PSYCHOLOGY

ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 – 2019
REPORT DUE DATE: 11/01/2019

- Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), as well as graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated in separate sections.
- Undergraduate, graduate and certificate programs must submit separate reports
- It is recommended that each assessment report not exceed 10 pages. Additional materials (optional) can be added as appendices.
- A curricular map should be submitted along with each assessment report (we suggest that the curricular map should be informed by recent assessment outcomes).

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@usfca.edu

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment

Email to submit the report: assessment_cas@usfca.edu

Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.

For example: FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor);

FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)

I.   LOGISTICS

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Professor Lisa Wagner   Professor John E. Pérez

Chair, Psychology Department   Faculty Assessment Coordinator, Psychology

Mail to: wagnerl@usfca.edu   Copy to: jperez6@usfca.edu

[Report was created by Prof. John Pérez as chair of the 2018-2019 Psychology Assessment Committee]

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) a Major and Minor aggregated report (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

Major and Minor Aggregated Report

In our previous report (AY 2017-2018), we failed to include the program learning outcomes for the minor, which were developed in 2017. They are included in the current report. We were unable to include data for minors in the current report, in part, because of the small number of minors in Psychology (N = 29, Fall 2018). We will need to aggregate data across multiple years in order to assess the program learning outcomes for the minor (please see the response to Closing the Loop below).

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Have there been any revisions to the Curricular Map?

No.

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting <u>an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor programs</u>

- **Mission Statement (Major and Minor):**

The Bachelor of Arts in Psychology provides a foundation for traditional and nontraditional students who wish to become psychologists. It also prepares students to become lifelong learners by delivering analytical, quantitative, and problem-solving skills that lead to self-awareness, critical social/cultural engagement as well as employment in a variety of work settings.

2. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting <u>an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.</u>
Note: It is expected that PLOs will vary in level of mastery between different programs in the same discipline (e. g., a major and minor in the same subject area). Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.
No.

PLOs (Major):

1. Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.
2. Students will respect and use critical thinking, skeptical inquiry and a scientific approach to understanding human behavior and psychological processes.
3. Students will understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.
4. Students will apply psychological theory, methodology and findings to develop a greater understanding of the whole person, as an individual and as a member of a large community, society, and culture.
5. Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats.
6. **Students will recognize, understand, and respect the complexity of sociocultural and international diversity.**

PLOs (Minor):

1. Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.

2. Students will use critical thinking, skeptical inquiry and/or a scientific approach to understanding human behavior and psychological processes underlying human behavior.

3. Students will apply psychological theory and findings to develop a greater understanding of the whole person, as an individual and as a member of the larger community.

3. State the particular program learning outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2018-2019. What rubric did you use?

The Role of Rubrics
The rubric is the single most important thing you need for assessment, and putting time and thinking into designing a good rubric is going to make the entire process a lot easier, faster, and meaningful. Your rubric should break down your chosen PLO into the smallest measurable components, so that the assessment of each piece of work becomes linear and easy, and the calibration among different faculty assessing more objective. If you still have to debate a while whether that one line of the rubric has been fulfilled or not, chances are your rubric item is still an aggregate and can be broken down further into smaller components. Once you have made a detailed rubric, then not only the "grading" work will be faster and straightforward, but at the end of it you will have data that is significantly more meaningful. For example, some parts of the PLO may be in tiptop shape while others may need to be massaged or tweaked, with more attention given to that particular item in class. Conversely, your data may show you that the PLO itself is not what you thought it should be—it may be that it duplicates something other PLOs include or that a crucial part of what you teach is getting lost in the cracks between your PLOs. So do make sure that the rubric is as detailed and thorough as you possibly can manage (a short rubric in fact makes the grading longer, as counterintuitive as that seems).

- **PLO(s) being assessed (Major):**

  PLO #6: Students will recognize, understand, and respect the complexity of sociocultural and international diversity.

