

Program (Major, Minor, Core):	<b>Bachelor of Science</b>
Department:	Psychology
College/School:	College of Arts & Sciences
Person(s) Responsible for Implementing the Plan:	Janet Kuebli
Date Submitted:	December 21, 2017

Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	Use of Assessment Data
What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?	Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?	How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.	How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and "close the loop" to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?
Students will demonstrate their knowledge of psychology concepts, principles, and over-arching themes that constitute the empirical knowledge base in the domains of <b>memory and cognition</b> , <b>neuroscience, and research</b> <b>methodology</b> .	throughout our curriculum. This outcome is assessed directly during a test session required for graduating seniors. Indirectly, this outcome is assessed via a required electronic survey that graduating seniors complete.	Psychology. Students' subscale scores will be compared with those	The UGP Director and UGP Committee will review and discuss results annually. The UGP Director will share results and make recommendations as needed annually to Department Chair and at a full department meeting.

Students will demonstrate their ability to apply psychological concepts, principles and skills.	PSY 3060 and in the PSY 4010 and 4880 capstone courses.	Article Assessment administered in PSY 4010. Direct: Judges' ratings of PSY 4010 and PSY 4880 capstone posters	Faculty who teach in this sequence and the UGP Director will review and discuss results annually. The UGP Director will share results and make recommendations as needed annually to Department Chair, the UGP Committee and at a full department meeting.

- 1. It is <u>not recommended</u> to try and assess (in depth) all of the program learning outcomes every semester. It is best practice to plan out when each outcome will be assessed and focus on 1 or 2 each semester/academic year. Describe the responsibilities, timeline, and the process for implementing this assessment plan.
  - a. The ETS Major Field Test in Psychology (MFT-Psych) will be administered in the Spring semester once every three years. The UGP Director will oversee the administration of this assessment and review of the results.
  - b. The Graduating Senior Exit Survey will be administered annually at the end of each spring semester. The UGP Director will oversee electronic administration of the survey as well as analysis and summary of the results.
  - c. Graduating Senior Exit Survey will be administered annually at the end of each spring semester. The UGP Director will oversee electronic administration of the survey as well as analysis and summary of the results.
  - d. The Empirical Article Assessment is administered each Spring semester by the course instructors who teach PSY 4010 and 4880. Students respond in writing to 10 short answer items which are scored by the instructor. To date, only the PSY 4010 course instructor has administered this measure and then reported the scores to the UGP Director and the Dept. Chair. In the future, it is desirable to develop a rubric to more fully extract performance information from this instrument. The UGP director will oversee development of a rubric with the course instructor and additional faculty members to be piloted with the graduating class of Spring 2017 in both PSY 4010 and PSY 4880 classes.

## 2. Please explain how these assessment efforts are coordinated with Madrid (courses and/or program)?

a. The UGP Directors at the SLU and Madrid campuses have begun to share their independently constructed assessment practices. While awaiting university-level clarification of the extent to which assessments should be identical (i.e., the "same" program at each campus), the SLU and Madrid Directors are reviewing ways to more closely coordinate our assessment strategies. At this time, Madrid does not have a B.S. program; therefore our coordination presently is only addressing the B.A. program that we have in common.

## 3. The program assessment plan should be developed and approved by all faculty in the department. In addition, the program assessment plan should be developed to include student input and external sources (e.g., national standards, advisory boards, employers, alumni, etc.). Describe the process through which your academic unit created this assessment plan. Include the following:

- a. Timeline regarding when or how often this plan will be reviewed and revised. (This could be aligned with program review.) Components of this plan, overseen by the UGP Director, were developed to support re-establishment of our B.S. option which occurred in 2013. Input about some components reflects contributions of four successive department chairpersons, members of the UGP Committee, and instructors responsible for teaching the DPP, 2050, 3060, and 4010 research methods sequence. Feedback from the full faculty at department meetings is also reflected in this plan. This plan is formally reviewed and revised as needed every 5 years by the UGP Director and the Department Chair, although modifications are made annually if needed.
- b. How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan. Membership of the UGP Committee includes a student representative from our chapter of Psi Chi which is the national honors organization for psychology majors. This individual is appointed by the Executive Board of Psi Chi. Input regarding assessment results is solicited annually from this student at a UGP Committee meeting. As needed, this individual solicits additional feedback from members of Psi Chi. As needed, the UGP Director also oversees occasional surveys and/or focus groups to solicit additional feedback from students who are not members of Psi Chi (e.g., PSY 2050 supplemental course evaluations).
- c. What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan? External sources which guide the plan include:
- APA BEA Task Force (2013). APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major, Version 2.0
- APA BEA Task Force (2008). Teaching, Learning, & Assessing in a Developmentally Coherent Curriculum
- d. Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel Resources required to accomplish this plan are currently not sufficient. The cost of the MFT-Psychology assessment dictates administration every three years. More administrative staff and additional faculty with dedicated time to give to these assessment tasks are needed to conduct this plan in a timely way. An additional faculty member along with two non-tenure faculty are needed to

review the DPP, PSY 2050, 3060, 4010, 4880 course sequence and to further refine the rubric for the Empirical Article Assessment. Faculty members who teach PSY 4880 will beasked to administer the Empirical Article Assessment for the first time in Spring 2017.



3700 Lindell Boulevard Morrissey Hall, Room 2505 St. Louis, MO 63108 Phone: 314-977-2300 Fax: 314-977-1014 gfellerj@slu.edu

The College of Arts and Sciences Department of Psychology

December 22, 2017

Kathleen Thatcher Assessment Coordinator Saint Louis University

## Re: Psychology B.A. & B.S. Program Assessment Plans

Dear Kathleen,

Please find attached with this letter, copies of the revised Program Assessment Plans for the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) and Bachelors of Science (B.S.) in Psychology. The revisions represent our efforts to improve the learning outcomes assessment, based on the feedback we received during the fall 2017 semester. Several of the more substantive changes that we made include the following:

- 1) Outcomes for the B.A. Assessment Plan were disaggregated to facilitate more targeted or specific assessment of learning outcomes. For example specific components of the Major Field Test in Psychology will be examined to determine quality of student learning in the areas of a) Social Psychology, b) Developmental Psychology, and c) Abnormal Psychology.
- 2) Outcomes for the B.S. Assessment Plan were disaggregated to facilitate more targeted or specific assessment of learning outcomes. For example specific components of the Major Field Test in Psychology will be examined to determine quality of student learning in the areas of a) Memory & Cognition, b) Physiological Psychology, and c) Research Methods & Measurement.
- 3) The changes described in points 1 and 2 were made not only to disaggregate student learning outcomes in two degree programs, but to more clearly highlight the curricular areas emphasized by the two programs.
- 4) An additional revision was made to better differentiate the B.A. and B.S. outcomes and acquire data that will inform program improvements. More specifically, aggregated faculty ratings for the students' capstone research, capstone course, and

capstone practicum projects will be collected, aggregated, and analyzed to permit both assessment of student learning outcomes, but also inform potential changes to improve the B.A. and B.S. programs.

In closing, we appreciate the feedback we received regarding the Program Outcome Assessment plans for our two undergraduate degree programs. We believe the changes summarized in this letter and reflected in the attached documents significantly address the points of feedback and have improved our assessment plans. We hope that you also find the revised plans to be substantively improved. If you wish to discuss this letter, or the revised Program Outcome Assessment plans, please do not hesitate to contact me or Janet Kuebli.

Sincerely,

Aller

Jeffrey D. Gfeller, Ph.D. Professor and Chair Department of Psychology Saint Louis University