

# YEARLY PLANNING DISCUSSION TEMPLATE

## General Questions

Program Name Psychology Academic Year 2025-2026

1. Has your program mission or primary function changed in the last year?

The mission and primary function have remained the same, but the infrastructure to support that mission has significantly improved to more adequately meet programmatic goals.

2. Were there any noteworthy changes to the program over the past year? (eg, new courses, degrees, certificates, articulation agreements)

- The program outcomes were updated for all the courses in the program to more explicitly align with the American Psychological Association 3.0 Guidelines.
- We moved PSY 117 Child Psychology to List B of the Psychology electives
- We listed PSY 127 Emotional Intelligence and PSY128 Positive Psychology, which were previously cross-listed courses, as Psychology List B electives
- All courses were mapped to Psychology Program Learning Outcomes.
- We were awarded an Innovative Fund grant (\$4,939.80) in the Fall 2025 semester to obtain Qualtrics and SPSS for our PSY Research Methods course but deferred funding until the securement of a computer lab. As of Spring 2026, we have secured a computer lab for the Fall semester, procured funding through the department for a site-based SPSS license, and we will re-apply for the grant once again in the Fall of 2026 to request funding for a Qualtrics annual license.

3. Is your two-year program map in place and were there any challenges maintaining the planned schedule?

Yes, our two-year program map is in place. The only challenges have been staffing courses, but we have hired several new part-time faculty members (see response to the next question) so hopefully those challenges are behind us.

4. Were there any staffing changes?

Yes, within the last year, two new full-time faculty members were hired to replace vacancies in the 2 full-time psychology positions. Moreover, two part-time faculty members were hired to teach at the Lompoc prison.

5. What were your program successes in your area of focus last year?

We now have procured an SPSS site-based license, which was a prior goal for the psychology program in the last program assessment that had not been previously met. The license is going to be beneficial for teaching PSY 105 Research Methods in Psychology as it will provide the instructor with the opportunity to provide more research-project based instruction that will enhance the utility value and relevance of

the course for psychology majors. Moreover, students will have an opportunity to run statistical analyses using SPSS to answer psychology research questions which align with one of our program learning outcomes (PLO2).

### Learning Outcomes Assessment

- a. Please summarize key results from this year's assessment.

First, we would like to make it known that the program learning outcomes have been updated to reflect alignment with the American Psychological Association Guidelines 3.0 for Psychology Undergraduates. Please see updated PLOs below:

**PLO1:** Explain major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings encompassed within major psychological disciplines, and apply them to issues of psychological health, adjustment, and growth.

**PLO2:** Describe and apply the scientific method, research designs, and statistical procedures to analyze and interpret data, drawing ethical and valid conclusions about human behavior and mental processes.

**PLO3:** Critically evaluate psychological information in academic, media, and popular contexts, and analyze the role of cultural, social and ethical influences on behavior and mental processes.

**PLO4:** Apply psychological theories to human development, behavior, and relationships across the lifespan, from conception through death.

**PLO5:** Communicate psychological concepts and research findings clearly and effectively in written and oral formats, while demonstrating self-reflection, collaborative skills, and professional responsibility appropriate to the discipline.

Because both Full-time Psychology members are new and getting up to speed with program assessment, the focus of this review will be on programmatic outcomes related to **PSY105: Research Methods in Psychology**. We will be reporting both quantitative and qualitative information to provide a baseline for meeting PLO2 and PLO3. Students completed a hypothesis assignment where they had to correctly identify a clear, testable hypothesis, explain major ethical concerns, and provide recommendations to protect participants based on a short case vignette. A sample of 20 assignments were randomly selected and assessed using the rubric below which includes the criteria, rating, PLO alignment, and course averages are reported in the table below. Students on average showed mastery of each of the criteria.

Criteria	Mastery (2 pts)	Developing (1 pt)	Not Yet Demonstrated (0 pts)	PLO Alignment	Average
<b>Hypothesis Identification</b>	Correctly identifies a clear, testable hypothesis including the relationship between similarity and participant response	Identifies a partially correct or unclear hypothesis	Hypothesis missing or incorrect	PLO2	1.55
<b>Ethical Evaluation</b>	Clearly explains major ethical concerns such as deception, emotional distress, and informed consent	Identifies at least one ethical issue but explanation is limited	Ethical concerns missing or inaccurate	PLO3	1.8
<b>Recommendations to Protect Participants</b>	Provides realistic and appropriate recommendations (e.g., debriefing, counseling resources, informed consent protections)	Provides limited or vague recommendations	Recommendations missing or inappropriate	PLO3	1.7

