

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: B.S. in Psychology

Contact Name and Email Virgil Sheets virgil.sheets@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>1.Outcome 1.4: Exhibit general understanding of APA ethics code</p>	<p>(1) Students took a quiz on the APA ethical standards and students completed IRB CITI training. (2) PSY 484: Field Work in Psychology and PSY 486: Research in Psychology</p>	<p>At least 75% of students will earn 70% or greater score on the quiz. The percentage of students completing IRB CITI training.</p>	<p>88% students earned 70% or greater on the ethics quiz. The average score on the quiz was 79%. 100% of students completed IRB CITI training.</p>	<p>(1) Jennifer Schriver is the instructor of PSY 484 and collected the results. Caitlin Brez is the instructor of PSY 486 and collected the results. (2) All assessment results for the year will be shared with faculty at the first meeting of AY2016-17 year.</p>
<p>2. Outcome 3.1: Identify appropriate applications of psychology in solving problems.</p>	<p>(1) Weekly journal in which students apply psychology knowledge to their internship experience and students grades for their research placements. (2) PSY 484: Field Work in Psychology and PSY 486: Research in Psychology</p>	<p>At least 80% of students earn an average rating of 3 on a 3-point scale across 8-10 journals. At least 80% of students earn a 'C' or better for their research placement.</p>	<p>80% of students earned an average rating of 3 for their ability to apply psychological knowledge to their internship experience across 10 journals. 100% of students earned a 'C' or better for their research placement.</p>	<p>(1) Jennifer Schriver is the instructor of PSY 484 and collected the results. Caitlin Brez is the instructor of PSY 486 and collected the results. (2) All assessment results for the year will be shared with faculty at the first meeting of AY2016-17 year.</p>
<p>3. Outcome 4.2: Demonstrate effective oral/written/graphic communication skills through discussion/presentation/papers and essays.</p>	<p>(1) Students' final research proposals. (2) PSY 486: Research in Psychology</p>	<p>At least 80% of students earn a 'C' or better on their final research proposal.</p>	<p>58% of students earned a 'C' or better.</p>	<p>(1) Caitlin Brez is the instructor of PSY 486 and collected the results. (2) All assessment results for the year will be shared with faculty at the first meeting of AY2016-17 year.</p>

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students’ learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

(1) We have discovered that our current assessment plan does not provide us with very meaningful data about students’ learning. We believe that our overall objectives are sound and are consistent with the objectives set forth by the American Psychological Association for undergraduate majors in psychology, but our measures are too broad to provide meaningful data that allows us to draw conclusions about learning. In analyzing the specific data that we’ve presented above, we find that most of our students are completing the assignments provided to them. For example, 100% of our students are completing IRB CITI training. However, a measure of students completing a project doesn’t provide us any information about the quality of their learning from that assignment. Regarding the outcome of demonstrating effective oral/written/graphic communication skills, we find that our students are not meeting the threshold of 80% passing grades that we established in PSY 486. However, this measurement doesn’t provide information about what students are doing well and not doing well in their research proposals. For example, we don’t know if they are writing well, using APA style, or developing good ideas for research methodology.

(2) We have revised our assessment plan significantly with respect to our outcomes and their measurement. We intend to gather less data but more precise data about actual student learning. We hope that our new assessment plan and process will provide more meaningful information that will allow us to better understand the experience of students in the psychology major.

(3) For next year, we plan to focus on evaluating students’ post-degree plans for life after graduation and students’ understanding of major concepts, theoretical perspectives, and seminal empirical findings in psychology. This will focus our attention primarily on two of our introductory courses, General Psychology and Careers in Psychology.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BS in Psychology Date: 8.25.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were

				assessed in this cycle.
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.

				<input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process. <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important

	plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. Learning Outcomes

The three outcomes assessed this past year are specific, measurable, and important to the discipline. I think the form in which you provided your new outcomes is fine (probably better than what the template calls for!), though you should consider revising the outcomes that use vague verbs such as “know” and “understand” so that they describe measurable actions. Yours is one of the few programs to include career-related outcomes, by the way-- thanks! Last, the new map suggests that a couple of the outcomes receive very little coverage, including that focused on knowledge of the discipline.

2. Measures & Performance Goals

The program used five discrete measures that provide students a variety of ways to demonstrate their knowledge and skills. I’m not sure what a “research placement” entails, but otherwise the methods appear to be appropriate to the related outcomes. Clear numerical expectations for student performance are offered, though there is no information about the criteria the numbers measure. If you are using checklists or rubrics to assess performance, summarize them and include the actual instruments in the college Blackboard site. (My rubric, for example, assesses learning outcomes, measures and performance goals (etc.) according to primary traits that determine whether the report is developing, mature, or exemplary....) Is the performance expectation for outcome 1.4 too low? What is the goal for completion of the IRB training? I will note that since you track only completion on this item, you could use it as your indirect measure if you would like to.

3. Results

Numerical results indicate that students met standards set for four of the five measures. In Part Two, I would expect to see some discussion of these results, and in particular a plan to improve students’ communication skills.

4. Engagement & Improvement

The two faculty members who teach the courses in which this year’s assessments occurred are responsible for collecting results, which will be shared. It is clear from Part Two that the faculty as a whole typically review results, and that they made an important discovery about the need to collect data that specifically reveal what students know and can do well/less well. (I have made that suggestion to at least fifty programs this summer!)

I look forward to your 2016-17 report, which should provide specific details about what your assessment activities taught you about student learning and offer plans to ensure that they continuously improve. Thanks!