

# ANNUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

(For AY 2013-2014 through 2018-2019)

**CURRENT YEAR - AY 2016-2017 (Year 4)**

<b>UNIT</b>	<b>COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES</b>
<b>Department (if applicable)</b>	<b>PSYCHOLOGY</b>
<b>Degree/Program</b>	Bachelor of Arts
<b>Prepared By:</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Michael K. Russell
<b>Email</b>	<a href="mailto:mike.russell@washburn.edu">mike.russell@washburn.edu</a>
<b>Ext.</b>	1566

Annually, complete a separate report for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Reports are to be sent electronically to [assessment@washburn.edu](mailto:assessment@washburn.edu) by **June 30** each year.

---



---

## SECTION I

<b>2016-2017 Academic Year</b>
Describe your program's assessment accomplishments since your last report. <i>Cell will expand to accommodate your text.</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With one exception (discussed in point #1 in the subsequent section), no discussion or changes were made to the assessment program or plan during 16-17 AY.</li> </ol>
Discuss ways in which you have responded to the Assessment Committee comments on last year's report and what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed. <i>Cell will expand to accommodate your text.</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One concern raised by the Assessment Committee last year related to "Communication with Stakeholders." More specifically, the Psychology department was considered "Developing" in the area of "Communication with students." In previous years, students were not told how they performed on the ACAT exam, a major field test. Beginning the Spring semester of 2017, students who completed the ACAT were provided (via email) with their scores on each of the 10 content areas and the overall percentile. The Psychology faculty member who served as the student's academic advisor was included on that email so that students would have the opportunity to discuss their results with someone familiar to them and someone who could address any questions the students had.</li> <li>Last year's Annual Program Assessment Report Evaluation rubric (in the area of "Communication with Stakeholders;" more specifically, "Communication with students") contained a note inquiring as to whether students presenting their capstone projects were provided with the assessment rubric completed by faculty. Faculty mentors are welcome and strongly encouraged to provide students with the assessment rubric to help students prepare for their presentation.</li> <li>Last year's Annual Program Assessment Report Evaluation rubric considered the Psychology department "Developing" in the area of "Communication with University Assessment Committee and other University wide entities." It is believed that numerous faculty within the Psychology department attended training sessions and meetings related to assessment. For example, several faculty attended the Assessment Extravaganza on February 9<sup>th</sup>. At that event, Dr. Russell presented a poster related to the assessment initiatives of the department. During the poster presentation and at roundtable</li> </ol>

- discussions, faculty from within and outside the Psychology department exchanged information assessment initiatives.
- A third and final concern raised by the Assessment Committee again related to “Communication with Stakeholders.” The Psychology department was considered “Beginning” in the area of “Communication with external constituents (e.g., advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.)” Regrettably, the faculty within the Psychology department has not developed a strategy by which external constituents can become well acquainted with program outcomes associated with the evaluation of student learning. This item will be discussed in one or more Fall 2017 department meetings.

Have there been any changes to your Program Assessment Plan (including calendar and curriculum map) since last year’s report? Cell will expand to accommodate your test

       Yes (describe what and why below)   X   No

### 2015-2016 Academic Year

Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

- To address the concerns of the Communication USLO committee, the capstone evaluation rubric was altered to ensure that students provide a clear summary of points and a strong closing statement.
- Discussion was given to altering the format of the assessment tool used for PSLO 4. One of our new faculty, Dr. Cindy Wooldridge, will teach Psychological Statistics (PY 151) each semester for the foreseeable future and believes that a more valid and reliable tool could be used. Discussion was quite brief and thus we are only at the beginning stages of considering a better assessment instrument.
- In the Spring 2016 semester, the Psychology department offered a new capstone option for its majors. The new option was PY 395, “Classroom to Careers.” It was discussed at our summer retreat (May, 2016) that that capstone option will likely be offered in future semesters. Given that, it would be prudent to determine the extent to which the capstone rubric was sufficient used to evaluate the Spring 2016 presentations of the students in that course. It may be necessary to create an additional or revise a current rubric; one specific to that course and yet captures the information related to PSLOs 2 and 3.
- In previous years, the collection of assessment data was somewhat problematic. Prior to the Fall 2015 semester, it was agreed that a single faculty member (Dr. Mike Russell) would be responsible for collecting assessment data and completing the assessment report for the undergraduate program. On a related note, an ARGOS report has been created that will allow us to easily determine which course content areas of the ACAT (PSLO 1 and 4) psychology majors actually completed. The ACAT covers 10 different subject areas, which may or may not be subject areas a student has been exposed to (i.e., psychology majors are not required to complete courses in all 10 ACAT subject areas). By knowing which courses our majors have completed, we will be able to more accurately assess teaching, learning, and information retention.

Discuss ways in which you have responded to the Assessment Committee comments on last year’s report and what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

- In terms of Assessment Criteria/Rubrics, the item “Criteria/rubrics in place” was rated as “Target.” Hence, no changes were made.
- In terms of Data Based Decision Making, the item “Using Assessment Data to guide curriculum/course changes or to “stay the course”” was rated as “Target.” Hence, no changes were made.
- In terms of Communication with Stakeholders, the item “Communication with/between faculty” was rated as “Target.” Hence, no changes were made.
- In terms of Communication with Stakeholders, the item “Communication with students” was rated as “Developing.” Students who completed the ACAT exam were informed that they would be told of their results, if so desired. To date, no student (following completion of the ACAT) requested their scores. In addition, students who complete the pre-test form of the Statistics-Experimental assessment tool are informed that the tool will be used to

assess how well the faculty teach.

5. In terms of Communication with Stakeholders, the item “Communication with University Assessment Committee and other University wide entities” was rated as “target.” Hence, no changes were made.
6. In terms of Communication with Stakeholders, the item “Communication with external constituents (e.g. advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.)” was rated as “Not Observed.” Assuming faculty agreement to do so, beginning the Fall of 2016, the on-site supervisor for student interns will be informed about the Department of Psychology’s program outcomes, measures, and rubrics. While an advisory board would surely be advantageous, the range of internship sites can be quite extensive and may or may not cover the areas of the members that would constitute an advisory board. For that reason, it would seem preferable to inform individual internship site supervisors of the departments program outcomes, measures, and rubrics and the role played by the internship site supervisor.
7. In terms of Continuous Improvement, the item “Alignment, analysis, and improvement” was rated as “Target.” Hence, no changes were made.

