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# PART ONE

## Introduction to the Assessment Measures

| Name | Description | Scale | Sample/Response Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Direct Measures | | | |
| Capstone Course Ratings | Students enrolled in a capstone course as a senior (required for graduation) are rated by faculty on their engagement in original research, critical thinking, writing, and oral communication skills. | Items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (Not competent) to 4 (Highly competent). | 46 out of 83 (55%) of students were rated by faculty in the Fall/Spring semesters. |
| Electronic Writing Portfolio (EWP) | Students submit papers from classes that meet the EWP submission requirements. | Faculty assign a holistic score between 1 (Unsatisfactory) and 4 (Superior) | 268 student papers rated |
| EIU Speaking Rubric | Students enrolled in CMN 1310G (Speech) and Senior seminars (EIU 4XXXG) are rated on their speaking ability | Items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (Not Competent) to 4 (Highly Competent) |  |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers | Faculty advisors of students enrolled in undergraduate research (PSY3900, PSY 4100, or Honors equivalents) complete an evaluation of their students at the end of each semester with questions similar to the Student Researcher Survey. | Items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (None) to 4 (A lot) | Of the 54 undergraduate research experiences, 53 were rated by faculty (98%). |
| Intern Evaluation by Supervisor | Off-site supervisors of students enrolled in undergraduate Internship rate the performance of their students at the end of each semester. | Eight items related to the department learning goals are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (None) to 4 (A Lot) | A total of 13 supervisors out of 19 (68%) in Summer/Fall/Spring completed the internship evaluation |
| Psychology Comprehensive Exam (PCE) | The PCE is administered in D2L to graduating seniors during their last semester on campus; it became a graduation requirement with the 2007 catalog. It is a 56-item multiple choice test that covers the major domains of psychology. There are also 2 critical thinking essay questions. | Scored out of 100% possible | Out of a possible 102 graduating seniors from Summer 2017 through Spring 2018 who had to meet this requirement, 100 (98%) met the requirement. |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation | Students enrolled in Research Methods (PSY3805) create posters of their research projects. Faculty rate the posters using the Poster Evaluation form. | Nine items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (None) to 4 (A lot) | Typically, 3-5 faculty volunteers are assigned to rate different subsets of posters so that the majority of posters are rated by at least two faculty. A total of 63 poster ratings were completed this year. |
| Research Methods Poster Oral Evaluation | Students who created posters for their Research Methods class (PSY3805) present their research orally to faculty members in the hallway during the research methods forum in the last week of class. | Four items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (None) to 4 (A lot) | Typically, 2-3 faculty volunteers evaluate several students each semester, resulting in 28 evaluations this year. |
| Watson-Glaser Test | This standardized test measures students’ critical thinking skills. | Overall scores are reported in comparison to all other EIU students who took the test. |  |
| Indirect Measures | | | |
| Graduating Senior Survey (GSS) | The GSS is a self-report survey completed online by seniors in their last semester. Students rate how much their experience as a psych major helped them to meet each of the department learning goals | Items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (None) to 4 (A lot) | Out of a possible 102 graduating seniors from Summer 2017 through Spring 2018, 61 (60%) completed the Graduating Senior Survey. |
| Intern Self-Evaluation | Students enrolled in undergraduate internship (PSY 4275) complete an online survey with questions about their internship experience at the end of each semester. | Eight items related to the department learning goals are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (None) to 4 (A Lot) | A total of 18 students out of 19 (95%) in Fall/Spring completed the internship self-evaluation |
| Student Researcher Survey | Students who conduct research (PSY3805, PSY3900, PSY4100, PSY4444 and PSY4644) are asked to complete an online survey at the end of each semester, which asks how much their research experience met the department learning goals. | Items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (None) to 4 (A lot) | Of the 160 student research experiences (including research methods), there were 87 (54%) responses. |

