

Institutional Effectiveness Report Template

Name of Program/Department:	Undergraduate Program in Psychology
Year:	2016-2017
Name of Preparer:	Crystal R. Hill-Chapman & Teresa Herzog

Program Mission Statement

- The Mission of the Department of Psychology is to provide students with an understanding of psychology as the science of behavior and experience, including the major theories and issues within psychology; to emphasize the role of the liberal arts in higher education and personal development; to promote an appreciation for individual and cultural diversity; to develop critical thinking skills; to develop competence with methods of scientific research and data analysis; to assure that students have the necessary research experiences and coursework to undertake graduate education; and to assist students in developing their skills in library research, scientific writing, public presentations, and computer applications. Psychology majors will become aware of the various career options related to the major. The program also provides opportunities for internships in applied settings. A major in psychology will provide students with a broad-based education that will equip them for entry-level positions in business, government, and a wide variety of human service organizations. The major also prepares students who wish to pursue further education in areas such as law, medicine, business, or seminary, as well as psychology.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

A graduate of the Psychology Program at Francis Marion University will:

- PLO 1.0 Have an understanding of psychology as the science of behavior and experience.
- PLO 2.0 Understand the major theories and issues in psychology.
- PLO 3.0 Understand the significance of individual and cultural differences.
- PLO 4.0 Engage in scientific thinking skills.
- PLO 5.0 Understand and appreciate the scientific method.

Executive Summary of Report (one-page maximum)

During the 2016-2017 academic year, the Psychology Department assessed four Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The SLOs represented the areas of understanding psychology as the science of behavior and experience, understanding the major theories and issues of the discipline, displaying critical thinking skills and analyzing psychological concepts and literature, communicating psychological concepts and research in the style of the American Psychological Association, examining diverse career options open to undergraduate psychology majors and graduate training options, as well as utilizing professional development opportunities.

The Psychology Department utilized an exit survey and departmental rubrics to evaluate the SLOs.

Regarding our desire to ensure that students understand the theoretical underpinnings and science of behavior, we were successful in meeting our overall benchmark of 70% on the

posttest exam in the areas of biological basis of behavior, social, developmental, experimental design, abnormal, and personality psychology. However, we did not meet our established benchmark of 70% and still show room for growth on our posttest of student understanding in the areas of learning/cognition, history and systems, as well as statistics. While on our exit questionnaire our students indicated that the department was successful in meeting our benchmark of 6.0 in the areas of theories of psychology, view of human nature, and role of culture, the department did not reach our benchmark of 6.0 of 6.0 in nature of psychology, scientific thinking and scientific method.

The psychology department experienced great success in meeting our benchmark of 4.0 on our internal assessment and the benchmark of 6.0 on the exit survey for our expectations that students think critically and communicate effectively about psychology as a discipline. We hope to continue our success in these areas.

In two areas, our students failed to meet our established benchmarks of 6.0. The first was analyzing psychological concepts. We will recommend to departmental faculty, in particular to instructors of Senior Seminar, to emphasize practice in this skill in specific modules of instruction. In addition, our goal benchmark to have students examine career options in psychology was not met. Students still report difficulties in determining what occupations they can pursue with their degree in psychology. Thus, we will place more emphasis of this aspect of the curriculum in PSY 220 (Careers in Psychology). In addition we will assess this learning outcome in PSY 220, when students are first introduced to careers relevant to psychology. It is possible that students were aware of career options just after taking PSY 220 but have forgotten that they were made aware of this information by the time of their graduation.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

SLO 1.0: Students will understand psychology as the science of behavior and experience and will understand the major theories and issues of the discipline.

SLO 2.0 Students will display critical thinking skills and analyze psychology concepts and literature. These skills involve the development of scientific reasoning and problem solving, including effective research methods.

SLO 3.0 Students will communicate psychological concepts and research in the style of the American Psychological Association.

SLO 4.0 Students will examine diverse career options open to undergraduate psychology majors and graduate training options, and utilize professional development opportunities.