  We used an assessment rubric based on three sources: University of North Carolina Wilmington Diversity Rubric (https://uncw.edu/assessment/documents/divrubric.pdf), International Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric (https://www.idrinstitute.org/dmis/), and Bennett's (1986, 1993, 2004, 2013) developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. Our final rubric included four domains: 1) Foundational knowledge, 2) Knowledge of diverse perspectives and their roots, 3) Evaluating claims and theories about diversity, and 4) Cultural sensitivity. A Likert rating scale was used to evaluate student writing in the four domains: 0 = Absent, 1 = Marginal, 2 = Benchmark, 3 = Milestone, and 4 = Capstone. A description of item

selection, pilot testing, and revision process for the rubric is provided below in the Methodology section. A copy of the assessment rubric is attached to this report.

III. METHODOLOGY

Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

For example, "the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a score for responses to those questions."

Important Note – WSCUC advises us to use "direct methods," which consist of a <u>direct evaluation of a student work product</u>. "Indirect methods" like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional complements to a direct method.

<u>For any program with fewer than 10 students</u>: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that <u>every 3 years</u>, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

<u>Important</u>: *Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.*

- **Methodology used (Major):**

Prof. Marisa Knight drafted and submitted an outline for the assessment of our diversity PLO. In addition, Prof. Knight drafted an assessment rubric as a direct measure of student work to be evaluated by faculty for the purpose of quantifying diversity knowledge and competence. Prof. Knight drafted two versions of the rubric—one with three items (Foundational Knowledge of Diversity, Knowledge of Diverse Perspectives and their Roots, and Knowledge: Cultural Self-Awareness) and one with four items (the same three items plus Evaluating Claims and Theories about Diversity). The original draft of the rubric was derived from two sources and adapted for use in our assessment. The definition for each competency measured in items 1-3, along with the criteria for the ratings scale were based on a rubric developed by a faculty team at the University of North Carolina Wilmington (for more information, please visit: https://uncw.edu/assessment/documents/divrubric.pdf). The definition for each competency measured in item 4, along with the criteria for the ratings scale are based on a larger set of rubrics developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the U.S. through a process that examined many existing campus

rubrics for each learning outcome (Association of American Colleges and Universities: for more information, please visit: https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics). For each competency assessed, a numeric scale (ranging from 0 "Absent" to 4 "Capstone") was created to identify varying levels of mastery. These items allowed us to assess PLO #6 in addition to mapping closely with institutional learning outcomes. These criteria also aligned with our goals and expectations for students completing a course that fulfills the Psychology Diversity requirement.

To establish interrater reliability, four full-time psychology professors (Profs. Kevin Chun, Aline Hitti, John Pérez, and Saralyn Ruff) evaluated the same two calibration papers—one from PSYC 305: Psychology of Ethnic Groups (Fall 2018) and one from PSYC 307: Cross-Cultural Psychology (Fall 2017)—using the three-item rubric adapted for the assessment. Members of this assessment committee subsequently met to compare their ratings and discuss any issues they observed with the assessment rubric. The ratings were consistent for two of the three items: Foundational Knowledge of Diversity and Knowledge of Diverse Perspectives and their Roots. There was greater variability in ratings for the domain assessing Knowledge: Cultural Self-Awareness. During the discussion, it was noted that, for only one of the two calibration papers, instructors had asked students to reflect on their own cultural identity and awareness. The instructions for the other calibration paper directed students to interview a person of Color and apply theory to their assessment of the respondent's cultural identity. Because the papers from different cultural diversity courses varied in terms of their focus, we replaced the Knowledge: Cultural Self-Awareness item with a Cultural Sensitivity item that would be applicable across the diversity courses. This item was based on Bennett's (1986, 1993, 2004, 2013) developmental model of intercultural sensitivity and the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric (https://www.idrinstitute.org/dmis/). In addition, after further discussion, we included the fourth item from the original rubric—Evaluating Claims and Theories about Diversity. We decided to include this item to allow the raters to distinguish discussion about theories from foundational knowledge.