**2017-2018 Results**

## 1. Scientific Inquiry, Critical Thinking, & Quantitative Reasoning

| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations?\* | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.1 Apply innovative, integrative, and critical thinking skills to interpret psychological phenomena | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 95%** | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | M = 3.37, 92% Some/A lot |
| Capstone Course Ratings |  | M = 3.39, 93% Some/A lot |
| PCE Critical Thinking Essay Questions |  | M = 48% correct |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.79, 100% Some/A lot |
| I**ndirect Measures** |  | **M = 96%** |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.76, 98% Some/A lot |
| GSS |  | M = 3.70, 97% Some/A lot |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | M = 3.78, 94% Some/A lot |
| 1.2 Apply innovative, integrative, and critical thinking skills to design and conduct research, analyze data, and interpret results. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 85%** |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | Appropriate Design: M = 3.33, 87% Some/A lot  Accurate Analysis: M = 3.52, 92% Some/A lot  Effective Interpretation: M = 3.26, 77% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.71, 100% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 98%** |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.84, 98% Some/A lot |
| GSS |  | M = 3.62, 98% Some/A lot |
| 1.3 Apply information literacy skills to find and evaluate research studies in psychology. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 90%** |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | M = 3.46, 90% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.42, 89% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 98%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.66, 97% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.79, 98% Some/A lot |
|  |  |  |
| 1.4 Produce, analyze, interpret, and evaluate quantitative materials. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 98%** |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.64, 98% Some/A lot |
| Watson-Glaser Test | Psychology students will meet or exceed the average score of all EIU students taking this exam. | In the 2016-2017 AY, the average composite score of the 81 Psychology majors taking the test was 24.09, which was slightly below the average of all 1120 students taking the test (25.40). |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 97%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.57, 95% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.83, 98% Some/A lot |

## 2. Communication

| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations?\* | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Writing and Critical Reading** | | | | |
| 2.1 Write critically and effectively in the discipline of psychology by developing a cogent scientific argument and evaluating evidence, issues, ideas, and problems from multiple perspectives. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 88%** | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.39, 86% Some/A lot |
| Capstone Course Ratings |  | M = 3.30, 96% Some/A lot |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | APA Style: M = 3.48, 92% Some/ A lot  Clear Grammar: M = 3.48, 87% Some/A lot  Scientific Argument: M = 3.14, 79% Some/A lot |
| EWP |  | M = 3.41, 93% Satisfactory/Superior |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 96%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.66, 94% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.82, 98% Some/A lot |
| 2.2 Evaluate primary sources in psychology, collect and employ source materials ethically, and understand the strengths and limitations of different types of sources. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 93%** |
| Capstone Course Ratings |  | M = 3.43, 98% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.42, 88% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 98%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.67, 97% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.80, 99% Some/A lot |
| **Speaking and Listening** | | | | |
| 2.3 Demonstrate competence in oral communication skills by presenting information using a scientific approach, engaging in discussion of psychological concepts, explaining the ideas of others, and expressing their own ideas with clarity. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 84%** | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| EIU Speaking Rubric (Senior Seminar) |  | M = 3.57, 96% Competent/Highly Comp. |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.50, 92% Some/A lot |
| Intern Evaluation by Supervisor |  | M = 3.92, 100% Some/A lot |
| Research Methods Poster Oral Evaluation |  | Present Information: M = 2.96, 68% Some/A lot  Engage Discussion: M = 3.04, 75% Some/A lot  Express with Clarity: M = 2.93, 72% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 88%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.48, 92% Some/A lot |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | M = 3.53, 82% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.62, 89% Some/A lot |
| 2.4 Exhibit flexible interpersonal approaches that optimize information exchange and relationship development. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 98%** |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.67, 100% Some/A lot |
| Intern Evaluation by Supervisor |  | M = 3.85, 100% Some/A lot |
| Research Methods Poster Oral Evaluation |  | Effectively exchange information: M = 3.32, 93% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 95%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.51, 92% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.71, 98% Some/A lot |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | M = 3.83, 94% Some/A lot |