Assessment Methods

Table 1. Student Learning Outcomes, Measures, and Benchmarks for the Department of Psychology

Student Learning Outcome	Measures	Benchmark
Students will understand psychology as the science of behavior and experience and will understand the major theories and issues of the discipline.	FMU Psychology Exit exam: divided into 10 content domains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% correct for domains covered by core classes • 65% correct for domains only covered by optional classes or no upper-level classes
	FMU Psychology Exit Survey questions 2-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of at least 6.0 on a 7 point scale
Students will display critical thinking skills and analyze psychology concepts and literature.	Internal Assessment used in PSY 499	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of at least 4.0 on a 6.0 scale
	FMU Psychology Exit Survey questions 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of at least 6.0 on a 7 point scale
Students will communicate psychological concepts and research in the style of the American Psychological Association.	Internal Assessment used in PSY 499	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of at least 4.0 on a 6.0 scale
	FMU Psychology Exit Survey questions 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of at least 6.0 on a 7 point scale
Students will examine diverse career options open to undergraduate psychology majors and graduate training options, and utilize professional development opportunities.	FMU Psychology Exit Survey question 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average of at least 6.0 on a 7 point scale

Assessment Results

Student Learning Outcome 1: Understanding of Psychology

Exit Exam

The revised exam was given in December 2015 and April of 2016 to graduating seniors enrolled in Psychology 499 Senior Seminar. The revised exam consisted of 100 items. (Similar versions of the exam have been given for the past 10 years. The exam was originally developed from a previous 360 item exam.) All full-time faculty reviewed the exit exam in August of 2014 and made modifications to a few questions based on updated information (e.g. the switch from the DSM 4 to the DSM 5 for classification of psychological disorders). Changes were made to Biological, Cognitive, Developmental, Social, and Abnormal domains.

Table 2 provides a breakdown of students' knowledge and skills. Data is presented for the past 5 academic years. In the rightmost column, department benchmarks are listed. Where data is available for both pre-test to post-test scores, we can confirm that our students are gaining and understanding of psychology. Additionally, it appears that the students met benchmarks set for the areas of Biological, Developmental, Experimental Design, Social, Abnormal, and Personality. Our students did not meet the benchmarks set for Learning/Cognition, Statistics, or History. However, we anticipate that in the academic year to come, with new faculty able to take on more responsibility, we will meet our benchmarks in all areas.

Table 2. Students' Knowledge and Skills

Area Tested	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Benchmark
	-	-	-	-	-	
	2013 ₁	2014 _{1,6}	2015 ₁	2016 ₁	2017 ^{1,6}	
				-	-	
Biological ²	66	68	74	67	74	70
Developmental ²	75	74	73	66	72	70
Experimental Design ²	76	80	78	69	71	70
Learning/Cognition ⁵	65	68	76	64	64	70
Social ²	78	79	71	69	72	70
Statistics ²	57	59	66	52	49	70
Abnormal ³	88	86	90	86	81	65
Personality ³	70	64	65	62	69	65
History ⁴	72	75	73	63	54	65
Total	72	72	74	66	66	70
Required Courses	71	71	74	64	67	70

Notes: ¹Data in cells represent mean percent correct, ²Required of all majors, ³Optional course, ⁴No advanced courses offered ⁵Became required course in 2013-2014 ⁶Data from Spring semester graduates only.

Exit Survey

The senior exit survey is a 28-item questionnaire administered to graduating majors within approximately two weeks of graduation. Questions 2-7 assess students' perceptions about what they have learned from the psychology major. These items are rated on a Likert scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is equal to *extremely unprepared* and 7 is *extremely prepared*. Question text is included below:

2. To what extent has the psychology program enabled you to have an understanding of psychology as a science of behavior and experience?
3. To what extent has the psychology program enabled you to understand the major theories and issues in psychology?
4. To what extent has the psychology program enabled you to have a broader view of human life?
5. To what extent has the psychology program enabled you to understand the significance of individual and cultural differences?

6. To what extent has the psychology program enabled you to engage in scientific thinking skills?

7. To what extent has the psychology program enabled you to understand and appreciate the scientific method?

Table 3 provides means and standard deviations for students' responses to the questions regarding their perceptions of their knowledge and skills for five years. In the rightmost column, department benchmarks are listed. While there is some variation from year to year across the survey items, this table shows that scores generally have been consistent over the last six years. Although the benchmark was met for the knowledge of Theories of Psychology, View of Human Nature, and Role of Culture, benchmarks were not met for the Nature of Psychology, Scientific Thinking and Scientific Method. Therefore, we achieved our expected target for three categories of knowledge, but did not achieve our target for another three.

