Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

Degree Program Name: Master's in Experimental Psychology   **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Jacqueline Shin (jacqueline.shin@indstate.edu)

Part One: Summary of Assessment Activities

a. What learning outcomes did you assess or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	b. (1) What assignments or activities 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 were your expectations for student performance?	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	MA Thesis	80 % on *Scientific Writing Rubric* (Appendix A)	100 % (3 of 3) of students who wrote and defended their thesis during this period achieved expectations.	Thesis committee provided data and discussed performance. Analyzed by Dr. Jackie Shin (program director)
	PSY 602 (Theory and Methods) Final Grade	At least a *B*	100 % (1 of 1) of students who took PSY 602 during this period achieved expectations.	Dr. Veanne Anderson (course instructor)
	PSY 604 (Advanced Statistics) Final Grade	At least a *B*	100 % (1 of 1) of students who took PSY 604 during this period achieved expectations.	Dr. Kevin Bolinskey (course instructor)
	MA Thesis Proposal	80 % on *Scientific Writing Rubric* (Appendix A)	No Data Available	
2. Analyze and critique scholarly work	MA Thesis	80 % on *Scientific Writing Rubric* (Appendix A)	100 % (3 of 3) of students who wrote and defended their thesis during this period achieved expectations.	Thesis committee provided data and discussed performance. Analyzed by Dr. Jackie Shin (program director)
3. Write in APA Style	MA Thesis	80 % on *Scientific Writing Rubric* (Appendix A)	100 % (3 of 3) of students who wrote and defended their thesis during this period achieved expectations.	Thesis committee provided data and discussed performance. Analyzed by Dr. Jackie Shin (program director)
	Final research paper in PSY 602 group project.	At least a *B*	100 % (1 of 1) of students who wrote a final research paper in PSY 602 during this period achieved expectations.	Dr. Veanne Anderson (course instructor)
4. Understand main theories and issues	All core content courses in Master's program	Faculty rating on Student Evaluation Form (Appendix B) of "Meets Expectations" or "Exceeds Expectations" on all courses taken	100 % (2 of 2) of students who took core content courses during this period achieved expectations on all relevant courses.	Instructors of core courses (Drs. Brez and Anderson)
	MA thesis defense	80 % on *Presentation Rubric* (Appendix C)	100 % (3 of 3) of students who defended thesis achieved expectations.	Thesis committee provided data and discussed performance. Analyzed by Dr. Jackie Shin (program director)
5. Present research	Presentation of current research at PSY 690)	80 % on *Presentation Rubric* (Appendix C)	100 % (2 of 2) of students achieved expectations.	All master's program faculty and students provided data, which was analyzed by Dr. Shin (program director)

| 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: Engagement and Improvement
In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?) 2) the changes you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

1) Assessment Results
Since the last assessment, three master's students have defended their theses and graduated. One will defend his thesis later this month, and a fifth is making good progress at the end of his first year. We have been able to collect data for all outcomes. It is likely that the close supervision of a small number of students made it possible to maximize each outcome goal.

2) Changes and Improvements
Relative to last year, we focused on fine-tuning some of the learning activities that can be used to gauge the outcome achievements, as follows and updated on the enclosed Curriculum Map:
- Outcome 1 (collect and analyze data and design studies): Added PSY 604 (Advanced Statistics) and substituted PSY 602 final grade for PSY 602 final paper score to incorporate the multifaceted aspects that this outcome encompasses.
- Outcome 4 (understand main theories and issues): Modified from four writing samples from content courses to faculty rating on *Student Evaluation Form* (Appendix B) to allow for a more simplified and unified assessment process.

In addition, we have started longitudinal assessment of outcome improvement throughout the master's program for individual students. Specifically, we assessed students' progress with respect to Outcome 5 (present research) by comparing the scores on the same *Presentation Rubric* (Appendix C) between the current research at PSY 690j, rated at the end of the first year or beginning of the second year, and the MA thesis defense, rated at the end of the program. We were able to do this analysis for one student, who showed improvement in the rubric from 3.4 to 3.8 on a 4-point scale. This type of analysis can help us assess the effectiveness of the feedback we give to students at the students' presentations during the PSY 690j meetings as well as the effectiveness of the course itself. In particular, we changed the format of that course from student only presentations to include both faculty and student presentations this past year, and we can evaluate the effectiveness of this format in improving student presentation ability.

3) Future plans
In the future, we would like to expand efforts of longitudinally evaluating our program with respect to other specific outcomes, such as APA style writing (Outcome 3). In addition, we would like to assess program success in terms of general goal achievement, perhaps by tracking and analyzing job acquisition and doctoral program entry following graduation.

A second goal for the future would be to create measures that more specifically target an outcome goal by applying a consistent rubric across various activities. An example would be to include a rubric for APA style writing in PSY 602 scoring (Outcome 3). Such a rubric is already incorporated into the *Scientific Writing Rubric* (Appendix A) for the other Outcome 3 activity (MA thesis). Similarly, a rubric for evaluating science ethics (Outcome 6) could be incorporated into multiple activities, such as MA thesis, MA proposal, and PSY 602 scoring, which could then be utilized as activities measuring that outcome.

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. Student Evaluation Form

Student's Name :   Semester:
Evaluator's Name: Class for which student is being evaluated:

	ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Needs attention	Weakness	Unable to judge
1	Masters the content of his/her course work					
2	Shows motivation and interest					
3	Verbally communicates clearly and accurately					
4	In written work, uses appropriate style, grammar and spelling					
5	Written work is expressed clearly, accurately, and is effectively organized					
6	Completes written work in a timely manner					
7	Regularly attends and arrives for class on time					
8	Actively contributes to classes					
9	Applies course content in class assignments					
10	Understands main theories and issues					
11	Demonstrates critical thinking and conceptual skills					
	ASSISTANTSHIP DUTIES					
1	Is responsible in completing assistantship duties					
2	Shows initiative and self-reliance					
3	Completes tasks in a timely manner					
4	Relates well to faculty					
5	Relates well to undergraduate students					
	PROFESSIONALISM					
1	Demonstrates emotional maturity					
2	Conducts him/herself in a professional manner					
3	Relates to peers in a respectful manner (i.e. class discussion)					
4	Relates to faculty/staff in a respectful manner					

Appendix C. 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			

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

Degree Program: MS in Psychology   Date: 01.21.18

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	☐ No outcomes were 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 important, 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.

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. ☐ Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate. ☐ Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.	☐ 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. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. ☐ Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.	☐ Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle. ☐ Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures assess some <u>high impact practices</u> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☐ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☐ Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided

		to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.	☐ If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected.	☐ Some data are being collected and analyzed.	☐ Data are being collected and analyzed.	☐ 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.
	☐ No information is provided about the data collection process.	☐ Some results are provided.	☐ Results are provided.	
	☐ No results are provided.	☐ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.	☐ 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 and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.
	☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ 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.	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.	☐ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.
	☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.	☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a	☐ Results regularly are shared with the faculty.	☐ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of

Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 - Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	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 results or plans.	☐ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ☐ These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. ☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. ☐ Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, 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**