## 3. Content Knowledge

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations?\* | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared? |
| 3. Comprehend fundamental knowledge, major concepts, theoretical perspectives, historical trends, and empirical findings in the primary content areas of psychology. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 93%** | Results will be shared by the **Assessment Committee Chair** with all psychology faculty. |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.57, 98% Some/A lot |
| PCE | At least half of the students will score at least 50% on the PCE. | The overall mean score was 58%. A total of 69% of students exceeded a score of 50% on the PCE. Performance on individual domains were:  Biological: 57%, Consciousness, Memory: 65%, Development: 70%, Language: 50%, Learning: 62%, Social: 53%, Personality: 66%, Thinking, Intelligence, Health: 54%, Abnormal: 52%, Research Methods: 55% |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | Knowledge of Psychology: M = 3.41, 87% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 98%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.64, 95% Some/A lot |
| GSS ratings of confidence in presenting on different topics | 70% of graduating seniors will indicate being somewhat confident in their ability to give a presentation based on information learned from courses in the major domains, and overall mean scores will be above 2.8 (i.e., mean rating on a 4-point scale). | The following are percentages of graduating seniors who indicated having at least “some” confidence: 84% in abnormal (M = 3.26), 77% in social (M = 3.13), 84% in personality (M = 3.26), 49**%** in biopsychology (M = 2.51), 57% in cognitive (M = 2.74), 71% in learning (M = 3.00), and 85% in developmental (M = 3.21). |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.81, 95% Some/A lot |

## 4. Ethical and Social Responsibility

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations?\* | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared? |
| 4.1 Evaluate formal regulations that govern professional ethics in psychology. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 99%** | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| Intern Evaluation by Supervisor |  | M = 3.87, 100% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.54, 98% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 95%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.54, 95% Some/A lot |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | M = 3.83, 94% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.76, 95% Some/A lot |
| 4.2 Interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with people from diverse backgrounds and demonstrate understanding of the sociocultural contexts that influence individual differences. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 98%** |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.52, 93% Some/A lot |
| Intern Evaluation by Supervisor |  | Interact Effectively: M = 3.92, 100% Some/A lot  Understand sociocultural contexts: M = 3.92, 100% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 97%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.57, 92% Some/A lot |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | Interact Effectively: M = 3.94, 100% Some/A lot  Understand sociocultural contexts: M = 3.94, 100% Some/A lot |
| Study Abroad Survey (2017) |  | Interact Effectively: M = 3.62, 100% Some/A lot  Understand Sociocultural Contexts: M = 3.62, 92% Some/A lot |
| 4.3 Implement values that will lead to positive outcomes in work settings and a society responsive to multicultural and global concerns. | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 99%** |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.55, 98% Some/A lot |
| Intern Evaluation by Supervisor |  | M = 3.92, 100% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 94%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.59, 93% Some/A lot |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | M = 4.00, 100% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.65, 90% Some/A lot |
| Study Abroad Survey (2017) |  | M = 3.54, 92% Some/A lot |

## 5. Professional Development

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations?\* | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared? |
| 5.1 Apply psychology-specific content | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 100%** | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.78, 100% Some/A lot |
| Intern Evaluation by Supervisor |  | M = 4.00, 100% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 94%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.82, 98% Some/A lot |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | M = 3.39, 89% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.76, 95% Some/A lot |
| 5.2 Work effectively as part of a team | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 88%** |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.58, 94% Some/A lot |
| Intern Evaluation by Supervisor |  | M = 3.91, 100% Some/A lot |
| Research Methods Poster Oral Evaluation |  | M = 3.04, 70% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 91%** |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | M = 3.83, 94% Some/A lot |
| GSS |  | M = 3.41, 92% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.67, 86% Some/A lot |
| 5.3 Self-reflect in preparation for employment, graduate school, or professional school | **Direct Measures** |  | **M = 100%** |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.70, 100% Some/A lot |
| Intern Evaluation by Supervisor |  | M = 3.91, 100% Some/A lot |
| **Indirect Measures** |  | **M = 95%** |
| GSS |  | M = 3.62, 90% Some/A lot |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | M = 3.94, 100% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.74, 94% Some/A lot |