Have there been any changes to your Program Assessment Plan (including calendar and curriculum map) since last year’s report? Cell will expand to accommodate your test

       Yes (describe what and why below)   X   No

### 2014-2015 Academic Year

Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

We set the following goals last year:

1. We plan to continue to discuss History and Systems as a capstone option and decide whether to upgrade the rubrics for that capstone project or switch to a different capstone option with a new rubric.
2. We need to review our problems with capstone data collection and problem-solve solutions.
3. We expect additional feedback from the Assessment Committee will lead to additional revisions to our Assessment Plan.

Outcomes:

1. During the past academic year, History and Systems was not offered as a capstone. Instead, we offered a Psychology Leadership class as a capstone option. We discussed the results of this pilot at our annual summer retreat. Although there were many positive aspects to this pilot course, the faculty decided to try a different capstone option during the next academic year; this course will be developed and taught by Dr. RaLynn Schmalzried. This new class will require the development of a new capstone rubric. We will discuss at the 2016 Psychology Department Retreat whether this new course will officially replace History and Systems as a capstone alternative for our students.
2. Assessment data collection remained somewhat problematic during the last year. Currently, our department has only one service role devoted to improving, monitoring, and reporting on assessment issues for both the undergraduate and graduate program. At our 2015 Psychology Department Retreat, it was decided that this service role needed to be split into two separate service roles so that one faculty member is not spread so thin. Therefore, during the 2015-2016 academic year, Dr. Turk will be the graduate program Assessment Coordinator, and Dr. Jericho Hockett will be the undergraduate program Assessment Coordinator. Additionally, we have officially made taking the ACAT a graduation requirement, which appears when students run degree audits. We hope that these changes will facilitate the improvement of our assessment practices as well as improve our ability to collect more complete data.
3. We made a few changes to our assessment practices based on feedback from the Assessment Committee provided on the Assessment Plan Evaluation Rubric. See the next section. That said, this will need to be an area of continued growth for the department.

Discuss ways in which you have responded to the Assessment Committee comments on last year’s report and what assessment work was initiated, continued, or

completed. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

Status of and changes to our BA assessment practices:

1. *Program Mission Statement.* The mission was rated as articulating with the University Mission Statement and as identifying student learning as central. It was noted that the mission did not agree with the most current University Catalog. The catalog was changed to address this problem.
2. *PSLO articulate measurable outcomes.* This item was rated as “developing,” and it was noted that “PSLO 1 is not measurable - suggestion might be “solve problems requiring the conceptual and analytical knowledge of the major areas of psychology.” After consultation with Margaret Wood, PSLO 1 was changed to read as follows: Identify and distinguish between the major subfields of psychology, comparing and contrasting the different content and emphasis of each. Another comment stated “PSLO 3 is course based. If it were written as “apply the peer reviewed literature to a specific issue or situation,” it would be program based.” PSLO 3 was revised to be consistent with this recommendation: Apply the peer-reviewed psychology literature to a specific issue or situation.
3. *PSLO are formulated to express discipline specific knowledge.* This item was rated as “target.” Hence, no changes were made.
4. *Number of PSLO is limited and/or appropriate for the program and level (graduate v. undergraduate) of learning.* This item was rated as “target.” Hence, no changes were made.
5. *Curriculum Map.* This item was rated as “observed.” Hence, no changes were made.
6. *PSLO linked with specific required courses for major.* This item was rated as “target.” Hence, no changes were made.
7. *Feedback loop.* This item was rated as “beginning.” The operational definition of this rating reads as follows: Measurements are not linked to appropriate developmental acquisition of skills. The following comment was also made: “No course-based assessments are possible? Wouldn’t this be useful for curriculum development?” As a department, we have had a bit of discussion on this item, but we made no changes at this point. For example, we do assess critical thinking in PY 100 because that is its SLO for General Education Purposes. In any given PY 100 class, there are only a couple of psychology majors but we could potentially also use these data for our PSLO assessments – especially if we re-administered that assessment in other classes as well. Moreover, this issue remains in need of additional discussion and planning in our department.
8. *Assessment Plan specifically identifies how each outcome will be assessed.* This item was rated as “target.” Hence, no changes were made.
9. *Direct/Indirect.* This item was rated as “developing” and the comments stated “Given the nature of the discipline, employer feedback would seem an appropriate and useful indirect assessment.” This comment is difficult to address because we frankly usually do not know what most of our student go on to do after graduation. We are, by far, most likely to know who goes on to graduate school because we write letters for them and usually encourage them to let us know whether they are accepted anywhere. We know much less about what happens with our other students because most of them do not yet have jobs at the time of graduation, and they do not get back in touch with us to tell us where they are eventually employed. It is not particularly realistic to get feedback from masters and doctoral programs because our students go to different programs all over the country. Actually, the graduate program with the most of our BA graduates would be our own master’s program, which probably averages taking 2-3 of our BA graduates each year.
10. *Acceptable Program PSLO Achievement Level.* This item was rated as “developing.” There were no comments, but this item is operationalized as “some PSLO have explicit achievement levels stated.” We need more information in order to understand what we need to do differently to improve on this item.
11. *Data collected reflecting performance of major’s within the program.* This item was rated as “developing.” We have expanded the level of detail in our data collection calendar in our MA Assessment Plan. A comment stated “Analysis and Reporting Calendar does not indicated analysis every year.” We were under the impression that, although data needed to collected every year (or more often, depending upon the particular assessment), data did not need to be analyzed and reported every year. Why have a calendar at all if all data must be analyzed yearly? We need additional clarification on this item.
12. *Sustainable multi-year Assessment Plan is in a place that identifies when assessment will take place (Assessment Calendar).* This item was rated as “target.” Hence, no changes were made.
13. *Data considered or analyzed.* All Psychology Department faculty discussed BA assessment procedures and results at the May 2015 summer retreat. We will do so again next summer. We have had difficulty fitting BA assessment agenda items into our regular faculty meetings. After Dr. Hockett familiarizes herself with the assessment process, she may have some recommendations about improving our current process.
14. *Stakeholder Involvement.* This items was rated as “beginning” and no comments were made to elaborate or make recommendations. More guidance on this item would help us move forward in our efforts to improve our assessment practices.

