Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16   **Date: June 7, 2016**
Degree Program Name: Master's in Experimental Psychology
Contact Name and Email: Jacqueline Shin (Jacqueline.shin@indstate.edu)

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	b. (1) What method(s)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?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1. Collect and analyze data and design studies	Final research paper in PSY 602 group project	At least a *B*	100 % (2 of 2) of students who took PSY 602 during this period achieved expectations.	Dr. Veanne Anderson (course instructor)
	MA thesis proposal	80 % on *scientific writing rubric* (Appendix A)	100 % (3 of 3) of students who presented a thesis proposal achieved expectations.	Thesis committee provided data and discussed performance. Analyzed by Drs. Veanne Anderson and Jackie Shin (program directors)
	MA thesis	80 % on *scientific writing rubric* (Appendix A)	100 % (1 of 1) of students who defended thesis achieved expectations.	
2. Analyze and critique scholarly work	MA thesis	80 % on *scientific writing rubric* (Appendix A)	100 % (1 of 1) of students who defended thesis achieved expectations.	Thesis committee
3.Write in APA style	Final research paper in PSY 602 group project.	At least a *B*	100 % (2 of 2) of students who wrote a final research paper in PSY 602 during this period achieved expectations.	Dr. Veanne Anderson (course instructor)
	MA thesis	80 % on *scientific writing rubric* (Appendix A)	100 % (1 of 1) of students who defended thesis achieved expectations.	Thesis committee. Analyzed by Dr. Veanne Anderson (program director)
4. Understand main theories and issues	Four writing samples from content course	80 % on *scientific writing rubric* (Appendix A)	Based on one writing sample, 100 % (1 of 1) of students who took content courses during this period achieved expectations (in PSY 608).	Dr. Jackie Shin (course instructor)
5. Present research	MA thesis defense	80 % on *scientific writing rubric* (Appendix A)	100 % (1 of 1) of students who defended thesis achieved expectations.	Thesis committee and Dr. Veanne Anderson (program director)
	Presentation of current research at PSY 690J	80 % on *presentation rubric* (Appendix B)	100 % (3 of 3) of students achieved expectations.	All master's program faculty and students. Analyzed by Drs. Anderson and Shin.
6. Demonstrate ethical behavior	Institutional Review Board approval	Received letter of approval from IRB	100 % (2 of 2) of students who applied to the IRB achieved expectations.	Thesis supervisors (Drs. Virgil Sheets and Caitlin Brez)

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.

1) Assessment Results

The Master's program curricula are structured with the aim of learning success in 100 % of students. This year, the assessment results suggest this structure has been successful. The assessment methods for each outcome have been based on coursework or thesis/research presentations, thesis preparation, and rubrics. Importantly, students have been receiving detailed feedback at the time of each course, presentation, or preparation event. That each student reached the criteria for each relevant assessment method indicates that students were receiving sufficient support to prepare each piece of work from their course instructors and research supervisors.

2-3) Improvements Inspired by Current and Past Outcome Results

It is important to maintain and augment the support students are receiving by continuing detailed feedback at each step of preparation of their research and coursework. The learning outcomes are primarily related to research. Thus, the assessment methods are conceptually and practically connected with each other. That is, certain methods of assessment and the feedback to the students build on other ones. For example, outcome data from a presentation at *PSY 690J* (for outcome 5) provides information that is helpful for preparing for the thesis proposal (outcome 1) and thesis defense (outcomes 2, 4, and 5). Given the potential utility of data from one assessment method in improving multiple learning outcomes, we plan to enhance the quality of feedback to students using assessment data. For example, during the presentation of individual ongoing research at *PSY 690J* (outcome 5), faculty will strive to provide detailed comments about the theory and methods of research (theoretical understanding and critique—outcomes 2 and 4), design (research methods—outcome 1), presentation style (presentation ability—outcome 5), and other rubric dimensions for each student.

Students typically take 2-3 content courses in their first year and 1-2 content courses in their second year. Given this variability, we should only expect to be able to collect data from 1-2 writing samples with respect to outcome 4 (understand main theories and issues) from each student in any given year, rather than the currently specified method of collecting 4 written samples. In addition, it would be a valuable experience for the master's and undergraduate students alike for the master's students to present their ongoing research in our *Research in Psychology (PSY 486)* course. Therefore, we are planning to add this method to assess outcome 5 (present research).

Due to the relatively small number of students and their high success rate in achieving the learning outcomes, the assessment results have usually been shared among the Master's program faculty informally. However, in order to elicit suggestions for improvement from the psychology faculty, we plan to discuss the results formally at the last faculty meetings of the spring and fall semesters.