Table 3. Students' Opinions of Knowledge Gained

Knowledge Goals	Year					Benchmark
	2012-2013 (n = 49)	2013-2014 (n = 58)	2014-2015 (n = 55)	2015-2016 (n=57)	2016-2017 (n=41)	
Nature of Psychology	6.10 (0.65)	6.02 (0.81)	6.15 (0.85)	6.04 (0.59)	5.94 (0.78)	6.0
Theories of Psychology	6.02 (0.72)	6.03 (0.94)	6.04 (0.86)	6.02 (0.63)	6.12 (0.96)	6.0
View of Human Nature	6.31 (0.94)	6.28 (1.00)	6.35 (0.87)	6.42 (0.62)	6.29 (0.77)	6.0
Role of Culture	6.12 (0.75)	5.91 (1.08)	6.11 (0.81)	6.09 (0.78)	6.06 (0.74)	6.0
Scientific Thinking	5.96 (0.98)	6.00 (0.97)	6.22 (0.94)	5.88 (0.70)	5.87 (2.25)	6.0
Scientific Method	6.10 (0.98)	6.03 (1.09)	6.18 (0.84)	6.18 (0.78)	5.96 (1.10)	6.0

Note: Numbers in cells represent: Means (Standard Deviation). Ratings were made on a 7 point scale where 1=extremely unprepared and 7=extremely prepared.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Critical Thinking and Analysis of Psychology

Internal Assessment

The psychology department developed an internal assessment of critical thinking about and analysis of psychological concepts. In its current form, the assessment has 7 skill areas, some of which assess critical thinking and some of which assess communication. Each skill area is rated on a 6 point scale with 1 indicating no evidence of the skill in question and 6 indicating complete mastery of the skill in question. Questions regarding critical thinking and analysis of psychology assessed the extent to which students 1) Considered context and assumptions, 2) Analyzed supporting data and evidence, 3) Used

other perspectives and implications, and 4) Assessed conclusions, implications, and consequences.

This year, we assessed our graduating seniors. Table 5 below presents the means and standard deviations for each item. All means for these items exceeded our benchmarks.

Table 5. Instructor Assessment of Critical Thinking about and Analysis of Psychology Concepts

Skill Assessed	2014-2015 (n=7)	2015-2016 (n=57)	2016-2017 (n=44)	Benchmark
Considered context & assumptions	4.71 (0.76)	4.45 (0.99)	4.85 (0.94)	4.0
Analyzed supporting data and evidence	4.29 (1.11)	4.21 (0.98)	4.83 (1.00)	4.0
Used other perspectives and implications	4.14 (0.38)	4.26 (1.12)	4.84 (0.95)	4.0
Assessed conclusions, implications, and consequences	4.43 (1.14)	4.25 (1.14)	4.77 (0.97)	4.0

Note: Numbers in cells represent: Means (Standard Deviation).

Exit Survey

The senior exit survey is a 28-item questionnaire. Question 8 assesses “To what extent has the psychology program enabled you to enhance your ability to think critically about and analyze psychological concepts and literature?” This item is rated on a Likert scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is equal to *extremely unprepared* and 7 is *extremely prepared*. The mean for this item exceeded our benchmark. Therefore, we did not achieve our Target on SLO number two.

Table 6. Student Perceptions of Ability to Analyze Psychological Concepts

	2015-2016 (n=57)	2016-2017 (n=41)	Benchmark
Analyze Psychological Concepts	6.18 (0.91)	5.83 (1.09)	6.0

Student Learning Outcome 3: Effective Communication

Internal Assessment

The psychology department developed an internal assessment of communication skills. In its current form, the assessment has 7 questions, some of which assess critical thinking and some of which assess communication. Each question is rated on a 6 point scale with 1 indicating no evidence of the skill in question and 6 indicating complete mastery of the skill in question. Questions regarding communication include 1) Summarized problem, question, or issue, 2) Communicated own perspective, hypothesis, or position, and 3) Communicated effectively.

This year we assessed our graduating seniors. Table 6 below presents the means and standard deviations for each item. All means for these items exceeded our benchmarks. Therefore, we achieved our Target on SLO number three.