- *In PSY 105, students learn about the three big research claims and the four big validities: construct, external, statistical, and internal. In the Spring of 2026, students interrogated these validities by reading four empirical psychology journal articles across the semester. Two of those articles were assigned by the instructor, and two were chosen by the students. **Of the 38 students who completed the course, all 38 demonstrated sound knowledge of each of the four big validities. Below is a sampling of responses when asked to address study limitations.***

- *One limitation involves internal validity because the study used a cross-sectional design. Since all data were collected at one point in time, the researchers cannot prove that early smartphone use directly caused lower attention performance. It is possible that individuals with naturally lower attention abilities are more likely to use smartphones heavily. Because of this, the study cannot establish a clear cause-and-effect relationship.*
- *Questions about external validity also exist because the sample consisted mainly of psychology students from Argentina, and most participants were women. This means the findings may not apply equally to other populations, age groups, or cultures. In addition, much of the smartphone usage data relied on self-report surveys, which may not always be completely accurate. Participants may have underestimated or overestimated the amount of time they spent on their phones.*
- *To further add on, their sampled participants consisted of professional background individuals with an established dependency of AI. As a result, it created a limitation in regards of generalizability among individuals in nonprofessional contexts. Lastly, this study also utilized self-reported surveys which created a bias in what participants rated themselves less harshly than if another person had rated their attitudes.*

- b. Please summarize your reflections, analysis, and interpretation of the learning outcome assessment and data.

My interpretation is that we are just at the beginning of providing sound and valid assessment methods for the psychology program to establish a baseline in understanding the degree to which students are mastering the learning

outcomes that align with recommendations from the American Psychological Association guidelines for Undergraduate Psychology majors. This year we have provided a sample of what assessment will look like moving forward. This summer, full-time psychology faculty members will be working with the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment team to improve the degree to which each of our psychology core courses and the instruction and assessments within those courses are in alignment with our new Psychology Program Learning Outcomes.

- c. Please summarize recommendations and/or accolades that were made within the program/department.

We have received many accolades from administration, counselors, faculty, and students about the visible improvements they have witnessed in the program in terms of instruction and new course offerings.

- d. Please review and attach any changes to planning documentation, including PLO rubrics, associations, and cycles planning.

As mentioned earlier, the updated PLOs are included below along with a sample rubric that aligns with both PLO2 and PLO3.

**PLO1:** Explain major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and empirical findings encompassed within major psychological disciplines, and apply them to issues of psychological health, adjustment, and growth.

**PLO2:** Describe and apply the scientific method, research designs, and statistical procedures to analyze and interpret data, drawing ethical and valid conclusions about human behavior and mental processes.

**PLO3:** Critically evaluate psychological information in academic, media, and popular contexts, and analyze the role of cultural, social and ethical influences on behavior and mental processes.

**PLO4:** Apply psychological theories to human development, behavior, and relationships across the lifespan, from conception through death.

**PLO5:** Communicate psychological concepts and research findings clearly and effectively in written and oral formats, while demonstrating self-reflection, collaborative skills, and professional responsibility appropriate to the discipline.

Criteria	Mastery (2 pts)	Developing (1 pt)	Not Yet Demonstrated (0 pts)	PLO Alignment
<b>Hypothesis Identification</b>	Correctly identifies a clear, testable hypothesis including the relationship between similarity and participant response	Identifies a partially correct or unclear hypothesis	Hypothesis missing or incorrect	PLO2
<b>Ethical Evaluation</b>	Clearly explains major ethical concerns such as deception, emotional distress, and informed consent	Identifies at least one ethical issue but explanation is limited	Ethical concerns missing or inaccurate	PLO3
<b>Recommendations to Protect Participants</b>	Provides realistic and appropriate recommendations (e.g., debriefing, counseling resources, informed consent protections)	Provides limited or vague recommendations	Recommendations missing or inappropriate	PLO3

**Distance Education (DE) Modality Course Design Peer Review Update (Please attach documentation extracted from the *Rubric for Assessing Regular and Substantive Interaction in Distance Education Courses*)**

- a. Which courses were reviewed for regular and substantive interactions (RSI)?

PSY 118 – Human Development: Lifespan was reviewed for regular and substantive interaction in Fall 2025.

- b. What were some key findings regarding RSI?