15. *The plan is examined and revised as necessary. The results of the review are shared with stakeholders.* This item was rated as “observed,” and no changes were made.

Have there been any changes to your Program Assessment Plan (including calendar and curriculum map) since last year’s report? Cell will expand to accommodate your test

Yes (describe what and why below)  No

We revised the wording of two of our PSLOs. We provide more detailed information about when assessments are administered in our curriculum calendar.

### 2013-2014 Academic Year

Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

According to the Assessment Committee, the annual report submitted last year had some strengths but quite a few problems as well. Steps were taken to address these concerns, and additional changes will be made as needed in response to the feedback on the report submitted this year. Changes are detailed in the next section.

Discuss ways in which you have responded to the Assessment Committee comments on last year’s report and what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

The following changes were made in response to last year’s report:

1. No problems were observed with the Mission Statement, and no changes were made.
2. The Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) were rated as “emerging” by the committee for all categories. In response to these comments, all PSLOs were revised. The revised PSLOs can be seen in the next section.
3. Measures were rated as “target” for direct measurement and “emerging” for rubrics. Some minor changes were made to our existing rubrics and a new rubric was created for our internship capstone option. These rubrics have been placed in the appropriate folder under S:Assessment:Psychology. If the committee continues to have concerns regarding our rubrics, we can work on additional rubric revision during the next academic year.
4. Alignment was rated as “target” with regard to PSLOs being linked to specific courses required for majors and “emerging” for feedback loop. The data from the annual report is discussed annually by the entire department. We are open to more additional, specific suggestions for improving our feedback loop.
5. The Curriculum Map was rated as “observed” and no changes were made.
6. Assessment Planning was rated as “emerging” in terms of having a sustainable plan and specifying how each outcome will be assessed. See the Program Assessment Plan for our multi-year assessment calendar and description of how our outcomes will be assessed. Periodic review of assessment plan was rated as “initial:” the plan has not been reviewed in five years. The plan was reviewed during the 2013-2014 academic year, so this rating is no longer applicable. Until our approach to assessment meets the Assessment Committee’s standards, we will continue to examine and revise our Program Assessment Plan each year. Assessment results will continue to be reviewed annually after an acceptable assessment plan is in place. Once an acceptable assessment plan is in place, the plan will be examined and revised as necessary.
7. Data Collection was rated as “target,” although data analyses conducted this year has revealed some problems with data collection. Specifically, the measure used to assess statistical and research methods knowledge (Stats.Experimental.Assessment) is supposed to be completed on three separate occasions (1<sup>st</sup> day of PY 151 Psychological Statistics, at the end of PY 251 Research Methods, and during finals prior to graduation). Due to multiple changes with regard to instructor of these courses and multiple changes with regard to the person in our department in charge of assessment, data collection has been rather hit-and-miss over the past several years for this instrument. Although our ethics measure is only given during finals prior to graduation, it had problems too, because it is a two page measure and multiple students did not realize that there was a second side to complete. These data are related to PSLOs 4 and 5, which are not due to be analyzed this year. Fortunately, data collection with our other outcome measures was more consistent. Data Considered or Analyzed was rated as “emerging.” Data are will be collected yearly and analyzed every 2 years. Given that some data are analyzed every year, some data will always be presented to the faculty annually.

8. Data Based Decision Making was rated at “emerging.” All Psychology Department faculty discusses assessment results annually. During the 2013-2014 academic year, the Psychology Department put significant changes to our BA program through Washburn University’s program approval process. Assessment data informed the decision making process.
9. Communication with Stakeholders was rated as “initial/not observed.” Student performance on assessment measures is discussed among faculty annually. Some, but not all, assessment data are shared with students. Specifically, students always receive feedback, via their capstone mentor, about their performance on their capstone project (i.e., how faculty judges rated each aspect of their project as well as their project overall). Students also receive feedback on their performance on the IRB training modules, given that this assessment is scored automatically and entered into the instructor’s online gradebook. At this time, students do not receive direct feedback on any other measures.

Have there been any changes to your Program Assessment Plan (including calendar and curriculum map) since last year’s report?

Yes (describe what and why below)  No

The primary change has been the revision of the PSLOs. Minor changes have been made to the measures used for assessment. Additional changes will be made in response to the Assessment Committee’s ratings of our Program Assessment Plan as needed. In many ways, we are still refining our approach to assessment to bring it up to standards.

## SECTION II

Delete rows that are not needed. Copy and paste to add rows. Cells will expand to accommodate your text.

2016-2017 Academic Year			
Program Student Learning Outcomes Analyzed and Reported for Current Year	List the Assessment Measure(s) for each PSLO – if rubrics are used, a copy of each should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe the results for PSLOs analyzed (assessed) <b>this</b> year – a copy of summary data should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe how results are <b>shared</b> with <b>faculty, students, university-wide entities, and stakeholders</b> (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.)
<p><b>PSLO #4</b> Apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis and interpretation.</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grades in PY 151 Psychological Statistics</li> <li>2. Grades in PY 251 Research Methods</li> <li>3. Score on “post” administrations of the Psychological Statistics – Experimental Psychology assessment test.</li> <li>4. ACAT content areas: Experimental &amp; Statistics</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Threshold: 75%</b> of students will earn a C or better in PY 151, “Psychological Statistics.” <b>Outcome:</b> The following data reflect grade distributions from F2014 through SP2017. Excluding students who withdrew from the course, <b>77.04%</b> of students earned a C or better. If students who withdrew from the course are included, <b>71.23%</b> of students earned a C or better. The data suggest 3 of 4 students who complete the course possess an acceptable level of knowledge relating to data analysis and application.</li> <li>2. <b>Threshold: 75%</b> of students will earn a C or better in PY 251, “Research Methods.” <b>Outcome:</b> The following data reflect grade distributions from F2014 through SP2017. Excluding students who withdrew from the course, <b>93.37%</b> of students earned a C or better. Including students who withdrew, <b>91.72%</b> of students earned a C or better. The data suggest the vast majority of students possess a strong understanding of research methods.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students receive their grades at the end of the course. The Psychology faculty will receive a copy of this report via email. Responses will be strongly encouraged especially by the faculty who teach PY 151 (Drs. Wooldridge and Russell).</li> <li>2. Students receive their grades at the end of the course. The Psychology faculty will receive a copy of this report via email. Responses will be strongly encouraged especially by the faculty member who teaches PY 251 (Dr. Hockett).</li> </ol>

