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BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED:

1. **PSY 497 (Senior Seminar) Grading Rubric for Final Presentation.** Presentations were rated in 6 sections of this course over 4 semesters (2014-2016). Ratings completed by 3 course instructors and 4 outside evaluators (all full-time members of the psychology department). 64 student presentations evaluated. The completed rubrics (in electronic and paper formats) are stored on a password-protected computer and in a locked file drawer in Dr. Camille Buckner’s locked office (Rowley G114).

2. **PSY 400 (Internship) Site Supervisor Evaluations of Student Performance.** Summary statistics for responses to relevant items. Evaluations are included for 4 sections of PSY 400 over 4 semesters (2014-2016). Site supervisors evaluated 41 student interns. These evaluations were obtained electronically from the Center for Career Services and stored on a password-protected computer in Rowley G114.

3. **Marymount Graduating Student Survey – Psychology (2014-2015 and 2015-2016).** Summary statistics for relevant items. Number of students responding ranged from 17-53 (depending on item). These surveys, along with the Alumni Surveys, were obtained electronically from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and then stored on a password-protected computer in Rowley G114.


5. **PSY 497 Focus Group Transcripts.** SEHS Associate Dean Shannon Melideo (or her designee) conducted focus groups in 2 sections of PSY 497 during the Spring 2015 semester. Approximately 30 students participated. These electronic transcripts are stored on a password-protected computer in Rowley G114.

This assessment report has also been uploaded to the Psychology Department Canvas site.

SPSS was used to analyze the data from the oral presentation grading rubrics and the site supervisor evaluations of student interns (Items #1 and 2 above). The grading rubrics and SPSS summary statistics are included in the appendices. The full SPSS output files and raw data can be obtained from Dr. Buckner. The full focus group transcripts (Item #5 above) are available upon request, and the raw data from Items 3 and 4 (above) can be obtained from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description from the Course Catalog: Please copy and paste the current year’s catalog description of this program. This is generally a one-two paragraph description immediately following the name of the program. Please be sure to include the listing of program outcomes as printed.

Psychology (B.A.)

Students earning an undergraduate degree in psychology will gain the knowledge and skills necessary for entry-level professional responsibilities in a variety of community, business, government, and educational settings. Students will also be prepared for graduate study in psychology and related fields.

The psychology major consists of a core of required courses plus completion of coursework chosen by students to reflect their interests, career aspirations, or graduate study ambitions.

Students take courses that emphasize effective scientific reasoning (construction of knowledge), critical thinking (analysis of knowledge), communication (transmission of knowledge), and transfer (application of knowledge). Psychology graduates interested in working in mental health-related professions might find employment in substance abuse treatment programs, family and child services, crisis counseling centers, and other human services agencies. Those majoring in psychology can also choose courses that help prepare them for graduate study in psychology and counseling. Marymount offers graduate programs in counseling and forensic and legal psychology, and more information about these programs can be found in the university’s Graduate Catalog.

Upon successful completion of the psychology program, students will be able to
• demonstrate critical evaluation of a psychological topic through effective writing;
• apply psychological research methodologies and statistical techniques to a research question;
• apply specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting;
• demonstrate effective presentation skills within the discipline.
List all of the program’s learning outcomes: (regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Year of Last Assessment</th>
<th>Assessed This Year</th>
<th>Year of Next Planned Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research - Students will apply psychological research methodologies and statistical techniques to a research question. (Construction of knowledge)</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking - Students will demonstrate critical evaluation of a psychological topic through effective writing. (Analysis of knowledge)</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication - Students will demonstrate effective presentation skills within the discipline. (Transmission of knowledge)</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Preparation – Students will apply specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting. (Application of knowledge)</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: In Fall 2014, we were approved to move to biennial assessment reporting. All 4 of our current learning outcomes were assessed during our 2012-2013 program review. Following our program review, we decreased our learning outcomes from 6 to 4, deleting Global Perspective and Ethics, a change approved by APBP. Our 4 remaining learning outcomes (listed above) are consistent with American Psychological Association recommendations for undergraduate psychology programs (APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major – Version 2.0, 2012). Our next program review will be during AY 2018-2019.

Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:

The Psychology program’s outcomes support Marymount’s Mission in the following ways:

1. The Research outcome (Students will apply psychological research methodologies and statistical techniques to a research question) supports Marymount’s emphasis on scholarship, inquiry learning, and intellectual curiosity.
2. The Critical Thinking outcome (Students will demonstrate critical evaluation of a psychological topic through effective writing) supports MU’s emphasis on academic excellence, intellectual curiosity, and written communication.
3. The Oral Communication and Career Preparation outcomes (Students will demonstrate effective presentation skills within the discipline and Students will apply specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting) support the development of opportunities for personal and professional growth.
4. The Career Preparation outcome (Students will apply specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting) supports MU’s emphasis on promoting professionalism and career readiness.
The Psychology program’s outcomes support Marymount’s Strategic Plan and the SEHS Strategic Plan by:

1. **Offering rigorous, cohesive, integrated undergraduate curricula that produce superior graduates able to succeed in their positions and communities** – Our four learning outcomes (Research, Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Career Preparation) collectively support this goal. Consistent with American Psychological Association (APA) recommendations, our learning outcomes center around skill development in research and statistical methodology, writing and critical thinking, oral communication, and career preparation/professionalism. These learning outcomes prompt students to construct, analyze, transmit, and apply psychological knowledge, essential skills for anyone pursuing a career in the field of psychology.

2. **Strengthening Marymount’s Catholic identity** – Our Research, Critical Thinking, and Career Preparation learning outcomes collectively address this goal, particularly in the way that expectations for ethical behavior and service to others are embedded in many of our research, critical thinking, and career preparation assignments. For example, our students become familiar with the APA’s Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct and must abide by this code when conducting independent research with human participants (Research). They also reflect on and write about how this ethical code applies to their conduct and interactions at their internship sites (Career Preparation). Finally, in PSY 497 (Senior Seminar), psychology majors integrate scholarly literature in two sub-fields of psychology in order to devise a program or an applied research project that addresses a pressing social problem, such as homelessness, PTSD in veterans, or psychological disorder stigma (Critical Thinking).

3. **Strengthening Marymount’s ties to the larger community through outreach and collaboration** – Through their internship, students connect with the larger community (Career Preparation). Many of our psychology majors choose community outreach programs for their internship sites (e.g., Doorways Shelter for Women and Families; Alternative House; Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network; National Alliance on Mental Illness), and some of our students’ internship supervisors are Marymount alumni (e.g., Annetta Benjamin at the Benjamin Counseling Center).

Please note that the SEHS Strategic Plan highlights all three of the items that are identified above from Marymount’s Strategic Plan. The Psychology learning outcomes also support the SEHS goals (stated on the SEHS website) of fostering caring, reflective, and ethical professionals, grounded in both psychological theory and practice.
The Psychology program’s four interrelated learning outcomes are intentionally consistent with best practices in the discipline. The APA recommends that college students need the following skills to succeed in the 21st century:

1. **Scientific Reasoning (Construction of knowledge)**
   All students complete a 3-course methodology sequence beginning in their first semester with a 1-credit laboratory course designed to allow students to "work with" the material they are learning in their introductory psychology course. This course helps students understand how we know what we know (how knowledge in our field is created). No other universities in the area have such a course. We also have a statistics course that lays the foundation for students to conduct their own research project in our Research Design course. In addition, approximately 12% of our majors are working on research with Psychology faculty beyond the classroom (this includes Discover grants, Honors theses, other student independent projects for course credit, and faculty grants).

2. **Critical Thinking (Analysis of knowledge)**
   Unlike mathematics where 2 + 2 always equals 4, the study of human behavior is complex and the answers to our questions ever-changing. Thus, the faculty in our department teach students to think critically about psychological phenomena by first evaluating the validity of the source of the information (information literacy), and secondly by asking students to weigh the evidence (before coming to a conclusion) using a variety of techniques (i.e., experimentation, case studies, studying controversial topics, peer discussion).

3. **Communication Skills (Transmission of knowledge)**
   Psychology majors hone their communication skills by writing papers and giving oral presentations throughout their studies at Marymount. They take at least two writing-intensive courses in the major in order to learn how to think and write like psychologists. This focus on effective communication skills will set students apart from their peers in the workplace and graduate studies.

