ratings Regarding the Chairman

	STRONG	SATISFACTORY	WEAK
1. Fairness in running the Department	80	20	0
2. Use of faculty input in decision making	60	25	15
3. Effort in improving the Department	30	50	20
4. Support of Departmental interest in interacting with the Administration	30	60	10
5. Availability to faculty members	75	20	5
6. Availability to students	70	30	0
7. Manner in conducting faculty meetings	25	60	15
8. Success in arousing esprit de corps	25	60	15
9. Openness and candidness in interacting with faculty members and students	50	40	10
10. Congeniality and friendliness in interacting with faculty members and students	80	20	0
11. Concern and assistance to faculty members and students	70	25	5
12. Any general comments?			

II. <u>Faculty</u> <u>Opinion</u> <u>Concerning</u> <u>Research</u>, <u>Teaching</u>, <u>and</u> <u>Allocation</u> <u>of</u> <u>Funds</u>

<u>Research</u>

While most faculty members feel that the Department provides adequate time for research (11/18) and access to research subjects (14/18), many feel that the equipment (14/18) and space (11/18) are inadequate. Also, most faculty members feel that research efforts are not adequately encouraged, supported, and recognized (11/19), but that the allocation of available research funds is satisfactory (13/19). Eight people feel that too little research is done within the Department, while 10 feel that adequate research is conducted. Thus, while the faculty, in general, feels that research is encouraged, time and subjects are adequate, there is a feeling that space and equipment limit the research that is done.

<u>Teaching</u> <u>and</u> <u>other</u> <u>duties</u>

Most staff members feel that teaching efforts (10/17) and committee work (14/18) are adequately encouraged, supported, and recognized. However, the staff members are divided with respect to their feeling concerning the encouragement, recognition, and support of thesis supervision and student advising. Eight people felt that thesis supervision and student advising are adequately recognized, 10 felt that thesis supervision and advising are not adequately recognized. Thus, in general, the staff feels that teaching and committee work is adequately supported, but they have divided feelings about the recognition of thesis direction and student advising.

<u>Allocation</u> <u>of</u> <u>Funds</u>

There is overwhelming agreement on the allocation of funds for nearly all categories of expenditure. The major exception concerns the allocation of funds for supplies and equipment used in teaching. Seven felt that too little of the available funds are spent on teaching supplies, while 11 felt the amount spent on teaching supplies is about right (see Table 2).

It should be pointed out that several staff members felt that the total funds made available to the Department by the Administration is inadequate.

Table 2

Faculty Opinion Concerning Allocation of Available Departmental Funds

	Too much	About right	Too Little
1. General program	2	14	1
2. Clinical program	2	14	1
3. School program	2	15	0
4. Supplies and equipment used in teaching	0	11	7
5. Supplies and equipment for the Departmental Office	1	12	5
6. Supplies and equipment for the faculty offices	0	14	4
7. Supplies used in the lab	5	11	2
8. Equipment used in the lab	3	10	5

III. <u>Faculty and Student Evaluation of the Graduate and Undergraduate Programs</u>

In order to elicit faculty and student evaluations of salient aspects of the Psychology Department, a survey of faculty and student opinions was conducted during the week of April 7-11, 1975. Completed questionnaires were received from 16 faculty members, 43 undergraduate psychology majors, and 22 graduate students enrolled in the three psychology graduate programs: clinical, general, and school. The questionnaire and a summary of the results are presented below.

A. For each of the statements below, score "1" if you agree, "2" if you are ambivalent, and "3" if you disagree with respect to the program you are in. Faculty members score all four programs.

<u>Statements</u>

		Program					
	Undergrad.		Clinical		General		School
	F^1	S^2	F	S	F	S	F	S
1. There is an adequate selection of courses offered in my program.	1.40	1.74	1.25	1.67	1.64	1.50	1.18	1.63
2. The quality of the lectures in most psychology courses is good.	1.46	1.58	1.44	1.79	1.44	1.50	1.57	1.90
3. The content presented in most psychology courses is adequate.	1.43	1.63	1.22	1.22	1.44	1.00	1.30	1.45
4. My program offers adequate opportunities for relevant practical experiences.	1.79	2.42	1.18	1.22	2.00	2.00	1.20	1.00
5. My program offers adequate opportunities for relevant research experiences.	2.00	2.16	1.90	1.67	1.56	1.50	1.75	1.36
6. The faculty provides adequate academic counseling.	1.83	1.49	1.22	1.55	1.44	1.00	1.11	1.18
7. In most psychology courses, I feel that grades reflect how much is learned.	1.75	1.23	1.50	2.33	1.50	2.00	1.63	1.72

Program

	Undergrad.		Clinical		General		School	
	F[1]	S[2]	F	S	F	S	F	S

8. My program does not have too many unnecessary redundancies in the material presented in different courses. 1.79 1.95   1.30 1.33   1.20 1.50 1.25 1.18

9. In my program there is adequate opportunity for student-faculty _academic_ contact. 1.60 1.53   1.09 1.55   1.10 1.55 1.10 1.09

10. In my program there is adequate opportunity for student-faculty _social_ contact. 2.14 2.25   1.70 2.55   1.56 2.55 1.71 2.00

11. My program allows an adequate number of elective hours in psychology. 1.20 1.35   1.82 2.33   1.11 1.00 1.50 1.18

12. In most of the Psychology courses, an adequate quantity and quality of teaching aids are used by the instructors. 1.67 1.96   1.75 1.64   1.83 2.00 1.83 1.27

13. I am satisfied with the way teaching assignments are made within the program 1.14 1.65   1.10 1.44   1.33 1.50 1.13 1.45

[1]F = faculty
[2]S = students
[3]Number is average (mean) of all ratings.