Appendix A. Scientific Writing Rubric

Points	Conceptual	Structuring	Language	APA Style
4	has cogent analysis, shows command of interpretive and conceptual tasks ; ideas original, often insightful, going beyond ideas discussed in lecture and class	well-constructed: good introduction, methods results, and discussion sections.; appropriate, clear, and smooth transitions;	uses sophisticated sentences effectively; usually chooses words aptly; observes professional conventions of written English and manuscript format; makes few minor or technical errors	Correct pagination, margins, and headers; in-text citations appropriate; references are complete and in hanging indent style; Tables and Figures are clear and appropriately labeled and formatted; all sections of paper are included and in correct order
3	shows a good understanding of the ideas and methods of the area; goes beyond the obvious; may have one minor factual or conceptual inconsistency	distinct units of thought in paragraphs controlled by specific, detailed, and arguable topic sentences; clear transitions between developed, cohering, and logically arranged paragraphs	a few mechanical difficulties or stylistic problems (language may be too informal); may make occasional problematic word choices or syntax errors; a few spelling errors or incomprehensible sentences	A few difficulties in style, i.e. heading, citation, figure/table format
2	shows an understanding of the basic ideas and information involved may have some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors	some awkward transitions; some brief, weakly unified or undeveloped paragraphs; arrangement may not appear entirely natural; contains extraneous information	frequent wordiness; unclear or awkward sentences; imprecise use of words; some distracting grammatical errors (wrong verb tense, pronoun agreement, apostrophe errors, singular/plural errors, article use, preposition use, comma splice, etc.); frequent spelling errors	Frequent mistakes are repeated throughout, i.e. improper citation and reference style, incorrect section headings, incorrect order of paper sections, etc.
1	shows inadequate command of current literature ; has significant factual and conceptual errors; confuses some significant ideas	simplistic, tends to narrate or merely summarize; wanders from one topic to another; illogical arrangement of ideas	some major grammatical or proofreading errors (subject-verb agreement, sentence fragments, word form errors, etc.); language frequently weakened by clichés, colloquialisms, repeated inexact word choices; incorrect quotation or citation format	Many errors in several aspects of style
0	writer lacks critical understanding of lectures, readings, discussions, or assignments	no transitions; incoherent paragraphs; suggests poor planning or no serious revision	numerous grammatical errors and stylistic problems seriously detract from the argument;	Inconsistent format in multiple areas indicative of inattention to style or use of non-APA style
Score				

Appendix B. Presentation Rubric

Points	Organization of Presentation	Delivery	Question and Answer
4	Uses examples to clarify main points; clear transitions between main ideas; presentation is well-organized and easy to follow; good connections between literature and own research; clear beginning and conclusion(s); length is adequate and sufficient	Speaks clearly; does not read presentation from notes or PowerPoint slides; maintains good eye contact with audience; includes creative touches such as humor, stories, quotes without distracting from presentation	Is knowledgeable and confident when responding to questions and/or comments
3	Good organization but transitions between main ideas may be a little confusing; may be a bit too short or too long	Speaks clearly but could improve eye contact; uses some creative touches; attempts to gauge audience reaction or awareness	Some difficulty in responding to questions and/or comments but is able to respond to most
2	Organization is somewhat confusing; shallow treatment of ideas; connections between literature and own research are unclear; no clear conclusions; too long or too short	Some difficulty in speaking clearly and maintaining eye contact; some extemporaneous speaking but relies a bit too much on reading from notes or PowerPoint slides	Difficulty in responding to questions and/or comments; appears unprepared
1	Poor organization; lack of review of relevant literature; too short; difficult to understand	Reads entirely from notes or PowerPoint slides; no creative touches; very little eye contact with audience	Great difficulty in responding to questions and/or comments; does not seem knowledgeable about area of presentation
0	Very unorganized; much irrelevant information presented	Hard to understand; no eye contact with audience	Cannot or does not respond to questions and/or comments
Score			

Degree Program: <u>MS in Psychology</u> Date: <u>8.25.16</u>

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

| 2. **Measures & Performance Goals** | ☐ No measures are provided.

☐ No goals for student performance are identified. | ☐ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.

☐ Measures are primarily indirect.

☒ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.

☐ Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate. | ☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.

☐ Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.

☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.

☒ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.

☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided. | ☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.

☒ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.

☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.

☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.

☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.

☒ Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)

☒ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.

☒ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do. |

				☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Some data are being collected and analyzed. ☐ Some results are provided. ☐ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☒ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☒ Results are provided. ☒ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. ☒ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ 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. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. ☐ 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	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☒ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. ☐ Little reflection is offered about previous	☒ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ☒ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ☒ These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ 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. ☐ Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans,

| | | results or plans. | ☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment. | actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.

☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.

☒ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.

☒ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Overall Rating** | ☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped** | ☐ **Level 1 - Developing** | ☒ **Level 2 – Mature** | ☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary** |

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   Some of the outcomes assessed in this cycle are specific, program-level outcomes. However, outcome 5 needs to be clarified (Effectively communicate the results of their research projects in internal and external settings?), and outcome 3 likely can be combined with it, particularly since the rubric incorporates APA style.

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   The program uses seven discrete measures that center on the thesis and include high-impact practices (group project, extended research project). IRB approval counts as an indirect measure, but by itself, is it a sufficient measure of students' ability to demonstrate ethical behavior? Performance standards generally are clear and appropriate to a graduate-level program, though outcome 1 is assessed via a grade, which *could* be appropriate if the grade is calibrated to a rubric (so that a "B" specifically reflects what students know and can do).

3. **Results**
   Clear numerical results are provided, though the sample size is quite small. Do you track results longitudinally to ensure their validity? In Part Two, I would love to hear more about what the numbers actually mean. What do students know/do well and less well?

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   Multiple faculty members collect and analyze results, and though they have not been shared formally with the larger faculty, the program plans to do so. Part Two describes a solid process for assessing students' performance over time and providing feedback to help them improve. Have you seen positive results from this process? This section also identifies two other plans for improvement (though they are not specifically connected to results): Enhancing the quality of feedback and providing students with an additional opportunity to present their research.

   Thanks for sharing this information about your student learning assessment program!