Twenty-four papers were deidentified and posted to our department Canvas site by our program assistant, Ms. Danica Cordova. These papers were randomly selected from Psychology majors in three different Psychology diversity courses: PSYC 305: Psychology of Ethnic Groups (Fall 2018), PSYC 307: Cross-Cultural Psychology (Fall 2017), and PSYC 316: African American Psychology (Spring 2017). Each of these courses fulfills the four-unit diversity requirement for the Psychology major. We used a block randomization procedure to select eight papers from each course. Four full-time psychology professors (Profs. Chun, Hitti, Pérez, and Ruff) evaluated six papers each from the three Psychology diversity courses (two from each course) using the final version of the diversity rubric. The lead faculty coordinator of this 2018-19 yearly assessment (J. Pérez) collected the data from all course instructors and conducted the data analysis.

IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section asks you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

a.   how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,

b.   any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and

c.   the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.

   To address this question, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

Level	Percentage of Students
Complete Mastery of the outcome	8.7%
Mastered the outcome in most parts	20.3%
Mastered some parts of the outcome	66%
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	5%

Results (Major):

The overall findings show **strong evidence of mastery at the intended level,** which was defined as mastery of *some parts* (Benchmark, average rating across all items ranging from 1.6-2.5) of the outcome to *complete mastery* (Capstone, average rating across all

items ranging from 3.6-4.0) of the outcome. For PLO #6, 92% showed mastery at the intended level, while only 8% did not master the outcome as intended. Of note, more than half (54%) of the student papers were assessed at the milestone level (mastered the outcome in most parts) or higher.

PLO #6: Competency Level Percentage for Average across All Items – Total Sample (*N* = 24)

Level*	% Total Sample
Capstone: Complete mastery of the outcome	4.17%
Milestone: Mastered the outcome in most parts	50.00%
Benchmark: Mastered some parts of the outcome	37.50%
Marginal: Did not master the outcome at the level intended	8.33%
Absent: No mastery of the outcome	0%

*3.6-4.0 = Capstone, 2.6-3.5 = Milestone, 1.6-2.5 = Benchmark, 1.0-1.5 = Marginal, 0-0.9 = Absent.

An analysis of the mean scores for each of the items also provides evidence of mastery across various domains of diversity. The mean score for three of the items—Foundational knowledge, Knowledge of diverse perspectives and their roots, and Cultural diversity—reached the level of mastery in most parts of the outcome. The mean score for one item—Evaluating claims and theories about diversity—reached the level of mastery in some parts of the outcome. Overall, students demonstrated consistent mastery across the four assessed domains.

Mean Item Scores – Total Sample (*N* = 24)

Item	Mean
Foundational knowledge	2.63
Knowledge of diverse perspectives and their roots	2.58
Evaluating claims and theories about diversity	2.42
Cultural sensitivity	2.58

Inasmuch as this was our first assessment of PLO #6, we did not observe any trends specifically regarding our diversity curriculum. Nevertheless, results from the current

assessment are consistent with the past few assessment cycles, demonstrating a high percentage of students mastering the outcomes at the intended level.

V. CLOSING THE LOOP: ACTION PLAN BASED ON ASSESSMENT RESULTS

1. Based on your analysis in Section 4, what are the next steps that you are planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require any changes to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

- **Closing the Loop (Major):**

Based on our analysis, we are meeting or exceeding the desired level of mastery in our curriculum to foster students' recognition, understanding, and respect of the complexity or sociocultural and international diversity. We will strive to continue meeting these expectations. In the course of our assessment, the subcommittee noted significant variability in the guidelines for papers from the different courses that we sampled. Consequently, we will discuss whether we should standardize writing requirements across our diversity courses. Furthermore, in our long-term planning, we will determine how to assess diversity across our curriculum, extending the assessment of diversity beyond our cultural diversity courses.

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2017-2018, submitted in October 2018)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in the more recent assessment discussed in this report?

- **Suggestions (Major and Minor):**

Feedback from the academic year 2017-2018 assessment report was highly positive, particularly regarding the methodology, analysis, and interpretation of our assessment data. Likewise, we attempted to present the data from our current assessment in a clear and meaningful manner. There were no major suggestions for improvements; however, it was suggested that we disaggregate the data by major/minor status in future assessments. We received the feedback in February 2019; consequently, it was not feasible to incorporate such changes in the current assessment because the assessment for the 2018-2019 academic year was already in progress. We can begin to assess the program learning outcomes for the

minor; however, we will need to aggregate data across multiple years because of our small number of minors (N = 29, Fall 2018).