- Some strengths:

The syllabus clearly identified a participation expectation through weekly CHAT attendance or email communication. However, this appeared to function primarily as attendance verification rather than substantive academic interaction.

- Some areas of possible improvement:

The review found that PSY 118 did not provide clear evidence of regular and substantive interaction. Canvas showed no discussion boards, collaborative learning activities, instructor-led engagement, recorded lectures, narrated presentations or instructional demonstrations. Course content appeared primarily limited to textbook readings and weekly 10-question automated quizzes.

The weekly CHAT sessions did not appear to provide substantive interaction because students could check in for attendance and leave once acknowledged. No structured academic discussion, ongoing content clarification forum or regular instructor-led academic engagement was observed.

Student-to-student interaction was also absent. The course showed no discussion boards, peer collaboration, group assignments, peer review or collaborative problem-solving opportunities.

- c. What is the plan for improvement?

Our program recognizes that stronger support structures are needed for part-time faculty teaching in the distance education modality. PSY 118 was taught by a part-time instructor, and the review highlighted the importance of improving collegial collaboration, communication and instructional support related to regular and substantive interaction expectations.

Although the program's request for a formal program coordinator position was not approved, we are currently working on a stipend proposal intended to

strengthen collaboration and support for part-time faculty. The goal is to create a more cohesive collegial environment that promotes consistency in course quality, RSI compliance, accessibility and student engagement across sections.

Planned improvements include:

- Providing greater guidance and mentoring related to regular and substantive interaction requirements.
- Increasing communication and collaboration between full-time and part-time faculty.
- Developing more consistent expectations for online course design and instructor presence.
- Supporting faculty in incorporating meaningful instructor-initiated interaction, active learning opportunities and student engagement strategies into online courses.
- Continuing peer review and feedback processes using the RSI rubric to identify areas needing improvement and ensure alignment with current distance education standards.

### **CTE two-year review of labor market data and pre-requisite review**

- a. Does the program meet documented labor market demand?

The short answer is definitely! The Psychology Associate of Arts Degree program (both for transfer and terminal) meets documented labor market demand in California because the state continues to experience increasing demand for mental health and behavioral health support workers, case managers, psychiatric aides, behavioral technicians, and human services professionals. Employers across California regularly seek applicants with foundational training in psychology, counseling, human behavior, and social services (see BLS supported table below).

Current job postings throughout California show ongoing hiring for positions such as Behavioral Technician, Mental Health Associate, Housing Specialist, and Behavior Therapist, many of which accept or prefer candidates with an associate degree in psychology or a related behavioral science field. Bright Outlook mental health occupations are shown below.

In addition, growing awareness of mental health needs and shortages in behavioral health services have increased workforce demand statewide. Our program here at AHC is crucial as an associate degree in psychology provides

students with preparation for entry-level employment in mental health and social service settings while also supporting transfer pathways to bachelor's and graduate degree programs needed for advanced careers in psychology, counseling, and social work.
















The program therefore supports both immediate employment opportunities and long-term workforce development needs in California's behavioral health and human services sectors

## Occupation Keyword Search

Occupations matching "mental health"

Search again:

20 occupations shown    Show matches:     

Code	Occupation
21-1014.00	<a href="#">Mental Health Counselors</a>  <span style="color: orange;">Bright Outlook</span>
21-1023.00	<a href="#">Mental Health and Substance Abuse Social Workers</a> 
29-1141.02	<a href="#">Advanced Practice Psychiatric Nurses</a> 
29-1223.00	<a href="#">Psychiatrists</a> 
21-1094.00	<a href="#">Community Health Workers</a> 
11-9111.00	<a href="#">Medical and Health Services Managers</a> 
29-2053.00	<a href="#">Psychiatric Technicians</a> 
19-3033.00	<a href="#">Clinical and Counseling Psychologists</a> 
25-1071.00	<a href="#">Health Specialties Teachers, Postsecondary</a> 
29-1171.00	<a href="#">Nurse Practitioners</a> 
21-1013.00	<a href="#">Marriage and Family Therapists</a> 
31-1133.00	<a href="#">Psychiatric Aides</a>
21-1011.00	<a href="#">Substance Abuse and Behavioral Disorder Counselors</a> 
31-2012.00	<a href="#">Occupational Therapy Aides</a>
19-5012.00	<a href="#">Occupational Health and Safety Technicians</a> 
21-1015.00	<a href="#">Rehabilitation Counselors</a>
31-9099.00	<a href="#">Healthcare Support Workers, All Other</a>
19-5011.00	<a href="#">Occupational Health and Safety Specialists</a> 
17-2111.00	<a href="#">Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors</a>
21-1091.00	<a href="#">Health Education Specialists</a> 

b. How does the program address needs that are not met by similar programs?