Table 6. Instructor Assessment of Communication Skills

Skill Assessed	2014-2015 (n=7)	2015-2016 (n=57)	2016-2017 (n=44)	Proposed Benchmark
Summarized problem, question, or issue	4.42 (0.79)	4.45 (0.99)	4.80 (0.98)	4.0
Communicated own perspective, hypothesis, or opinion	4.57 (0.79)	4.29 (1.12)	4.95 (0.86)	4.0
Communicated effectively	4.00 (1.29)	4.16 (1.27)	4.65 (1.06)	4.0

Note: Numbers in cells represent: Means (Standard Deviation).

Exit Survey

The senior exit survey is a 28-item questionnaire. Question 9 assesses “To what extent has the psychology program enabled you to enhance your ability to effectively communicate about psychological concepts and research?” This item is rated on a Likert scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is equal to *extremely unprepared* and 7 is *extremely prepared*. The mean for this item exceeded our benchmark.

Table 7. Student Perceptions of Ability to Analyze Psychological Concepts

	2015-2016 (n=57)	2016-2017 (n=44)	Benchmark
Effective Communication	6.05 (0.85)	5.43 (1.10)	6.0

Student Learning Outcome 4: Exposure to Career Options

Exit Survey

The senior exit survey is a 28-item questionnaire. Question 10 assesses “To what extent has the psychology program enabled you to have an awareness of the various types of career options for a psychology major?” This item is rated on a Likert scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is equal to *extremely unprepared* and 7 is *extremely prepared*. Means and standard deviation information for the past 5 years plus the current year is presented in Table 8 below. For the third consecutive academic year, we did not meet our benchmark on this question. Students felt they were slightly underprepared, relative to our benchmark, in terms of their awareness of career options for psychology majors. Therefore, we did not achieve our Target on SLO number four.

Table 8. Student Perceptions of Awareness of Career Options

	Year					
	2012-2013 (n = 49)	2013-2014 (n = 58)	2014-2015 (n = 55)	2015-2016 (n=58)	2016-2017 (n=41)	Benchmark
Awareness of Career Options	6.06 (0.85)	6.16 (0.97)	5.73 (1.25)	5.81 (0.91)	5.26 (1.39)	6.0

Action Plan

Student Learning Outcome 1: Understanding of Psychology

Exit Exam

Means for all coursework domains except Learning/Cognition, Statistics, and History and Systems equaled or exceeded our benchmark. While this is promising, there is still considerable deviation among the domains. It is possible that students are gaining an equal amount of knowledge in all domains but start the program with less knowledge in some domains (e.g. statistics) than in others (e.g. abnormal).

To investigate this hypothesis, the department aims to complete a pre-test in Introduction to Psychology. In addition, a review of the Exit Exam is being undertaken to ensure that all questions assess content being taught in required coursework.

Exit Survey

Although last year, means for all items except for Scientific Thinking surpassed our benchmark, this year three areas (i.e., Nature of Psychology, Scientific Thinking and Scientific Method) fell short. Going forward next year, all full faculty intend to build modules into their content area courses that show students how to apply these knowledge goals to particular areas of psychology. However, we acknowledge that the large number of adjunct instructors who teach in our department limits our efficacy in setting such standards (please see section entitled Student Teacher Ratio below on page 14).

Student Learning Outcome 2: Critical Thinking and Analysis of Psychology

This year all graduating students were assessed on critical thinking and analysis of psychological concepts using both an internally developed measure as well as the exit survey. Means for both instruments exceeded our benchmarks. The department hopes to continue our success in this area.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Effective Communication

This year all graduating students were assessed on effective communication using both an internally developed measure as well as the exit survey. Means for both instruments exceeded our benchmarks. The department intends to continue to achieve success in this area.

Student Learning Outcome 4: Exposure to Career Options

We did not meet our benchmark with respect to students' perception of their awareness of career options for psychology majors. We plan to place more emphasis on this aspect of the curriculum in PSY 220 (Careers in Psychology) for the 2017-2018 academic year. We also plan to assess students' perceptions earlier. We currently assess their perceptions as they're graduating (which is also around the time they are finishing their internships). In the upcoming academic year, we will gather baseline data on these questions in the context of PSY 220, when students are first introduced to careers relevant to psychology. It is possible that students were aware of career options just after taking PSY 220 but have forgotten that they were made aware of this information by graduation. We plan to adopt a true longitudinal design, whereby we match pre and post scores for all psychology majors, from their entry into the major in PSY 200, Careers in Psychology, to the semester of graduation in PSY 499, Senior Seminar.