VI. BIG PICTURE

What have you learned about your program from successive rounds of assessment? Is a picture of the whole program starting to emerge? For example, what areas of strength have emerged? What opportunities of improvement have you identified?

- **Big Picture (Major and Minor):**

Based on successive rounds of assessment, we determine that we are providing a solid educational foundation for our students. We have met or exceeded our intended level of mastery for all of our learning outcomes. We now have assessed all of our program learning outcomes at least once; however, we have not assessed all of our courses. Consequently, we plan to assess other courses in our curriculum (e.g., breadth courses, electives). Moreover, we have identified writing as an area of potential improvement in our curriculum. As a long-term goal, we plan to explore developing a writing-enhanced curriculum. This would require significant resources; we are seeking funding sources in order to pursue this goal.

VII. Feedback to your Assessment Team

What suggestions do you have for your assessment team (the Faculty Directors of Curriculum Development and the Associate Dean for Academic Effectiveness)? What can we do to improve the process?

As indicated above, we received the feedback on our AY 2017-2018 assessment report in February 2019, when our AY 2018-2019 assessment was already in progress. While it may be feasible to make minor changes (e.g., presentation of data), it is not feasible to make significant changes to the assessment process at this point. We suggest that the FDCD encourage long-term changes and consider changing the wording in the assessment report form in the section on Closing the Loop-Suggestions (Section V.2) regarding incorporating or addressing suggestions from the most recent assessment report feedback. We thank the members of the FDCD and Associate Dean Chakraborty for providing guidance, support, and feedback in the assessment of our program learning outcomes.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)

See assessment rubric below.

Diversity PLO Rubric

	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Benchmark (2)	Marginal (1)
Foundational knowledge	Provides a comprehensive, detailed, and accurate discussion of an issue or theme regarding human diversity.	Accurately explains the major elements of an issue or theme regarding human diversity.	Identifies some of the basic elements of an issue or theme regarding human diversity. Description is incomplete or contains some inaccuracies or misconceptions.	Uses some terminology surrounding diversity, but identifies few, if any, of the basic elements of an issue or theme regarding human diversity.
Knowledge of diverse perspectives and their roots	Discusses in detail the perspectives of a specific social group or groups and comprehensively examines how culture and society influenced (and continue to influence) those perspectives.	Explains the important aspects of the perspectives of a specific social group or groups and discusses how culture and society influenced (and continue to influence) those perspectives.	Identifies some elements of the perspectives of a specific social group or groups and provides some explanation of how culture and society influenced (and continue to influence) those perspectives.	Identifies some elements of the perspectives of a specific social group or groups, but does not demonstrate an awareness of societal or cultural influences on those perspectives.
Evaluating claims and theories about diversity	Presents an evidence-based, accurate and well-thought-out argument for or against a claim, argument or theory regarding the interplay between diversity, identity and experience. Acknowledges competing viewpoint(s).	Presents an evidence-based, accurate and substantially complete argument for or against a claim, argument or theory regarding the interplay between diversity, identity and experience. May acknowledge other viewpoint(s).	Provides some accurate evidence that backs up or disputes a claim, argument or theory regarding the interplay between diversity, identity and experience. Argument is not complete, and other evidence may be inaccurate or unrelated.	Attempts to provide evidence that backs up or disputes a claim, argument or theory regarding the interplay between diversity, identity and experience; however, evidence is inaccurate or unrelated.
Cultural sensitivity	Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of more than one worldview. Recognizes and responds sensitively to one's own cultural biases and others' cultural differences.	Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview. Demonstrates the ability to experience another culture and shows some awareness of appropriate cultural norms and biases.	Identifies components of other cultural perspectives, but responds in all situations with one's own worldview.	Minimizes differences between cultures. Views the experience of others, but does so through one's own cultural worldview.

Items 1-3 from: *University of North Carolina Wilmington*
https://uncw.edu/assessment/documents/divrubric.pdf

Item 4 is based on Bennett's (1986, 1993, 2004, 2013) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity and the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric.
https://www.idrinstitute.org/dmis/
value@aacu.org