

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): Undergraduate Psychology B.S. 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 empirical knowledge base in the domains of memory and cognition, neuroscience, and research methodology.

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, (a) administered the Empirical Article Assessment to assess application in the domain of research methodology and (b) capstone project posters completed by students enrolled in our PSY 4010 and PSY 4880 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:

- The PSY 4010 instructor administered the Empirical Article Assessment (sample attached) to students enrolled in two sections of this capstone course and reported results to the Undergraduate Program Coordinator. Students read an empirical journal article provided by the instructor and then respond in writing to 10 items (see attached). Scores range from 0 to 27. Minimum competence corresponds to scores from 7 to 13; Proficiency is defined as a score from 14 to 19; and Mastery corresponds to an overall score of 20 or

higher.

- 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? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

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 *SDs* 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. Empirical Article Assessment: A total of 45 students (PSY 4010-01: $n = 26$; PSY 4010-02: $n = 19$) completed this assessment. The mean total score for PSY 4010-01 was **25.14** ($SD = 2.89$; Median score = 25; 93% average correct). The mean total score for PSY 4010-02 was **23.79** ($SD = 4.02$; Median score = 24; 89% average correct). Therefore, as a group, students demonstrated Mastery of research methodology as assessed by this measure.

Analyses from Spring 2017 ($n = 41$ students, 2 sections combined) yielded an overall mean total score of **25.39** ($SD = 1.74$; Median score = 26, 94% average correct) suggesting a similar level of performance to the Spring 2018 cohort. In Spring 2016, 40 students enrolled in this course, the mean total score was **25.11** ($SD = 1.85$; Median = 26, 93% average correct). Thus, student learning outcomes in this course have remained fairly stable and strong from 2016-2018.

3. Capstone Judges' Ratings: Each of 14 posters (PSY 4010: $n = 12$; PSY 4880: $n = 2$) 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 **5.56** ($SD = .49$) on a scale from 1 (Poor) to 7 (Superior). For these two capstone courses combined, poster ratings ranged from a minimum rating of 4.97 to a maximum rating of 6.43. 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 with the Department. Dialogue at that time will yield recommendations, if warranted, for changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment.

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.

Results of the Spring 2017 administration of the Empirical Article Assessment were also discussed by the Undergraduate Program Committee last fall. Although some concerns were expressed about possible ceiling results, no changes were indicated until further assessments can be collected and trends examined.

Finally, 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. Additional 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 revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

**Psychology Comprehensive Exam
Journal Article Analysis**

Your Student ID#: _____ 27 points total possible _____

The purpose of this instrument is for the Psychology department faculty to assess how well we are teaching you. Please answer the questions to the best of your ability.

The following 10 questions are based on the article you just read.

Factual Questions

1. Did the driver have a fake beer in his hand in all 4 conditions?

Yes, 1pt

2. Identify the levels of the independent variable(s) in this experiment.

1 pt for each condition (4 possible)

Unintoxicated driver, no confederate

Intoxicated driver, no confederate

Intoxicated driver, confederate complies

Intoxicated driver, confederate refuses

3. Identify the primary dependent variable?

Whether the participant agrees or refuses to enter the car (1pt)

(participants' degree of concern was secondary, so doesn't count)

4. Was there a statistically significant difference between groups? _____yes_____ If so, at what probability level? _____ $p < .001$ _____

(2pts)

5. Give three examples of deception used in the study.

Yes, the driver was not really intoxicated, the study wasn't really about "cognitive maps and spatial relationships," the participants didn't know that the other "participant" was a confederate. (3 points possible, one point for each way mentioned)

Analysis Questions

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)

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.

7. Describe (do not simply name them) 2 methodological weaknesses of the design of the study other than 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 causes 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 -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 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.