4. **Career Preparation (Application of knowledge)**
   Students complete an internship at a site of their choosing, reflecting their own interests and career goals. Examples of recent internship sites include: Arlington County Juvenile Court (forensic psychology), National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (nonprofit service), NIH (research), Alternative House (counseling), St. Thomas More Elementary School (education), Sibley Hospital (health psychology), and Navy Federal Credit Union (I/O psychology). Internships are important because they help students focus their career interests and goals, teach them about workplace culture, and provide essential networking opportunities. From Spring 2015-Spring 2016, 17% of our interns were offered jobs at their internship sites, and 76% of the supervisors recommended their student intern for future employment in the field (with 24% not responding). Of the graduates responding to our 2014 and 2015 Alumni Surveys, an average of 72% were employed in psychology or a related field.
Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges, and planned improvements and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment:

Overview of the Assessment Process

1. **Psychology Department Presentation Rubric/Direct Measure of Oral Communication.** We use the final presentation in PSY 497 (Senior Seminar) as the product for assessing students’ oral communication proficiency. Students present on a major integrative, applied research project that they have conducted over the course of the term. Three course instructors and 4 outside evaluators (all full-time members of the psychology department) rated presentations in 6 sections of PSY 497 over 4 semesters (2014-2016). A total of 64 student presentations were evaluated. The presentation rubric contains 10 items (see Appendix A), and a composite score is calculated for each presenter across all items. In 2014-2015, each item was rated on a 3-point response scale, ranging from 0 = *Unsatisfactory* to 2 = *Excellent*. To attain greater consistency across all of our learning outcomes, the department modified the 2015-2016 presentation rubric to have a 5-point response scale (ranging from 1 = *Unsatisfactory* to 5 = *Excellent*). Descriptive statistics for faculty ratings of student presentations appear in Appendix B.

2. **Internship (PSY 400) Site Supervisor Evaluations of Student Performance/Direct Measure of Career Preparation.** At the end of the internship, site supervisors rate Marymount psychology interns on their performance. Since the Career Preparation learning outcome deals with *applying specialized knowledge in an internship setting*, only relevant evaluation items (e.g., knowledge and learning, work quality, ethics, and client interaction) were examined. Supervisors rated each item on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 = *Poor* to 5 = *Excellent*. Although supervisors completed the Fall 2014 evaluations by hand and returned them directly to the internship coordinator, we subsequently revised the evaluation form and converted it to an online format. From Spring 2015-Spring 2016, these evaluations were submitted electronically to the Center for Career Services and then forwarded to the Psychology Department Chair. See Appendix C for the revised evaluation form, with items relevant to this analysis highlighted.

   Supervisor evaluations were analyzed for 4 sections of PSY 400 over 4 semesters (2014-2016). Supervisors evaluated 41 student interns. Descriptive statistics for the relevant evaluation items are shown in Appendix D.

3. **Marymount Graduating Student Survey (GSS) – Psychology (2014-2015 and 2015-2016)/Indirect Measure of Oral Communication and Career Preparation.** The GSS was administered and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Number of students responding ranged from 17-53 (depending on item). Responses to relevant items for Oral Communication and Career Preparation (3 items from the
2014-2015 survey and 4 items from the 2015-2016 survey) are summarized later in this report. Descriptive statistics for each item are shown in Appendix E.

4. **Marymount Alumni Survey – Psychology (2014 and 2016)/Indirect Measure of Oral Communication and Career Preparation.** This survey was administered and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. A total of 44 students participated (representing graduation classes from 2005-2014). Responses to relevant items for Oral Communication and Career Preparation (5 items) are summarized later in this report. Descriptive statistics for each item are shown in Appendix F.

5. **Focus Group Transcripts/Indirect Measure of Career Preparation.** SEHS Associate Dean Melideo (or her designee) conducted focus groups in 2 sections of PSY 497 during the Spring 2015 semester. Students gave open-ended responses to 8 questions and were also allowed to make general comments at the end of the focus group. Student responses were transcribed by the focus group moderator into an electronic file, with no identifying information included. See Appendix G for student responses to the two questions pertaining to career preparation. Approximately 30 students participated.