		<p>3. <b>Threshold: 75%</b> of students will earn at least 4 out of 6 points (i.e., score of 66.7% or higher) on the “post” administrations of the Psychological Statistics – Experimental Psychology assessment test. <b>Outcome:</b> The following data reflect grade distributions from F2014 through SP2017. <b>76.3%</b> of students met or exceeded the threshold. The data suggest approximately 3 out of 4 Psychology majors possess an acceptable knowledge base in the areas of research methods/experimental design and statistics.</p> <p>4. <b>Threshold:</b> Students will score <b>within 1 standard deviation (<math>\pm 100</math>) of the mean (500)</b>. <b>Outcome:</b> The threshold was met for the Experimental content area for the past 3 academic years (2016-17: <b>479</b>; 2015-16: <b>461</b>; 2014-15: <b>508</b>). The threshold was also met for Statistics for each of the past 3 years (2016-17: <b>481</b>; 2015-16: <b>477</b>; 2014-15: <b>506</b>).</p>	<p>3. The Psychology faculty will receive a copy of this report via email. Given that this assessment instrument evaluates student understanding of statistics and research methods, responses will be strongly encouraged by the faculty who teach PY 151 and PY 251 (Drs. Hockett, Wooldridge, and Russell).</p> <p>4. Beginning the Spring 2017 semester, students completing the ACAT will be informed of their performance in the 10 content areas. Their overall percentile score will also be provided. Those results were also sent to the student’s academic advisor. The Psychology faculty will receive a copy of this report via email. Responses will be strongly encouraged especially by the faculty who teach PY 151 and PY 251 (Drs. Hockett, Wooldridge, and Russell).</p>
<p><b>PSLO #5</b> Recognize the necessity for ethical behavior in all aspects of the science and practice of psychology.</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Score on the IRB ethics training module.</li> <li>Score on the department’s Ethics exam.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Threshold: 95%</b> of students enrolled in PY 251 will receive at least an 80% on the IRB training module. <b>Outcome: 100%</b> of students enrolled in PY 251 scored 80% or better on the IRB ethics training module. The data suggest Psychology majors clearly understand research ethics as espoused by the IRB.</li> <li><b>Threshold: 75%</b> of students will receive a score of 70% or better on the department’s Ethics exam. <b>Outcome: 83.3%</b> of students received a score of 70% or better on the department’s Ethics exam. The data suggest</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students receive their scores on the IRB Ethics training module as soon as the associated quiz is completed. The Psychology faculty will receive a copy of this report via email. Responses will be strongly encouraged especially by Dr. Hockett, since she is the faculty member who teaches PY 251. Students enrolled in PY 251 are exposed to information relating to the IRB and are required to complete the IRB training modules as a requirement for PY 251.</li> <li>The Psychology faculty will receive a copy of this report via email.</li> </ol>

		the large majority of graduating Psychology majors possess at least an adequate understanding of ethics.	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**Discuss the implications of the results reported above and how faculty members are involved in using assessment data to improve student learning.**

1. Of the 4 measures used to assess PSLO #4, the threshold was surpassed for 3.5 of them. The half relates to the goal of 75% of the students completing Psychological Statistics with a final course grade of C or higher. While that threshold was achieved when considering the number of students who completed the course, the threshold was not reached when all students who enrolled in the course are considered. For academic and financial reasons, it is obviously in the best interest of the student to maintain enrollment in, and pass, all of their courses. Drs. Wooldridge and Russell will meet during the 2017 summer to discuss possible means by which to increase the percentage of students who remain enrolled in (and dedicated to) PY 151. Discussion will also be given to the means of increasing the percentage of students who achieve a grade of C or higher. While there will obviously be students who will drop their course or fail to achieve a C or higher despite every intention and effort by the faculty member, it is hoped that a significant number of students will be convinced to remain enrolled and continue to devote time and energy to the course.
2. Of the 2 measures used to assess PSLO #5, the threshold was surpassed on both of them.
3. Overall, the data support the belief that the PSLOs 4 and 5 are being achieved. Nonetheless, with respect to PSLO #4, in particular student performance on the ACAT exam, the data suggest that WU Psychology majors possess an average level of understanding in the areas of research methods/experimental design and statistics. Obviously, there is room for improvement. Considering that Drs. Hockett, Wooldridge, and Russell teach the related courses, it would seem prudent for those three faculty members to meet during the summer of 2017 and discuss strategies that might enhance student knowledge of statistics and research methods. It is hoped that the proposed strategies could be implemented beginning the Fall 2017 semester. Considering that forgetting occurs quickly and that several semesters often transpire between when students complete those courses and when students complete the ACAT exam, consideration should be given to ensuring long-term memory of course content.

**Describe how students and external stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.) are made aware of PSLOs and measures.**

Feedback from the Assessment Committee and any proposed changes to our approach to assessment are normally discussed at our annual summer retreat. However, that retreat took place soon after the Spring 2017 semester concluded and no discussion was given to our undergraduate assessment program. However, it is expected that discussions will take place at one or more Fall 2017 department meetings. One item to be discussed involves putting the department Ethics exam and exit version of the Psychological Statistics – Experimental Psychology assessment test online. Currently those two items are paper-and-pencil items. By moving the items online, students will be able to receive feedback on their performance as soon as each item is completed. In the meantime, this report will be sent via email to all Psychology faculty. No specific changes are being recommended at this time. We will continue to monitor the data.