The program curriculum prepares students to directly transfer to psychology programs at 4-year universities. Moreover, the psychology program, and Introduction to Psychology course specifically, becomes critical in the age of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) as it helps students from across all majors build psychological literacy skills—the ability to apply psychological principles to real-world contexts. More specifically, the psychology program's emphasis on the study of human cognition and behavior, scientific reasoning, and ethical evaluation makes it well-positioned to become a collaborative hub major in our current AI-driven era, given that the study of psychology is relevant to a broad

set of academic disciplines (e.g., healthcare, education, technology, business) and prepares students to a wide range of career pathways.

- c. Does the employment, completion, and success data of students indicate program effectiveness and vitality? Please explain.

Overall, the employment, completion and student success data indicate that the psychology program remains effective and vital. Students continue to successfully complete coursework, transfer to four-year institutions and pursue educational and career pathways related to psychology. At the same time, the program is currently in a transitional phase focused on strengthening and modernizing the program through curriculum revision, expanded course alignment, innovative scheduling discussions and increased support for instructional consistency across sections.

- d. Has the program met the Title 5 requirements to review course prerequisites, and advisories within the prescribed cycle of every 2 year for CTE programs and every 5 years for all others?

Yes, in fall 2025 all prerequisites were reviewed during the extensive curriculum modifications that were made.

- e. Have recommendations from the previous report been addressed? N/A

Use the tables below to fill in **NEW** resources and planning initiatives that **do not apply directly to core topics. This section is only used if there are new planning initiatives and resources requested.**

New Program Planning Initiative (Objective) – Yearly Planning Only	
<b>Title (including number):</b>	Strengthen Psychology Research Infrastructure and Instructional Resources
<b>Planning years:</b>	2026-2028
<b>Description:</b>	
<p>The Psychology Program is seeking to strengthen research instruction, data literacy and student preparation for transfer and workforce pathways through the development of more consistent instructional infrastructure and research resources. Current needs include access to a consistent computer lab environment for psychology courses requiring research and statistical analysis, renewal of SPSS licensing and program access to Qualtrics for student research, survey design and data collection activities.</p> <p>These resources are increasingly important as the program modernizes curriculum, expands research-oriented assignments and aligns coursework with transfer expectations and contemporary psychological science practices. Access to SPSS and Qualtrics would improve students’ quantitative reasoning, research methodology skills and familiarity with tools commonly used in upper-division coursework and professional settings. A stable lab environment would also help reduce barriers for</p>	



# Area of Focus Discussion Template

## INNOVATIVE SCHEDULING

**Innovative Scheduling** embraces mapping, scheduling, and student outcomes. This focus includes a review of modalities, times, days, and sequence of courses. It supports areas of interest. It is based on student success, retention, and completion/graduation data. Sample activities include the following:

### 1. What data were analyzed and what were the main conclusions?

Term Fall 2024|Campus All|Department All|Discipline Psychology & Psychology (CCN)|  
Course Attribute All | Part of Term All

BeginTime	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
6am							
7am							
8am	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
9am	3	2	3	2	0	0	0
10am							
11am	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
12pm	1	2	1	2	0	0	0
1pm							
2pm	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
3pm	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
4pm							
5pm							
6pm	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
7pm							
8pm							
9pm							
ONLINE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Term Spring 2025|Campus All|Department All|Discipline Psychology & Psychology (CCN)|  
Course Attribute All | Part of Term All

BeginTime	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
6am							
7am							
8am	2	2	2	2	0	0	0
9am	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
10am							
11am	1	3	1	3	0	0	0
12pm	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
1pm							
2pm	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
3pm	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
4pm							
5pm	0	2	0	3	0	0	0
6pm	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
7pm							
8pm							
9pm							
ONLINE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The program reviewed scheduling heat maps for Fall 2024 and Spring 2025 to evaluate course offerings by day, time and modality. The analysis showed that several psychology courses were scheduled during overlapping high-demand time blocks, particularly during mid-morning and midday periods, which may create conflicts for students attempting to enroll in multiple psychology courses within the same semester. The review also highlighted limited scheduling variety in certain time blocks and modalities. In response, the program has begun discussing ways to distribute courses more strategically across days and times to improve student access and progression through the program.

