

Program Assessment: Annual Report

Program(s): Undergraduate Psychology B.A. Major

Department: Psychology

College/School: College of Arts & Sciences

Date: June 30, 2018

Primary Assessment Contact: Janet Kuebli

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

The student learning outcomes assessed during 2017-2018 were:

SLO 1: Students will demonstrate their knowledge of psychology concepts, principles, and overarching themes that constitute the empiri9cal knowledge base in the domains of social, developmental and clinical/abnormal psychology.

SLO 2: Students will demonstrate their ability to apply psychological concepts, principles and skills to their capstone projects.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

For SLO 1, we administered our Graduating Senior Exit Survey (indirect) in April-May, 2018. NOTE: We administer a direct assessment of this outcome (i.e., ETS Major Field Test in Psychology) in alternating years which will be conducted again during April/May 2019.

For SLO 2, we collected Capstone Judges' ratings for capstone project posters completed by students enrolled in our PSY 4780 and PSY 4900 capstone courses.

Madrid student artifacts are not included.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved? **NOTE:** If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

For SLO 1, descriptive statistics were computed for self-report items on the survey we administered. A graduate student assistant entered and analyzed the data under the supervision of the Undergraduate Program Coordinator.

For SLO 2, for each capstone course, two judges (a faculty member and a graduate student) completed ratings of posters during our annual Psychology Capstone Symposium. A faculty member summed the ratings for each judge and then averaged the sums across judges to yield mean total poster ratings for each course. These means were then combined, yielding one overall mean total poster rating which was reported to the Undergraduate Program Coordinator (ratings form attached).

4. What did you learn from the data? <u>Summarize</u> the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

1. Graduating Senior Exit Survey: This survey has been administered each spring for more than a decade. This annual survey of our graduating majors' perceptions of the program was completed by 60 of the 71 (90%) graduating seniors (including both B.A. and B.S. majors). Seventeen items address students' perceptions of the extent to which psychology courses contributed to their knowledge, skills and personal development, and for which ratings were made from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very much). The mean rating for this section was **4.50** (with *SD*s ranging from .45 to .89). Thus, students' satisfaction with their own learning was high. This result is slightly higher than in Spring 2017 (M = 4.44) and represents a steadily increasing trend since 2007 (M = 4.21).

An additional 10 items measure students' satisfaction with the psychology curriculum, also rated from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very much). The mean rating for this section was **4.33** (SDs ranging from .54 to 1.03), suggesting that students are generally satisfied. Students rated the "overall quality or caliber of instruction" they received as 4.53 (SD = .54). This result also was higher than in Spring 2017 (M = 4.15). Since 2007, this result has fluctuated between 3.99 and 4.33. Spring 2018 items with the lowest means (ranging between 4.00 and 4.13) were about course scheduling concerns, and provision of information about the variety of specializations in psychology and careers.

Additionally, **58%** of respondents reported completing a psychology-related field practicum. Regarding research experiences, **47%** reported working as a research assistant in the department and **58%** reported earning course credit (PSY 3060, PSY 4010, PSY 4880) for designing and conducting their own research. Finally, **20%** of the graduating class reported applying to graduate study in psychology and **86%** of those students also reported having been accepted. An additional **30%** of graduating seniors applied to professional or graduate programs other than psychology, with **90%** of those students reporting acceptance. Students not immediately pursuing advanced study after college reported planning to enter human services/mental health (**28%**), health fields (**23%**), education (**3%**), business/financial (**8%**), and other fields or were uncertain (**18%**) of their immediate plans.

- **2. Capstone Judges' Ratings**: Each of twelve posters (PSY 4870: n = 6; PSY 4900: n = 6) were evaluated by a team of judges comprised of one faculty member and one graduate student (one team per capstone course). Judges rated (a) the physical poster (appearance and content), (b) students' oral presentations about their projects (style and content) and (c) overall quality. The overall mean poster rating was **5.53** (SD = .63) on a scale from 1 (Poor) to 7 (Superior). For these two capstone courses combined, poster ratings ranged from a minimum rating of 4.65 to a maximum rating of 6.53. This is the first year we have used these data for assessment purposes; therefore, interpretation is limited until we have more years to review. However, initially these results suggest that judges evaluated students' application of psychological concepts, principles and skills to their capstone projects favorably. Our scale currently only labels the endpoints; thus it is difficult to interpret results more precisely at this time.
- 5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

During the Fall 2018 semester, the UG Program Coordinator will share these results with the Undergraduate Program Committee and the department as a whole. Dialogue at that time will yield recommendations for changes deemed warranted.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? (For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)

During Fall 2017, results of the Spring 2017 administration of the Major Field Test in Psychology were discussed by the Undergraduate Program Committee and presented to the Department. As this was the first administration of this measure undertaken in the program, the consensus was that we should re-administer the MFT-Psychology in Spring 2019 and review results in comparison to Spring 2017 for informative trends.

Highlights of the Spring 2017 Graduating Senior Exit Survey were also presented at the Undergraduate Program Committee last fall. Students' ratings of 17 items related to their perceptions of the extent to which psychology courses contributed to their knowledge, skills and personal development were favorable (M = 4.46) which was comparable to the same mean for 2016 and also the highest since 2006 when the survey was introduced. An additional 10 items related to students' satisfaction with the psychology curriculum yielded a mean rating of 4.19, which was slightly lower than in 2016 but still deemed satisfactory. No formal changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment were determined at that time.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any <u>revised/updated assessment plans</u> to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

PSYCHOLOGY CAPSTONE SYMPOSIUM

Project Ratings Form (Spring 2018)

Poster Number:	Judge Number:	
----------------	---------------	--

A. PHYSICAL POSTER RATINGS

1. Rate the overall **physical appearance** of the poster. (40%)

Consider the visual and aesthetic qualities of the poster overall. Consider, for example, the following elements in making your evaluation.