**Strengths of the Process**

The Department of Psychology has improved its assessment of student learning over past years in several ways:

1. The department has assessed all four of our learning outcomes (Research, Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Career Preparation) with direct measures for the past four years. To expand the scope, we supplement these direct measures with indirect measures. With relatively large sample sizes, the data collected provide a comprehensive picture of student learning.

2. We have strengthened our grading rubrics (e.g., Research, Critical Thinking, and Career Preparation) over time and made them more user-friendly. Moreover, the assignments assessed for the Research and Critical Thinking outcomes are consistent across different sections of the course and different professors.

3. We use SPSS to analyze the assessment data from the Research, Critical Thinking, and Oral Communication rubrics and the site supervisor evaluations, which gives us a clear picture of the trends in the data. With our move toward course-embedded assessment, we can also use SPSS to examine whether there are differences among sections and professors in student achievement of learning standards.

**Challenges and Planned Improvements**

- **Challenge:** Unbalanced numbers of instructor raters and outside faculty raters for Oral Communication and Research products. For Oral Communication (assessed this year), instructors assessed 57 presentations (F15 instructor ratings missing), and outside raters assessed 25 presentations, with 7 of these being assessed by outside raters alone (F15). **Planned Improvements:** Continue to increase number of
outside faculty raters evaluating the products for these two outcomes. Continue to monitor inter-rater reliability between instructor raters and outside faculty raters who evaluate the products for these two outcomes.

• **Challenge:** Review content of Oral Communication rubric. **Planned Improvement:** Though we modified the response scale to be more consistent with the scales used to assess our other outcomes (i.e., 5-point scales), we should reexamine whether the 10 items rated on the Oral Communication rubric are indeed the best items to assess oral communication skill. This can, in part, be addressed statistically by examining the internal consistency of the set to identify stronger and weaker items.

• **Challenge:** Examine focus of the Career Preparation outcome (**Students will apply specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting**). The department has intentionally focused this outcome on a specific area of career preparation. However, certain questions in the Graduating Student Survey and the Alumni Survey (quality of preparation in program to apply knowledge and skills to new situations and to solve problems in field using knowledge and skills) are relevant and important. Do we mean to include or exclude such items in our assessment? **Planned Improvement:** The department will consider these issues carefully and decide how to address them.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

As no challenges were listed in Psychology’s 2013-2014 Assessment Report, planned improvements for unlisted challenges are addressed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Planned Improvement</th>
<th>Update (Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>To make the response scale for the oral presentation rubric more consistent with the 5-point response scales used to assess our Research, Critical Thinking, and Career Preparation learning outcomes.</td>
<td>This improvement was implemented in Fall 2015. Prior to F15, each item on the rubric was rated on a 3-point response scale, ranging from 0 = Unsatisfactory to 2 = Excellent. As of F15, we modified the presentation rubric to have a 5-point response scale (ranging from 1 = Unsatisfactory to 5 = Excellent). See Appendix A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Preparation</td>
<td>To make the supervisor evaluation of student interns (Career Preparation) more succinct and user-friendly by reducing the number of items and changing to an online format.</td>
<td>We implemented this improvement in Spring 2015. We eliminated many redundancies in the survey and changed it to an online format. We added important items to the survey, including ratings of: a) overall intern performance, b) whether intern offered job at site, c) whether supervisor recommended intern for future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report:

1. Expand the number of reviewers of student work beyond the course instructor.

In 2012, we moved away from a portfolio method of collecting student work toward course-embedded assessment for our Research, Critical Thinking, and Oral Communication learning outcomes because our portfolio completion rates were 80%, at best. With course-embedded assessment, it is possible to assess 100% of the submitted work. Furthermore, the APA recommends the course-embedded method as a best practice in assessment (because it maximizes the amount of information that can be used for improvements, at both the instructor and program levels). We began our course-embedded assessment of these three standards with instructor ratings of student products. In 2014, the Assessment Committee requested that we expand the number of reviewers of student work beyond the course instructor. In Spring 2015, we began to have outside faculty raters assess the Research and Oral Communication learning outcomes, in addition to instructor assessment of these outcomes. We continued this model for the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 terms.