2. Based on the data analysis and looking through a lens of equity, what do you perceive as *challenges* with student success or access in your area of focus?

Overlapping course times may disproportionately impact students with work, family, transportation or caregiving responsibilities who have limited scheduling flexibility. When multiple required or highly desired psychology courses are offered at the same time, students may be forced to delay course completion or alter their educational plans. Limited variety in scheduling options may also create barriers for students who rely on evening, online, or alternative scheduling formats to access coursework.


3. What are your plans for change or *innovation*?

The program is working to spread psychology course offerings across a wider range of days and times to reduce scheduling conflicts and improve student access. Faculty are also reviewing course sequencing and modality offerings as part of broader innovative scheduling discussions. In addition, the program requested further data from Institutional Effectiveness (IE) to help identify potential enrollment bottlenecks, course sequencing issues and scheduling patterns that may negatively impact completion or retention. These findings will help guide future scheduling decisions and support more intentional program planning.


4. How will you *measure* the results of your plans to determine if they are successful?

The program will continue reviewing enrollment trends, fill rates, retention, success rates and completion patterns following scheduling adjustments. Additional measures will include monitoring whether students are able to enroll in needed courses without delays, evaluating reductions in scheduling conflicts and reviewing future heat map data to assess distribution across time blocks and modalities. Feedback from students and faculty, along with updated IE data, will also be used to evaluate whether the scheduling changes improve access and support student progression through the psychology program.

Program Review Signature Page:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Program Review Lead

5/22/26  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
[Monica Millard \(Jun 2, 2026 13:00:11 PDT\)](#)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Program Dean

Jun 2, 2026  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President, Academic Affairs

Jun 4, 2026  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Rubric for Assessing Regular and Substantive Interaction in Distance Education Courses

Course:  
PSY 118  
Semester:  
Fall 2025  
Reviewer:  
Codie Place

### Part I: Regular and substantive interaction –Instructor Contact

#### Substantive interaction:

- The course doesn't show clear evidence of engaging students in teaching, learning, and assessment that is consistent with the content under discussion.
- The course shows clear evidence of engaging students in teaching, learning, and assessment that is consistent with the content under discussion.

#### Explanation and/or examples:

1. Course content is primarily limited to textbook reading assignments and weekly 10-question automated quizzes.
2. No discussion boards, collaborative learning activities, or instructor-led instructional engagement were observed in Canvas.
3. No instructor feedback or comments were visible in the Canvas gradebook.

In addition, the course shows evidence of at least two of the following:

#### 1. Direct instruction:

- The course doesn't provide direct instruction.
- The course provides direct instruction.

#### Explanation and/or examples:

1. No recorded lectures, instructor-created videos, narrated presentations, or instructional demonstrations were present.
2. PowerPoint outlines were referenced in announcements but did not constitute substantive instructional engagement.
3. Students were expected to independently learn material primarily through textbook reading.

#### 2. Assessing or providing feedback on a student's coursework.

- The course doesn't show clear evidence of assessment and feedback on students' coursework.
- The course shows clear evidence of assessment and feedback on students' coursework.

#### Explanation and/or examples:

1. Weekly quizzes were automatically graded by Canvas with no instructor feedback.
2. No comments, rubric feedback, or individualized responses were observed in the gradebook.
3. One class project was assigned, but no rubric or visible formative feedback process was present.

3. Providing information or responding to questions about course content/competency.

- The course doesn't show clear evidence of responses to student questions about the course.  The course shows clear evidence of responses to student questions about the course.

Explanation and/or examples:

1. Students were instructed to attend a weekly CHAT session or email the instructor for participation points.
2. CHAT participation primarily consisted of students checking in for attendance rather than substantive course discussion.
3. No archived Q&A discussions or ongoing content clarification forums were observed in Canvas.

4. Facilitating group discussion regarding course content/competency.

- The course doesn't show clear evidence of facilitating group discussions regarding course content or competencies.  The course shows clear evidence of facilitating group discussions regarding course content or competencies.

Explanation and/or examples:

1. No Canvas discussion boards or peer interaction activities were present.
2. The CHAT feature was used primarily for attendance verification rather than academic discussion.
3. No structured opportunities for students to discuss developmental concepts or theories were observed.

5. Other instructional activities **approved by the college** or accrediting agency.

- The course doesn't show any other evidence of instructional activities.  The course shows other evidence of instructional activities (as described below).