Appendix

Other Assessment Information

Student Involvement in Faculty-Sponsored Research/Service

A key aspect of preparing students for graduate school and helping students decide whether they want to pursue graduate school is to be involved in faculty-sponsored research and/or service. For research projects this may include assistance with project development, data collection, data entry, data analysis, writing, or any other part of the research process. Service projects may include activities such as volunteering with local organizations providing psychological services, such as Homeless Connect and Lighthouse Ministries.

The psychology department has directly tracked the number of students engaged in these types of opportunities. Table 9 below presents the total number of students engaged in these opportunities and the number of students participating per faculty member. We feel that the total number of students did not meet our benchmark because, among the full-time faculty in the department, three faculty were in their second year (one on maternity leave for the Spring semester) and two in their first year. Thus, over half of our full time faculty were either just establishing their programmatic lines of research or in the very time-intensive career phase of developing teaching. Nevertheless, the average number of students engaged in research with faculty did meet our benchmark.

Table 9. Student Involvement in Faculty-Sponsored Research/Service

	2015-2016	2016-2017	Proposed Benchmark
Number of students involved	41	24	30
Average students per faculty member	4.56	3	3

Student Presentations at Conferences and Manuscripts Submitted

An additional critical aspect of preparing students for graduate school is experience in public presentations of research, either at a conference or in a journal. The psychology department has directly tracked the number of students who engaged in these types of opportunities. Overall our students were quite active this year. Table 10 below presents the raw number of students engaged in these opportunities and the average number of students participating per faculty member. For the second straight year, relative to our benchmarks, we realized three times the number of presentations involving students that were produced by the department as well as the number of students who participated in public research presentations. In addition, the number of publications produced by faculty exceeded our benchmark eight-fold. In addition, we exceeded our benchmark by a factor of three for average presentations per faculty member and average number of students per faculty member. It is worthwhile noting that this one-on-one mentoring of students was accomplished despite the small number of full-time faculty who could reasonably be expected to have their programmatic research fully operational.

Table 10. Student Presentations at Conferences and Manuscript Submissions

	2014- 2015	2015- 2016	2016- 2017	Proposed Benchmark
Number of presentations	8	20	24	8
Average presentations per faculty member	1	2.22	3	1
Number of students who presented	10	25	20	8
Average number of students per faculty member	1.25	2.77	3	1
Number of manuscripts submitted	2	1	8	1

Student Clinical Experience

An important aspect of the undergraduate transition to a professional role, including the learning of professional expectations, is to gain closely supervised experience in a psychological practicum. In the 2016-2017 academic year, above and beyond the internship class (PSY 498) that is offered to all undergraduates as part of their “integrated experience,” we afforded additional mentoring to a total of 17 students. These students worked closely with individual clinical faculty to gain exposure to the application of psychological principles in the real world. Of this total, 5 students worked with the Early Autism project, gaining supervision in line therapy, a growing field with a high demand for practitioners. In addition, 8 students gained first-hand practice in supporting the underserved population of the homeless, through faculty involvement in the Florence, SC, Homeless Connect. Finally, 3 undergraduates ran group therapy lessons for children in preschool classroom.

Student Exit Survey – Perception of Program

In addition to assessing student learning outcomes, the exit survey also assesses students’ perceptions of the program more generally. This is assessed both through Likert-scale questions regarding the quality of the program and the quality of the faculty, as well as open-ended questions about the program. Means and standard deviations for the past 5 years are presented in Table 11 below. The only opinion area where we met our benchmark was for the overall quality of our courses. That being said, in none of the other areas did we fall far short of our goal. Nevertheless, our action plan is to emphasize to faculty that they review their own plans to deliver quality of advising, as well as review how to assess their meeting of class objectives, their conduct of class, and availability to students. As for fairness of grading and knowledgeability of instructor, as we go forward with our longitudinal assessment, we fully expect to see the very common correlation between GPA and these measures, with high performing students rating their instructors higher on these indices.