## General Results

Figure 1: “360” Comparison of Faculty and Student Ratings of Learning Sub-goals

The figure above shows the ratings of our department’s 15 learning sub-goals by three different groups:

1. Seniors who complete the Graduating Senior Survey (GSS) who rate their own effectiveness in meeting each learning goal.
2. Undergraduate Research Supervisors (Faculty) who rate their student researchers’ effectiveness in meeting each learning goal
3. Students enrolled in undergraduate research experiences who rate their own effectiveness in meeting each learning goal

The average rating for each of the five learning goals was calculated across all measures and sub-goals. Overall, we exceeded our goal of a 3.5 average rating for each learning goal. The experiences that produce the highest ratings of achieving our department learning goals are undergraduate internships and undergraduate research. These high-impact experiences require intensive faculty resources, but produce the greatest benefit to students.

## PART TWO

Describe what your program’s assessment accomplished since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

### Previous Plans Addressed

1. We continued to refine and update surveys to match learning goals and fill gaps where we did not ask questions.
2. We posted our last assessment report on our department web site and distributed the report to all department faculty.
3. Starting Fall of 2016, we started piloting a new PCE that was built from questions that tap into the main pillars (domains) of the suggested common core for introductory psychology. We have also added two questions from the St. Joseph’s critical thinking exam. However, after Spring 2017, EIU did not renew the D2L option for item analysis on quizzes (Insights) so we do not have the individual item analysis available to us to determine how well each question is correlating with the total score on the PCE. Hopefully, we cleaned up the PCE well enough after the first year of data collection.
4. Although we did gather data from students who had a Summer 2016 study abroad experience in Italy, we have not been able to offer the trip for the past 2 summers.
5. There were no specific changes requested by Dr. Karla Sanders, other than to maintain our high quality assessment program.

## PART THREE

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

### How have you used the data? What have we learned?

1. For some years we have noted that our graduating seniors are not equally confident about their knowledge levels across the various domains of Psychology (LG 3: Content Area Knowledge). Consistently, students have less confidence in their ability to give a presentation on *Biological* and *Cognitive* topics. However, on the PCE, performance on these subdomains is comparable to others, suggesting that it is primarily a problem with confidence and not ability. We expect confidence in these domains to somewhat lower than others for several reasons: Most students will not enter a profession that directly deals with these areas of psychology and there is likely to be more interest (and repetition) of the other topics across the curriculum.
2. Although students in our department score very close to the mean for the university on the Watson-Glaser test, that’s not much to get excited about, considering the overall mean is below the national average. Although ratings of critical thinking are quite high among faculty and students in different contexts (Goal 1.1), performance on the PCE critical thinking questions is low (partially because some students choose to skip these questions on the PCE).
3. We would like to note that although EIU has struggled with enrollment and budget issues over the past few years, assessment results in our department suggest that the quality of education in psychology is still high. However, to provide a greater number of students with the high-impact practices of undergraduate internships and research will ultimately require more faculty.

## Plans for the Future

1. The one area in which we could make improvements would be to consider providing more explicit instruction in critical thinking skills in one or more of our required courses. There is a considerable amount of instruction in the research methods course, but it might be helpful to add more in courses such as PSY 2999 (Orientation to the psychology major). We are still contemplating the idea of developing a separate course for critical thinking in psychology.
2. We plan to continue to maintain the high quality of undergraduate experiences in the psychology department. No major changes in assessment instruments are anticipated.
3. We expect to start making some comparisons in assessment measure of our online students as more of them graduate. We had our first two graduates in Spring 2018.