Brief discussion has been given to the idea of posting on the Psychology department webpage the results of our assessment initiatives. The idea will be discussed in more depth at one or more department meetings in the fall 2017 semester.

Students receive direct feedback on their performance on the IRB ethics training module as part of PY 251. Students receive direct feedback via their grades in PY 151 and PY 251. Students receive feedback about their performance on the ACAT exam within one day of Dr. Russell receiving the results from ETS (the corporation that owns the ACAT). At this time, students do not receive feedback on their performance on the department’s ethics exam and the post and exit versions of the Psychological Statistics – Experimental Psychology assessment test.

**2015-2016 Academic Year**

<b>Program Student Learning Outcomes Analyzed and Reported for Current Year</b>	List the Assessment Measure(s) for each PSLO – if rubrics are used, a copy of each should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe the results for PSLOs analyzed (assessed) <b>this</b> year – a copy of summary data should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe how results are <b>shared</b> with <b>faculty, students, university-wide entities, and stakeholders</b> (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.)
<p><b>PSLO #1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding representing appropriate breadth and depth in the major content areas of psychology.</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b> Major field test - ACAT</p>	<p><b>Threshold:</b> Students who complete the relevant coursework at WU will score within 1 standard deviation (100) of the mean (500) on the 10 content areas represented on the nationally standardized ACAT. <b>Outcome:</b> This standard was met, given that the average score achieved by our graduating students was between 400 and 600 for all 10 content areas. Mean score for all content areas was 457. This value reflects students who did as well as those who did not complete all courses in the 10 content areas of the ACAT. When considering only the content courses completed by psychology majors, the mean ACAT score was 496.</p>	<p>Though students do not automatically receive their ACAT scores, scores are sent to those who request them. Student outcomes on this PSLO are shared annually with all faculty in the department.</p>
<p><b>PSLO # 2</b> Use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry and, when possible, the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes.</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b> Capstone Project</p>	<p><b>Threshold:</b> 95% of students will receive an overall rating of “pass” or “pass with distinction” on their capstone rubric from 3 faculty members (mentor plus 2 others). <b>Outcome:</b> During the 2015-2016 academic year, 35 students gave a capstone presentation. In short, 100% received an overall rating of “pass” or “pass with distinction.”</p>	<p>Students always receive feedback, via their capstone mentor, about their performance on their capstone project (i.e., how faculty judges rated each aspect of their project as well as their project overall). Student outcomes on this PSLO are shared annually with all faculty in the department.</p>
<p><b>PSLO # 3</b> Clearly articulate and explain the application of the peer-reviewed literature to a specific issue or situation.</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b> Items from the capstone rubric that evaluate presentation style and application</p>	<p><b>Threshold:</b> 90% of students will receive a rating of “pass” or “pass with distinction” for “Presentation style” “Answering questions,” and “connection/discussion/conclusion” items on the relevant capstone rubric</p>	<p>Students always receive feedback, via their capstone mentor, about their performance on their capstone project (i.e., how faculty judges rated each aspect of their project as well as their project overall). Student outcomes on this PSLO are shared annually with all faculty in</p>

		<p>from 2 faculty members.</p> <p>Each type of capstone has a somewhat different rubric.</p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> “Presentation style” was judged for only 10 out of 35 capstone projects. That said, 10 out of 10 (100%) students were rated as passing this item by 3 faculty members, which meets our threshold of 90%.</p> <p>“Answering questions” was judged for all 35 capstone students. Overall, 35/35 (100%) students were rated as passed this item as determined by the responses of 3 psychology faculty members, which meets our threshold of 90%.</p> <p>For the item related to relating the peer-reviewed literature to the project (i.e., connection, discussion, conclusions), all 35 capstone students were rated on this item. Again, 35/35 (100%) students were rated as passing this item by 3 faculty members, which meets our threshold of 90%.</p>	<p>the department.</p> <p>To better evaluate capstone students on this PSLO, a “Presentation Style” item will be added to all forms of the capstone rubric.</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Discuss the implications of the results reported above and how faculty members are involved in using assessment data to improve student learning.**

1. With respect to PSLO 1, the data suggest that Washburn University psychology majors possess the knowledge and understanding of what constitutes the discipline of psychology at a desired level. The average ACAT score of Washburn University psychology majors was determined to be 496. This score suggests that our majors possess a knowledge and understanding that is highly similar to that of the average psychology major across the nation (mean = 500). It is also worth mentioning that of the 10 content areas that comprise the ACAT, no content area had an average below 460 (less than one-half of a single standard deviation below the national mean) and the content areas of clinical/counseling and sensation & perception were above the national average by a notable amount (561 and 533, respectively). While a score of 496 meets our threshold, there obviously is a desire for our majors to perform at a higher level. During the 2016-17 AY, faculty will be provided with the ACAT scores for the previous 3 years and discussion will be focused on the means by which to enhance student knowledge and understanding, which should, in turn, enhance student performance on the ACAT exam.
2. With respect to PSLO 2, the data suggest that Washburn University psychology majors possess critical and creative thinking skills expected of a graduating student. All 35 capstone students received at least a passing evaluation. More impressive was that 41% of faculty judgments were “pass with distinction.” These results suggest that our majors are performing at a level beyond satisfactory. Like the ACAT scores, faculty mentors receive the results of the capstone evaluation approximately 1 week of the capstone presentation. By doing so, the faculty mentor is able to revise (if necessary) the manner with which they supervise their mentees and/or the manner by which they prepare students for their presentation. In short, the assessment loop is complete here.

3. With respect to PSLO 3, the data clearly suggest that graduating Washburn University psychology majors are perfectly capable of articulating published scientific research. Though presentation style was not assessed for every capstone student, every capstone student was assessed in terms of their ability to answer questions and connect/discuss/conclude. As stated above, students performed at an acceptable level. One hundred percent of the students passed. It is worth noting that 65% of the “presentation style” judgments, 48% of “answering questions” judgments, and 42% of the “connect/discuss/conclude” judgments were “pass with distinction.” The degree to which students “pass with distinction” supports the notion that graduating psychology majors are more than adequately capable of grasping and conveying peer-reviewed literature. As stated previously, faculty mentors quickly receive capstone evaluation results relating to their mentees and thus are able to determine if any changes need to be made in the manner with which they supervise undergraduate capstone projects.

