Psychology Major & Minor

ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2017 – 2018
REPORT DUE DATE: 10/26/2018

Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), 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.

Note: Dear Colleagues: In an effort to produce a more streamlined and less repetitive assessment report format, we are piloting this modified template for the present annual assessment cycle. We are requesting an assessment report that would not exceed eight pages of text. Supporting materials may be appended. We will be soliciting your feedback on the report as we attempt to make it more user-friendly.

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
6. Ms. Corie Schwabenland, Academic Data & Assessment Specialist- ceschwabenland@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)

Psychology Department Aggregate Assessment Report

Academic Year 2017-2018

I.   LOGISTICS & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

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

Chair, Psychology Department

Mail to: wagnerl@usfca.edu

[Report was created by Prof. Kevin Chun as chair of the 2017-2018 Psychology Assessment Committee]

2. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program.

No.

Major & Minor Mission Statement:

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.

3. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.

No.

Psychology Major & Minor PLOs:

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.

4. Which particular Program Learning Outcome(s) did you assess for the academic year 2017-2018?

PLOs **#1, #3 & #4**

II. METHODOLOGY

1. 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 grade for responses to those questions."

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

Three full-time psychology professors (Profs. Michael Bloch, Kevin Chun, Ed Munnich) with extensive experience teaching General Psychology (PSYC 101) created a 15-item multiple-choice questionnaire to assess PLO #1 (questionnaire items #1-5), PLO#3 (items #6-10), and PLO#4 (items #11-15). All items were selected from widely-used Introductory Psychology textbook test banks and grouped according to conceptual equivalence with each of the three PLOs. Each faculty member was tasked with selecting items for one of the three PLOs then all three members convened to review all questionnaire items to confirm their conceptual equivalence across all three PLOs based on their collective PSYC 101 expertise. All three faculty members designed the basic data analysis and assessment rubric to evaluate the results. **The assessment rubric is based on the total number of correct items for each PLO (5 items total) with 5 correct items=***complete mastery of the outcome,* **3 to 4 correct items=***mastered most parts of the outcome,* **2 correct items = ***mastered some parts of the outcome,* **and 0-1 correct item = ***did not master outcome at the level intended.* This rubric was deemed appropriate given that PSYC 101 is an introductory level course, which aims to *introduce* basic psychological concepts and theories, research methods, and applied psychology research findings to a broad audience of psychology majors & minors, nursing majors, and non-psychology majors completing the CORE E Social Sciences requirement. This course, in many respects, serves as a baseline comparison point from which we can

measure maintenance or improvement of foundational knowledge of the field as psychology majors and minors move into our more advanced psychology course offerings.

The 15-item multiple-choice questionnaire was administered in class to all (4) General Psychology sections during the last two weeks of Spring 2018 instruction (see attached "Memo to Instructors" for administration procedures). The lead faculty coordinator of this 2017-18 yearly assessment (K. Chun) collected the data from all course instructors and ran the data analysis with assistance from our program assistant, Ms. Danica Cordova. The current assessment did not survey total number of psychology majors and minors within each section, but instead based its analyses on all students enrolled in PSYC 101 for a more complete evaluation of course instruction and mastery of program learning outcomes.

III.   RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

1.   What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?
This section is for 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

Given that PSYC 101 is an introductory course for psychology majors & minors, and non-psychology majors, **the overall findings show strong evidence of mastery at the intended level, which was defined as mastery of at least *some parts* (2 out of 5 items correct) of the outcome to *complete mastery* (5 out of 5 items correct) of the outcome.** In this case, for PLO#1, 99% showed mastery at the intended level while only 1% did not master the outcome as intended. For PLO #3, 88% mastered the outcome as intended while 12% did not, and for PLO#4, it was 100% and 0%, respectively. Mastery levels for PLOs #1 and #4 were especially encouraging and provide strong evidence of effective instruction on these outcomes. Relatively lower, but still strong mastery levels for PLO #3 were expected given that psychological research methods, including research design, data analyses and interpretation, are quite complex and generally not key interests of some psychology majors/minors, and most non-psychology majors in this

introductory major and CORE E course. Still, the fact that 88% of PSYC 101 students mastered this outcome as intended is still very encouraging, noteworthy and important evidence of effective instruction on this outcome.

b.   any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles

When comparing current PLO #3 results to our 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 assessments of this same PLO, psychology majors appear to show sustained or improved knowledge and application of research methods as they progress into our Research Design, Statistics and Advanced Research Methods/Topics courses. PLO#3 assessment results from the two aforementioned reports showed that most psychology students exhibited satisfactory to above satisfactory mastery levels in these courses. This suggests that baseline knowledge of research methods acquired in PSYC 101 is successfully transferred and potentially strengthened in these more advanced research courses as intended. Likewise, the same maintenance or upward progression of expected foundational knowledge is witnessed when comparing current PLO#1 assessment results with PLO#1 results from our 2016-2017 report, which again indicated solid mastery of this outcome in our ART/ARM courses.

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

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

	age of Students
te Mastery of the outcome	
d the outcome in most parts	
d some parts of the outcome	
master the outcome at the level intended	

**5=Complete Mastery, 3-4.9=Mastered most parts, Mastered

PLO #1 – Mastery Level Percentage - Total PSYC 101 Sample (N=136)

Level	% Total Sample
te Mastery	13%
d Most Parts	73%
d Some Parts	13%
master at Level Intended	1%

*5 correct items=complete mastery of the outcome, 3-4 correct items=mastered most of the outcome, 2 correct items=mastered some parts of the outcome, 0-1 correct items=did not master outcome at level intended.

PLO #3 – Mastery Level Percentage - Total PSYC 101 Sample (N=136)

Level	% Total Sample
te Mastery	4%
d Most Parts	57%
d Some Parts	27%
master at Level Intended	12%

*5 correct items=complete mastery of the outcome, 3-4 correct items=mastered most of the outcome, 2 correct items=mastered some parts of the outcome, 0-1 correct items=did not master outcome at level intended.

PLO #4 – Mastery Level Percentage - Total PSYC 101 Sample (N=136)

Level	% Total Sample
te Mastery	70%
d Most Parts	29%
d Some Parts	1%
Master at Level Intended	0%

*5 correct items=complete mastery of the outcome, 3-4 correct items=mastered most of the outcome, 2 correct items=mastered some parts of the outcome, 0-1 correct items=did not master outcome at level intended.

IV.   CLOSING THE LOOP

1. Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you 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 that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

The current results suggest that for PLO#3, PSYC 101 instructors can communicate with Research Design, Statistics, and ARM/ART instructors to confirm that basic research methods concepts, including basic research design, data analyses and interpretation, are effectively introduced and synchronized with more advanced psychology research courses. This can include sharing syllabi, key lecture content, and exams. Also, course learning outcomes across these courses can be synchronized to emphasize continual and progressive research methods knowledge and skills from PSYC 101 to these more advanced research courses.

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2016-2017, submitted in October 2017)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?

Feedback on our last 2016-2017 was very positive and did not outline any major suggestions or improvements other than possibly including the distribution of student achievement or mastery levels within the sample. In this report, we thus included three tables showing the distribution of mastery levels for each PLO within our total student sample.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

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