Table 11. Students' Attitudes and Opinions

	Year					Benchmark
	2012-2013 (n = 49)	2013-2014 (n = 58)	2014-2015 (n = 55)	2015-2016 (n=57)	2016-2017 (n=57)	
<i>Quality of Program</i>						
Availability of Courses	5.20 (1.26)	5.17 (1.30)	5.07 (1.20)	5.37 (0.67)	5.59 (1.27)	6.0
Setting Objectives	6.12 (0.78)	6.10 (0.81)	5.96 (0.77)	5.84 (0.72)	5.89 (0.89)	6.0
Meeting Objectives	6.04 (0.84)	5.91 (0.80)	5.91 (0.82)	5.75 (0.80)	5.88 (0.79)	6.0
Instruction Quality	5.88 (0.75)	5.93 (0.79)	5.85 (0.93)	5.84 (0.70)	5.82 (1.00)	6.0
Fairness of Grading	5.86 (0.79)	5.74 (0.93)	5.91 (0.82)	5.74 (.076)	5.85 (1.26)	6.0
Quality of Courses	5.96 (0.82)	6.19 (0.76)	6.16 (0.69)	5.95 (0.80)	6.04 (1.05)	6.0
<i>Quality of Faculty</i>						
Knowledge of Material	6.53 (0.71)	6.48 (0.68)	6.51 (0.69)	6.32 (.073)	5.98 (0.81)	6.0
Conduct of Class	6.10 (0.77)	6.12 (0.80)	6.11 (0.76)	6.14 (0.85)	5.72 (0.77)	6.0
Treatment of Students	5.86 (1.04)	6.00 (1.06)	6.27 (0.89)	5.74 (0.89)	5.80 (1.21)	6.0
Approachability of Faculty	6.04 (0.94)	6.10 (1.05)	6.22 (0.81)	5.93 (0.81)	5.71 (1.30)	6.0
Quality of Advising	6.06 (0.85)	6.16 (0.97)	5.93 (1.02)	6.02 (0.93)	5.62 (1.10)	6.0

Note: Numbers in cells represent: Means (Standard Deviation). Ratings were made on a 7 point scale where 1=very insufficient and 7=excellent.

The exit survey also contains a number of open-ended questions. Several themes were evident in these responses, and are reflective of why students were less satisfied than we would have liked with several aspects of the program. Open-ended responses again indicated student frustration with course availability, class size, and course scheduling. Of the 42 students who mentioned a weakness of the department, 16 mentioned the limited availability of psychology courses and 8 mentioned the need for more faculty. Of the 41 students who suggested a way in which the department could be improved, 24 mentioned the need for greater availability of psychology courses or more faculty members.

Student-Teacher Ratio

Our assessment of student perceptions of the psychology program revealed a number of ways in which we can improve. First, it seems obvious that the current staffing level (9 full-time faculty) is insufficient. In 2012-2013 we had 10 faculty, yet students still

expressed considerable dissatisfaction with course availability. Clearly the psychology undergraduate program is popular as the number of graduates continues to grow. However, staffing levels have fallen over the past several years: the department had 11 faculty until 1999, when it dropped to 10. See Table 12 below that compares the number of full-time faculty to the number of graduating seniors.

Table 12. Faculty and Graduating Seniors in the Department of Psychology

	Academic Year Ending										
	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
# graduating	22	12	30	10	33	43	49	58	55	57	74
# full time faculty	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	8	9	9

It is likely that it will require the hiring of additional full-time faculty to see adequate levels of student satisfaction with course availability. The strategy used to cover class demand has been to hire more adjunct professors. In fact, for the 2016-2017 academic year there were 2 part-time faculty for every full-time faculty member in the department. Furthermore, of the 99 undergraduate courses (excluding 1 credit hour courses such as 216, 220, and courses that do not count towards faculty's teaching load, such as 270, 370, and 470) taught in Fall and Spring semesters of 2016-2017, 54 (55%) were taught by an adjunct professor or tenure-track professor on overload. This further decreases student satisfaction as 1) classes taught by adjunct faculty are primarily taught at night and students dislike taking night classes as it interferes with work and family life, 2) reliance on adjunct faculty, rather than hiring additional full-time faculty, means that current full-time faculty have to take a larger role in other tasks (e.g. more advisees per faculty member) which decreases the time they can devote to each student, 3) reliance on adjunct faculty, rather than full time faculty, provides students with fewer opportunities to be involved in research as fewer faculty are available for collaboration, and 4) the fact that adjuncts do not have offices during daytime hours decreases the availability of teachers to their students for tutorials, conflict resolution, and establishing rapport in general. This situation also makes it difficult to determine exactly to what extent full-time faculty is being assessed through this IE process. For these reasons, the department plans to continue asking the administration for more full-time faculty as we do not feel we have fully resolved the staffing problem that leads to lower rating of courses.