Describe how students and external stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.) are made aware of PSLOs and measures.

This assessment report is shared with the faculty via email. Feedback from the Assessment Committee and changes to our approach to assessment planning will be discussed at department meetings during the 2016-17 Academic Year. Depending on the response of the Assessment Committee, it is possible a prolonged discussion will occur at our annual summer retreat.

Students receive feedback on their performance on their capstone project directly from their faculty mentor.

At this time, students do not receive feedback on their performance on the ACT, the department’s ethics exam, and the Psychological Statistics – Experimental Psychology assessment test.

In the case of external stakeholders, this only applies to majors whose capstone project involves an internship. For that group, the external stakeholder would be the internship on-site supervisor. Currently, supervisors are not made aware of our PSLOs and measures. As mentioned in Section I, internship on-site supervisors will be informed of our PLSOs and measures beginning the Fall of 2016 (pending faculty approval).

### 2014-2015 Academic Year

Program Student Learning Outcomes Analyzed and Reported for Current Year	List the Assessment Measure(s) for each PSLO – if rubrics are used, a copy of each should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe the results for PSLOs analyzed (assessed) <b>this</b> year – a copy of summary data should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe how results are <b>shared</b> with <b>faculty, students, university-wide entities, and stakeholders</b> (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.)
<p><b>PSLO #4</b> Apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis and interpretation.</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grades in PY 151 Psychological Statistics</li> <li>Grades in PY 251 Research Methods</li> <li>Score on “post” administrations of the Psychological Statistics – Experimental Psychology assessment test.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Threshold:</b> 75% of students will earn a C or better in PY 151 Psychological Statistics. <b>Outcome:</b> Students with an unresolved incomplete were not included in calculations. Because PY 150 has been eliminated and replaced by PY 151, data from only one year are available. Excluding students who dropped the course, 68% of students earned a C or better. Including students who dropped the course as failures to pass with a C, 63% of students earned a C or better.</li> <li><b>Threshold:</b> 75% of students will earn a C</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students receive their grades at the end of the course. All faculty will discuss these results and their implications for the curriculum at the annual Psychology Department Summer Retreat. Faculty also receive a copy of this report via email. PY 151 is a revised course, which is new as of this year (replacing PY 150). The faculty will discuss whether the failure to meet the established threshold reflects that the threshold needs to be changed, the course needs to be altered, or some combination of those two possibilities. Alternatively, given the relatively limited data from only one year of data collection, a</li> </ol>

	<p>4. ACAT content areas: Experimental &amp; Statistics</p>	<p>or better in PY 251 Research Methods. <b>Outcome:</b> Students with an unresolved incomplete were not included in calculations. Because PY 150 has been eliminated and replaced by PY 151, data from only one year are available. Excluding students who dropped the course, 97% of students earned a C or better. Including students who dropped the course as failures to pass with a C, 92% of students earned a C or better.</p> <p>3. <b>Threshold:</b> 75% of students will earn 4/6 points the two “post” administrations of the Psychological Statistics – Experimental Psychology assessment test. <b>Outcome:</b> The first “post” administration is at the end of PY 251 Research Methods. Data are only being reported for the past year, since PY 251 replaced PY 250 and only 1 year of data are available for this new course. 78% of students met or exceeded the threshold of earning 4/6 points on this test. The second “post” administration is at the end of the spring semester prior to graduation. Due to administration problems at the end of the last academic year, data are only available from the current academic year. 69% of students met the threshold of earning 4/6 points on this test.</p> <p>4. <b>Threshold:</b> Two of the 10 ACAT content areas are relevant to this SLO and will be judged according to the standard in PSLO 1. <b>Outcome:</b> The threshold of scoring in the range of 400 – 600 (ACAT Mean = 500; SD = 100) was met for the Experimental (2013-2014: 486; 2014-2015: 508) and Statistics (2013-2014: 505; 2014-2015: 506) content areas during each of the last two academic years.</p>	<p>period of additional observation may be warranted before any changes are made.</p> <p>2. Students receive their grades at the end of the course. All faculty will discuss these results and their implications for the curriculum at the annual Psychology Department Summer Retreat. Faculty also receive a copy of this report via email. PY 251 is a revised course, which is new as of this year (replacing PY 250). PY 250 had relatively high rates of student failures and withdraws. The content of PY 250 was divided and expanded to cover two new courses: PY 251 (required of all majors) and PY 252 (an elective encourage for those with graduate school aspirations). These initial data suggest that this change is already benefiting our students.</p> <p>3. All faculty will discuss these results at the annual Psychology Department Summer Retreat in order to determine whether any actions need to be taken within the curriculum. Faculty also receive a copy of this report via email. The data suggest that most students meet our standards for understanding statistics and experimental design by the end of Research Methods but their memory for this material shows some evidence of fading by the time that they reach graduation.</p> <p>4. All faculty will discuss these results at the annual Psychology Department Summer Retreat in order to determine whether any actions need to be taken within the curriculum. Faculty also receive a copy of this report via email. The data suggest that WU Psychology majors perform at a level similar to students at other universities in the areas of research methods/ experimental design and statistics.</p>
<p><b>PSLO #5</b> Recognize the necessity</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b> 1. Score on the IRB</p>	<p>1. <b>Threshold:</b> 95% of students enrolled in PY 251 will receive at least an 80% on the IRB</p>	<p>1. All faculty will discuss these results at the annual Psychology Department Summer</p>