B. List what you feel are the main strengths of your program. (Faculty members list strengths for each program).

Undergraduate

Faculty: Good teaching, good teacher-student relations, good core of required courses and variety of courses were most frequently listed.

Students: Good teaching, good teacher-student contact and advising, good background in psychology, and good selection of courses were most frequently listed.

Clinical

Faculty: Practical experience gained during internship, testing and interviewing skills, proved success of graduates, and providing trained

personnel for work in nearby mental health facilities.

Students: Practical experience, curriculum, and good faculty.

General

Faculty: Good preparation for future teaching and/or doctoral study, teaching experience, flexibility of course offerings, physiological research, and success of graduates.

Students: Accessbility of faculty and administrative personnel, broad spectrum of courses, and good preparation for further graduate work.

School:

Faculty: Practical experience, close supervision of students, close relationship among students, and testing skills.

Students: Good practical experience, very good program chairman, testing opportunities, and relevancy of the required course work to the needs of children in educational settings.

C. List what you feel are the main weaknesses of your program. (Faculty members list weaknesses for each program).

Undergraduate

Faculty: Lack of research, lack of research funds and equipment, too many service courses (e.g., 201, 206, 240, 275, 305) taken by majors as result of poor advising, lack of practical experience, lack of innovative efforts on part of faculty, heavy student load, and lack of audio-visual aids.

Students: Lack of effective teaching, too much overlap among courses, need for a greater variety of courses, need for more practical experience courses, lack of depth in pursuing topics, lack of relevancy with respect to real life situations and popular trends, large class sizes, and lack of communication between faculty and students.

Clinical

Faculty: Lack of therapy training prior to internship, training in projective tests, too few electives, and lack of course work in primary job responsibility.

Students: Too much work crammed into too little time, too little feedback on work, and inadequate instruction.

General

Faculty: Inadequate experience in research, lack of preparation for doing anything after graduation except go on to school, and lack of leadership in program development and maintenance.

Students: Lack of opportunities for various types of research, lack of opportunities for practical experience, and lack of required course in computer use.

School

Faculty: Need for more psychology electives, inadequate exposure to theories, and lack of exposure to varying views of what a school psychologist is.

Students: Need for increased faculty (program chairman is overloaded), need for curricular revisions (e.g., 427 made more practical, specific courses like behavior modification should be required, courses in related areas such as interviewing and counseling), thesis requirement, and confusion over Level I or Level II certification by the State.

D. We would appreciate any suggestions or constructive criticisms that you may want to make on the following: (Faculty members, make comments relevant to each of the programs).

1. Course additions or deletions:

Undergraduate

Faculty: Delete 150, 206, 240, 275; add courses in sensation-perception, motivation, sexuality, family, theories and systems;

restrict electives (e.g., limit of 10 quarter hours toward major from 201, 240, 275, and 305).

Students: Add more courses to increase course selection (e.g., paranormal trends, animal behavior, consumer psychology, physiological application, counseling and clinical psychology, behavior modification more advanced than 225).

Clinical

Faculty: Delete sensitivity training; add courses in modes of therapeutic intervention, psychotherapy, gerontology, and personality theories in depth.

Students: Delete the required course in research; add theory of psychoanalysis and behavior modification (469) to required courses.

General

Faculty: Add teaching in the community college (with practicum), research experience in areas other than physiological, history or systems course, and comparative course.

Students: Add the psychology of sleep.

School

Faculty: Add measurement theory, advanced child psychology dealing with theories, and behavior modification in the classroom.

Students: Delete research design; add applied learning theory, counseling and interviewing techniques and use of projective tests by school psychologists; allow more freedom in selection of courses.

2. Personnel additions (specify by subject area)

Undergraduate

Faculty: Need additional faculty to reduce class sizes; member to teach in the child, educational, and school areas; experienced member who has grant-obtaining skills; a good MA to teach two sections of 210 each quarter.

Students: Add a member in industrial and organization area.

General

Faculty: Add member in the social-industrial area.

School

Students: Add another school psychologist (suggested by seven students).

3. Use of teaching aids (specify type)

Undergraduate

Faculty: Need more equipment and lab space for 210 (experimental); need more audio-visual aids (e.g., films, projectors, slides, tapes, and videotapes).

Students: Need to use more films, speakers, field trips, and tapes.