- Is the title easily read from a distance (e.g., 6 feet)?
- Does the title quickly communicate the main topic to be addressed?
- Is the selected font easy to read (e.g., size, type, etc.)?
- Does the use of color enhance the poster?
- Do section labels guide the reader through the poster?
- Are the layout and flow of elements effective?
- Are tables, figures, pictures or other graphics used appropriately?
- Does the poster invite reading?
- Does the poster appear "professional"?

Poor					\$	Superior
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. Rate the **poster content**. (60%)

Looks can be deceiving and should not substitute for content. When applicable, consider the following kinds of elements in evaluating the overall content of the poster.

- Is the background information or introduction complete/adequate?
- Are purpose statement, hypotheses, or problem definitions clear?
- Is the methodology that was employed adequate?
- Are results or outcomes clear?
- Are conclusions or implications persuasively presented?
- Are credits and/or acknowledgements provided when appropriate?

Poor					;	Superior
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

B. ORAL PRESENTATION RATINGS

1. Rate the **presentation style.** (40%)

Please invite the poster presenter(s) to summarize or discuss their project with you. Then rate the stylistic qualities of the oral explanation or summary provided by the presenters. Some examples of qualities you may wish to consider are provided below.

- Speaking skills
- Professionalism
- Poise
- Enthusiasm
- Evidence of preparation
- Ability to handle questions
- Ability to adopt an intelligent approach to the experience

Poor					\$	Superior
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. Rate the **presentation content**. (60%)

Again, content counts. Therefore, evaluate the content of the oral presentation by the project author(s). For example, you may consider:

- Completeness, ability to address all or most of main elements of project
- Clarity, directness, stays on topic
- Depth and precision/accuracy of comments
- Insightfulness

Poor						Superior
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

C. OVERALL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Finally, please judge the extent to which the poster and presentation combined reflect the capacity for psychological thinking and/or inquiry at a level consistent with your expectations for psychology majors who are graduating seniors. Consider, for example, whether the poster meets the following criteria/dimensions used by the Psychology Department for assessment and accreditation purposes:

- Demonstrates the authors' familiarity with major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, historical trends and/or applications in psychology
 - Shows the authors' acquisition of inquiry, critical thinking and problem solving
- Demonstrates the authors' understanding, awareness, and respect for human diversity and dignity

Poor					5	Superior
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Psychology Comprehensive Exam Journal Article Analysis

	19	our Student ID#:	2/ points total possible
	e of this instrument is for the Psychol. Please answer the questions to th		•
The followin	ng 10 questions are based on the art	icle you just read.	
Factual Que	estions		
1. Did the d	river have a fake beer in his hand in a	all 4 conditions?	
Yes, 1pt			
2. Identify the	he levels of the independent variable((s) in this experiment.	
1 pt for each	condition (4 possible)		
Unintoxi	cated driver, no confederate	Intoxicated driver,	, no confederate
Intoxicat	ted driver, confederate complies	Intoxicated driver,	, confederate refuses
3. Identify the	he primary dependent variable?		
Whether the	e participant agrees or refuses to en	ter the car (1pt)	
(particip	ants' degree of concern was second	ary, so doesn't count	
	e a statistically significant difference p<.001	between groups?	_yes If so, at what probability
5. Give three	examples of deception used in the stu	udy.	
Yes, the	driver was not really intoxicated, th	ne study wasn't really	y about "cognitive maps and spatial
relations	hips," the participants didn't know	that the other "part	icipant" was a confederate. (3 points
possible,	one point for each way mentioned)	1	
Analysis Qu	estions		

Small n subject to high error rate, age of subjects restricted, uses only university students, artificial in that the situation involves driving with strangers, etc.

6. Identify 3 factors that impact the generalizability of the results. Explain why for each factor?

1 pt for each factor if they explained WHY (3 points possible)

- **7.** Describe (do not simply name them) 2 methodological weaknesses of the design of the study <u>other than</u> generalizability.
- 4 points possible, two for each weakness that's listed and described

How concern was measured (reactivity), small n, no gender differences analyzed, etc.

- **8.** Should the reader conclude that peer conformity <u>causes</u> one to be more likely to ride with an intoxicated driver?
- 3 points possible
- 1 point for yes, because it's an experimental design or no because there are too many problems with the study
- 3 points for yes/no/hard to tell because it's an experimental design but there are too many problems with the study
- **9.** Discuss the implications of this study's results.

3 points possible,

- 1 point if they mention only what was mentioned in the discussion section such as people shouldn't drink in groups, including gender as a variable, measure concern better, manipulate dangerousness more, say you will be driving on the highway.
- 3 points if they mention real world applications such as using the information in alcohol programs or driver's ed classes
- **10.** Write how this article would appear in an APA formatted reference page.
- 3 points possible $-\frac{1}{2}$ point per error. The same error twice (such as writing out the full first names of both authors) counts as one error only and would be only $\frac{1}{2}$ point off.
- Powell, J. L., & Drucker, A. D. (1997). The role of peer conformity in the decision to ride with an intoxicated driver. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 43, 1-7.