<p>for ethical behavior in all aspects of the science and practice of psychology.</p>	<p>ethics training module.</p> <p>2. Score on the department's Ethics exam.</p>	<p>training module. <b>Outcome:</b> 97% of students enrolled in PY 251 scored 80% or better on the IRB ethics training module.</p> <p>2. <b>Threshold:</b> 75% of students will receive a score of 70% or better on the department's Ethics exam. <b>Outcome:</b> 83% of students received a score of 70% or better on the department's Ethics exam. Note: As indicated in last year's report, we had problems with administering the ethics exam last year (i.e., it was a two-sided text but most students completed only one side). Consequently, only data from the past academic year are reported (2014-2015). Moving forward, we will continue to print the exam on the front only of two pages so that this problem does not occur again.</p>	<p>Retreat in order to determine whether any actions need to be taken within the curriculum. Faculty also receive a copy of this report via email. The data suggest that the vast majority of WU Psychology majors understand research ethics at a level consistent with that demanded of researchers by the IRB.</p> <p>2. All faculty will discuss these results at the annual Psychology Department Summer Retreat in order to determine whether any actions need to be taken within the curriculum. Faculty also receive a copy of this report via email. The data suggest that the majority of WU Psychology majors retain what they have learned about ethics across the curriculum at the time of graduation.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Discuss the implications of the results reported above and how faculty members are involved in using assessment data to improve student learning.**

Our data suggest greater evidence for student success regarding recognizing and analyzing ethical challenges. It is no surprise to us that our students have more difficulty with statistics and research design than with any other elements of our curriculum. We have good news and bad news in this area. The good news is that our students perform in these areas at a level similar to students at other universities and most can demonstrate their acquired skills and knowledge on objective tests even years after those courses are over (i.e., these are freshman and sophomore level courses and we test their knowledge with our second post-test and the ACAT at graduation). On the other hand, it is also clear that some students continue to struggle in these areas. Our revision to our statistics and research method sequence in our curriculum just took effect this year. Consequently, we have yet to see the long-term effect of our curriculum changes; to do so, we will need to continue to monitor our outcome data for several more years.

**Describe how students and external stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.) are made aware of PSLOs and measures.**

Feedback from the Assessment Committee and changes to our approach to assessment planning were discussed at our annual summer retreat. Data collected from our assessments were also discussed at our annual retreat. This assessment report is shared with the faculty via email. Currently, our biggest focus has been on getting our assessment practices up to Assessment Committee Standards. Secondly, the faculty has generally been of the opinion that the data we have collected to date support that most students are meeting our PSLOs but that there is still room for improvement. That said, no specific changes are being recommended at this time. We will continue to monitor the data.

Students receive direct feedback on their performance on the IRB ethics training module as part of PY 251. Students receive direct feedback via their grades in PY 151 and PY 251. At this time, students do not receive feedback on their performance on the ACT, the department's ethics exam, and the Psychological Statistics – Experimental Psychology assessment test.

**2013-2014 Academic Year**

<p><b>Program Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<p>List the Assessment Measure(s) for each PSLO – if rubrics are used, a copy of each should be in your department's assessment</p>	<p>Describe the results for PSLOs analyzed (assessed) <b>this</b> year – a copy of summary data should be in your department's</p>	<p>Describe how results are <b>shared</b> with <b>faculty, students, university-wide entities, and stakeholders</b> (advisory boards, employers,</p>
-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b><u>Analyzed and Reported for Current Year</u></b>	subfolder on the shared drive	assessment subfolder on the shared drive	community, alumni, etc.)
<p><b>PSLO #1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding representing appropriate breadth and depth in the major content areas of psychology.</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b> Major field test - ACAT</p>	<p>Threshold: Students who complete the relevant coursework at WU will score within 1 standard deviation (100) of the mean (500) on the 10 content areas represented on the nationally standardized ACAT. This standard was met, given that the average score achieved by our graduating students was between 400 and 600 for all 10 content areas.</p>	<p>Students do not receive feedback on their scores on the ACAT. Student outcomes on this PSLO are shared annually with all faculty in the department.</p>
<p><b>PSLO # 2</b> Use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry and, when possible, the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes.</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b> Capstone Project</p>	<p>Threshold: 95% of students will receive an overall rating of “pass” or “pass with distinction” on their capstone rubric from 2 faculty members. During the 2013-2014 academic year, 100% of 30 students received an overall rating of “pass” or “pass with distinction” on their capstone rubric from 2 faculty judges (for 2 of these students, only 1 faculty judge was available; both students were given a passing rating).</p>	<p>Students always receive feedback, via their capstone mentor, about their performance on their capstone project (i.e., how faculty judges rated each aspect of their project as well as their project overall). Student outcomes on this PSLO are shared annually with all faculty in the department.</p>
<p><b>PSLO # 3</b> Clearly articulate and explain the application of the peer-reviewed literature to a specific issue or situation.</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b> Items from the capstone rubric that evaluate presentation style and application</p>	<p>Threshold: 90% of students will receive a rating of “pass” or “pass with distinction” for “Presentation style” “Answering questions,” and “connection/discussion/conclusion” items on the relevant capstone rubric from 2 faculty members.</p> <p>Each type of capstone has a somewhat different rubric.</p> <p>“Presentation style” was judged for 23 out of 30 capstone projects. An item for “presentation style” has now been added for our theoretical/non-empirical projects (n</p>	<p>Students always receive feedback, via their capstone mentor, about their performance on their capstone project (i.e., how faculty judges rated each aspect of their project as well as their project overall). Student outcomes on this PSLO are shared annually with all faculty in the department.</p> <p>The Psychology Department has been phasing out History and Systems as a capstone course. In the future, the Psychology Department either needs to revise the History and Systems rubric to make it more similar to the other capstone rubrics or phase this capstone option out.</p>