Clinical

Faculty: Need up-to-date films on behavior change; need film library for students to use; need to do more video taping of testing and therapy for instructional uses.

Students: Use more films, recordings, and demonstrations.

General

Students: Need anatomical models for physiological psychology.

School

Students: Need more films; observations of testing techniques.

4. Opportunities for practical experience

Undergraduate

Faculty: Need more (e.g., placing some students under supervision in the field, visits to Caswell, mental health clinics, Sheltered Workshop, Developmental Evaluation Clinic, etc. and observations in mental health clinics, schools, etc. as course content might indicate).

<u>Students</u>: Need more, especially some type of field placement.

<u>Clinical</u>

<u>Faculty</u>: Opportunities are good but a training clinic in the Department (i.e., on campus) is needed.

<u>Students</u>: Need more opportunities and closer supervision of practical experience.

<u>General</u>

<u>Faculty</u>: Need more (e.g., in the social-industrial area, teaching internship, application of behavior modification).

<u>Students</u>: Adequate.

<u>School</u>

<u>Faculty</u>: Good.

<u>Students</u>: Good.

5. Opportunities for research

<u>Undergraduate</u>

<u>Faculty</u>: Inadequate but lighter teaching loads, more money, and more space are needed to encourage research efforts.

<u>Students</u>: More opportunities are needed (e.g., increase of lab work done in 210, access to independent research under supervision of a faculty member).

<u>Clinical</u>

<u>Faculty</u>: Some members consider it adequate while others think it to be inadequate, listing poor preparation for research in the statistics and design sequence and a need for more.research other than the questionnaire type.

<u>General</u>

<u>Faculty</u>: Adequate with two exceptions: (1) research is restricted to either physiological or social, (2) more research with humans is needed.

Students: Adequate.

School

Faculty: Adequate

6. Are there any other comments that you would like to make?

Faculty: Reduce the foreign language requirement for the undergraduate program, reduce the number of rats and add other animal species, reduce the tendency to coddle students in order to attract them for it is unnecessary--the Department has plenty to offer, speed up the "social-industrial" option with the graduate general program, the general program could easily be developed along two lines: (1) training behavior managers for institutions like Caswell, and (2) training community college teachers.

Students: The points made in the comments are restatements of strengths, weaknesses, etc. listed above.

IV. Professional Activities of Faculty Members

The Department as a whole has published 36 papers, with one outstanding member contributing 15 of these published papers. A total of 57 Master's theses were completed, with 47 theses currently going on. Thirteen members attended 57 Conventions, with many of them presenting papers or presiding over paper and discussion sessions in these conventions. More than half of the faculty members have been active in speaking before community organizations.

In the past four years, faculty members have served as officers in various professional organizations, ranging from such positions as Southeastern Psychological Association Committee Chairman to Psi Chi Southeastern Vice-president to the present president of the North Carolina Psychological Association. Faculty members have gained distinctions in being selected as Outstanding Educators of America, American Men and Women of Science, Who's Who in Education in the South, Personalities of the South, and gaining recognition from honor societies such as Sigma Xi and Phi Sigma Pi.

Other professional activities of faculty members include consulting work with various mental health centers, V. R., Education Systems, Prison Systems, industrial and governmental organizations. Several members are currently working on research grants. Some members have served as evaluator of ESEA proposals, reviewers of books, and consulting editor to professional journals.

Table 3

Summary of Professional Activities of Faculty Members

1. Number of Publications:

    1-2 N=7
    3-6 N=2
    15 N=1

2. M.A. theses supervised to completion:

    1-4   N=3
    5-6   N=3
    10 and more N=3

3. M.A. theses presently under supervision:

    1-3   N=6
    4-5   N=3
    9 and more N=2

4. Number of conventions attended

    1-2   N=2
    3-4   N=8
    5-10   N=3

5. Number of presentations at professional meetings:

    1-2   N=8
    3-5   N=2
    11   N=1

6. Appearances before community organizations:

    1-5   N=6
    6 and more N=7

7. Offices held in professional organizations:

    NCPA: President, secretary-treasurer, committee members
    ENCPA: President
    SEPA: Committee chairman

PSI CHI: Southeastern vice president; faculty advisors.
DKG: Research committee chairman

8.   Special awards and distinctions:

Outstanding educators of America: N=6
American Men and Women of Science: N=3
Personalities of the South: N=3
Who's Who in Education in the South: N=2
Sigma Xi: N=2
Phi Sigma Pi: N=1

V.   Recommendations

1.   Based on faculty responses, it is strongly recommended that the chairman be retained.

2.   Based on faculty responses, it is recommended that more support in equipment, space, and time be provided to increase faculty research.

3.   Based on faculty and student responses, it is recommended that the Department provide more opportunities for research by students.

4.   Based on student responses, it is recommended that faculty-student social contact be increased.

5.   Based on responses from students in the clinical program, it is recommended that more electives for this program be considered.

6.   Based on student responses from the clinical and general programs reflecting dissatisfaction, it is recommended that the grading system in these programs be re-evaluated.