Explanation and/or examples:

1. The COR identifies group activities, films, guest speakers, essays, and research projects as instructional methods; these were not implemented.
2. No multimedia learning activities or interactive instructional tools were observed.
3. No evidence of instructor-initiated substantive learning activities beyond attendance CHAT sessions was found.

**Regular interaction:**

1. Opportunities for substantive interaction **on a predictable and scheduled basis**

- The course doesn't provide opportunities for substantive interaction on a predictable and scheduled way.  The course provides opportunities for substantive interaction on a predictable and scheduled way.

Explanation and/or examples:

1. Although CHAT sessions occurred weekly, they functioned primarily as attendance verification rather than substantive instructional interaction.
2. Students were permitted to simply check in and leave once acknowledged by the instructor.
3. No regular instructor-led academic engagement, discussion, or guided interaction was observed.

2. Monitoring student academic engagement and success and promptly and proactively engaging in interaction based on such monitoring or upon request by students.

The course doesn't monitor student engagement and success nor engages in interaction based on that monitoring or upon request by students.

The course monitors student engagement and success and engages in interaction based on that monitoring or upon request by students.

Explanation and/or examples:

1. No proactive instructor outreach or documented monitoring of student progress was visible in Canvas.
2. No individualized feedback or intervention strategies for struggling students were observed.
3. Communication appeared largely dependent on students emailing the instructor first.

## **Part II. Regular and substantive interaction –Student-to-Student Contact**

1. Giving students opportunities to initiate interaction with other students.

The course doesn't provide opportunities for students to initiate interaction with other students.

The course provides opportunities for students to initiate interaction with other students.

Explanation and/or examples:

1. No discussion boards or peer collaboration tools were used.
2. No group assignments or peer engagement opportunities were present.
3. Students interacted only with the instructor through CHAT or email.

2. Giving opportunities to engage in regular and substantive interaction with other students.

The course doesn't provide opportunities for students to engage in regular and substantive interaction with other students.

The course provides opportunities for students to engage in regular and substantive interaction with other students.

Explanation and/or examples:

1. No student-to-student communication structures were observed in the course shell.
2. The COR identifies group activities and collaborative learning opportunities that were absent from the course design.
3. No peer discussion, peer review, or collaborative problem-solving activities were included.

3. Providing guidelines explaining levels of participation and how participation will be evaluated.

The course doesn't explain the levels of interaction between students expected from each student nor how such interaction will be evaluated.

The course explains the levels of interaction between students expected from each student and how such interaction will be evaluated.

Explanation and/or examples:

1. The syllabus explains participation requirements for weekly CHAT attendance.
2. Students are informed that participation points are awarded for CHAT attendance or email communication.
3. Participation expectations are clearly outlined; however, the interaction requirement is tied primarily to attendance rather than substantive academic engagement.









# Innovative Scheduling\_PSYC\_ 2025-2026

Final Audit Report

2026-06-04

Created:	2026-06-02
By:	Shayna Andrews (shayna.andrews@hancockcollege.edu)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAA0U7y34IDBxXDy5-mA488Yin_ABPJAb4g

## "Innovative Scheduling\_PSYC\_ 2025-2026" History

-  Document created by Shayna Andrews (shayna.andrews@hancockcollege.edu)  
2026-06-02 - 7:58:41 PM GMT- IP address: 209.129.94.61
-  Document emailed to Monica Millard (monica.millard@hancockcollege.edu) for signature  
2026-06-02 - 7:59:06 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Monica Millard (monica.millard@hancockcollege.edu)  
2026-06-02 - 7:59:53 PM GMT- IP address: 209.129.94.61
-  Document e-signed by Monica Millard (monica.millard@hancockcollege.edu)  
Signature Date: 2026-06-02 - 8:00:11 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 209.129.94.61 - Signature Appearance Selected: DRAW
-  Document emailed to Robert Curry (rcurry@hancockcollege.edu) for signature  
2026-06-02 - 8:00:13 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Robert Curry (rcurry@hancockcollege.edu)  
2026-06-03 - 2:01:17 AM GMT- IP address: 24.5.203.0
-  Document e-signed by Robert Curry (rcurry@hancockcollege.edu)  
Signature Date: 2026-06-04 - 5:39:39 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 209.129.94.61 - Signature Appearance Selected: IMAGE
-  Agreement completed.  
2026-06-04 - 5:39:39 PM GMT