		<p>= 3 students not rated). An item for “presentation style” was added to the internship/community service capstone half way through the year (n = 4 students not rated). Going forward, this item will have more complete data. That said 22/23 (95.7%) students were rated as passing this item by at least 2 faculty members, which meets our threshold of 90%.</p> <p>“Answering questions” was judged for 20 out of 30 capstone projects. Students who presented their projects at the Great Plains Student Psychology Convention are not rated for this item. Additionally, students completing the History and Systems Capstone Project are not rated on this item. Overall, 20/20 (100%) students were rated as passing this item by at least 2 faculty members, which meets our threshold of 90%.</p> <p>For the item related to relating the peer-reviewed literature to the project (i.e., connection, discussion, conclusions), 23 out of 30 capstone students were rated on this item. The 7 students in History and Systems do not have an analogous item in their rubric. Overall, 20/20 (100%) students were rated as passing this item by at least 2 faculty members, which meets our threshold of 90%.</p>	
<p><b>PSLO # 4</b> Apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis and</p>	<p><b>Direct:</b> 5. Grades in PY 151 Psychological Statistics 6. Grades in PY 251 Research Methods 7. Score on “post” administration of the</p>	<p>Threshold: 1. 75% of students will earn a C or better in PY 151 Psychological Statistics. 2. 75% of students will earn a C or better in PY251 Research Methods. 3. 75%</p>	<p>Data were collected for this SLO but it is not due to be analyzed until next year. To preview next year’s report, we did have some difficulty with data collection for Direct Assessment #3 due to a variety of factors, so those data will be</p>

interpretation.	Psychological Statistics – Experimental Psychology assessment test 8. ACAT content areas: Experimental & Statistics	of students will earn 4/6 points the two “post” administrations of the Psychological Statistics – Experimental Psychology assessment test. 4. Two of the 10 ACAT content areas are relevant to this SLO and will be judged according to the standard in PSLO 1.	incomplete. We will take steps to improve data collection this year.
<b>PSLO # 5</b> Recognize the necessity for ethical behavior in all aspects of the science and practice of psychology.	<b>Direct:</b> 1. Score on the IRB training module. 2. Score on the department’s Ethics exam.	Threshold: 1. 95% of students enrolled in PY 251 will receive at least an 80% on the IRB training module. 2. 75% of students will receive a score of 70% or better on the department’s Ethic’s exam.	Data were collected for this SLO but it is not due to be analyzed until next year. To preview next year’s report, we did have some difficulty with data collection for Direct Assessment #2 (the test had 2 sides – front and back -- but some students only completed one side), so those data will be incomplete. We will take steps to improve data collection this year.
<b>Describe how faculty members were involved in using assessment data to improve student learning.</b>			
Assessment data from the capstone have been helpful in evaluating our capstone options. In particular, the data from our internship capstone support our favorable impression of this capstone option, which the Psychology Department has expanded in recent years. Assessment data are discussed by the faculty annually. However this year, and likely next year, a greater focus will be on bringing our approach to program assessment up to standards rather than revising our curriculum based on assessment data.			
<b>Describe how stakeholders are engaged in your assessment plan and process.</b>			
Feedback from the Assessment Committee and changes to our approach to assessment planning were discussed at several faculty meetings and at our annual summer retreat. This assessment report is shared with the faculty via email and discussed in a meeting each year. Students receive direct feedback on their performance on their capstone project from their faculty mentor.			

---

---

## SECTION III

### 2016-2017 Academic Year

During this year, if any PSLO was addressed through new or unique experiences outside the classroom, explain where and how the opportunities were provided to students in your program (i.e. internships, field experiences, visiting lectures, collaborative projects, and other creative ideas you have employed).

### 2015-2016 Academic Year

During this year, if any PSLO was addressed through new or unique experiences outside the classroom, explain where and how the opportunities were provided to students in your program (i.e. internships, field experiences, visiting lectures, collaborative projects, and other creative ideas you have employed).

During the past academic year, 14 students completed an internship in the community in order to fulfill the capstone requirement for the major. This number is slightly lower than the preceding year likely due to an alternative capstone option (PY 395, "Classroom to Career") being offered to students.

### 2014-2015 Academic Year

During this year, if any PSLO was addressed through new or unique experiences outside the classroom, explain where and how the opportunities were provided to students in your program (i.e. internships, field experiences, visiting lectures, collaborative projects, and other creative ideas you have employed).

We continue to help our student better access internship experiences. We developed the following new undergraduate internship partners: Mirror, Inc., Heartland Hospice, Shawnee County Court Services, To Write Love on Her Arms Summer Internship, Highland Park High School Counseling Center, Advisors Excel, Topeka Police Dept., TARC, and Integrated Behavioral Technologies. During the past academic year, 20 students completed an internship in the community (up 1 student from 19 students last year).

### 2013-2014 Academic Year

During this year, if any PSLO was addressed through new or unique experiences outside the classroom, explain where and how the opportunities were provided to students in your program (i.e. internships, field experiences, visiting lectures, collaborative projects, and other creative ideas you have employed).

We continue to help our student better access internship experiences. During the past academic year, 19 students completed an internship in the community (up 7 students from 12 students last year).

---

---

---

---

## SECTION IV

### 2017-2018 Academic Year

In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the next academic year?

### 2015-2016 Academic Year

In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the next academic year?

Goals:

1. Ensure all capstone rubrics contain a "Presentation Style" item so as to be completely assess PSLO 3.
2. Determine ways to enhance student understanding, knowledge base and retention, which , in turn, should result in higher ACAT scores.
3. Determine if the Statistics – Experimental assessment tool is the most reliable and valid metric. Since that instrument is used to evaluate PSLO 4 and since PSLO 4 will be one of the two PSLOs that comprise the 2016 – 2017 Psychology undergraduate assessment report, it would seem to be an appropriate time to begin discussion for a better instrument.
4. Address issues raised by the Assessment Committee.

### 2014-2015 Academic Year

In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the next academic year?

Goals:

1. Orient new Assessment Coordinator Dr. Jericho Hockett to our current approach to BA Assessment and support her efforts to improve our assessment practices.
2. Address issues raised by the Assessment Committee with regard to our current BA Assessment practices.

### 2013-2014 Academic Year

In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the next academic year?

We plan to continue to discuss History and Systems as a capstone option and decide whether to upgrade the rubrics for that capstone project or switch to a different capstone option with a new rubric. We need to review our problems with capstone data collection and problem-solve solutions. We expect additional feedback from the Assessment Committee will lead to additional revisions to our Assessment Plan.

---

---

*Supporting documents (rubrics, summary data tables/charts, etc.) should be in your department's assessment subfolder on the shared drive in the correct academic year subfolder.*