The Oral Communication outcome is assessed in the current report (the Research outcome will be assessed in our next report). We had 3 instructors and 4 outside faculty evaluators rating student presentations for the Oral Communication learning outcome (across the S15 – S16 terms). The instructors assessed 57 presentations (F15 instructor ratings missing), and the outside raters assessed 25 presentations, with 7 of these being assessed by outside raters alone (F15). Note that no bias was detected in instructor ratings of their own student products. There was no significant difference in ratings of oral communication quality between instructors and outside faculty raters for Spring 2015, \( t(6) = -2.17, p > .05 \). This same pattern held for Spring 2016, \( t(10) = 1.96, p > .05 \).

2. Be sure that outcomes listed in course catalog are updated to match the outcomes listed in the Student Learning Assessment Report.

This problem was addressed in the 2014-2015 undergraduate catalog and remains correct in the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 catalogs.
Outcomes Assessment 2015-2016

Learning Outcome 1: Oral Communication (Transmission of Knowledge) - *Students will demonstrate effective presentation skills within the discipline.*

**Assessment Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</em></td>
<td><em>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</em></td>
<td><em>Discuss the data collected and student population</em></td>
<td><em>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct Measure:** Instructors and outside faculty evaluators used the Oral Communication rubric (see Appendix A) to evaluate the final presentations in 6 sections of PSY 497 (Senior Seminar) over 4 semesters (2014-2016).

- For F14-S15, with a 3-point response scale scored 0-2, an acceptable level of performance is a mean of at least 1.0 and at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students earning ratings of 1.0 or above.
- For F15-S16, with a 5-point rating scale scored 1-5, an acceptable level of performance is a mean of at least 3.0 and at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students earning ratings of 3.0 or above.

- 3 instructors and 4 outside faculty evaluators used the Oral Communication rubric to evaluate the final presentations in 6 sections of PSY 497 (Senior Seminar) over 4 semesters (2014-2016). 64 student presentations were evaluated.

- The presentation rubric contains 10-items, and a composite score is calculated for each presenter. In 2014-2015, each item was rated on a 3-point response scale, ranging from 0 = *Unsatisfactory* to 2 = *Excellent*. In 2015-2016, each item was rated on a 5-point response scale (ranging from 1 = *Unsatisfactory* to 5 = *Excellent*).

The Oral Communication data for 64 students were entered into SPSS. An average composite score was calculated across all items for each participant, separately for instructor and outside faculty ratings. Means (M), standard deviations (SD), and frequencies (f) were calculated. Summary statistics appear in Appendix B.

- For F14-S15 instructor ratings (N = 36), M = 1.52 and SD = .22. 100% of students scored 1.0 or above (rated on a 0-2 scale). For F14-S15 outside faculty ratings (N=11), M = 1.55 and SD = .25. 100% of students scored 1.0 or above.
- For F15-S16 instructor ratings (N = 21), M = 3.85 and SD = .57. 89.3% of students scored 3.0 or above (rated on a 1-5 scale). For F15-S16 outside faculty ratings (N=14), M = 3.49 and SD = .42. 100% of students scored 3.0 or above.

Students thus exceeded acceptable levels of performance on the direct measures of Oral Communication.

- Also, though Ns were small, there was no significant difference in ratings of oral communication quality between instructors and outside raters for S15, t(6) = -2.17, p > .05. This same pattern held for S16, t(10) = 1.96,
Indirect Measure: Marymount Graduating Student Survey – Psychology Program (2014-2015 and 2015-2016). There is one item on the GSS relevant to assessing Oral Communication (Quality of preparation in program to deliver a coherent oral presentation). All items assessed via self-report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Measure: Marymount Graduating Student Survey – Psychology Program (2014-2015 and 2015-2016). There is one item on the GSS relevant to assessing Oral Communication (Quality of preparation in program to deliver a coherent oral presentation). All items assessed via self-report.</th>
<th>With a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = Poor to 5 = Excellent, an acceptable level of performance is a mean of at least 3.0 and at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students reporting ratings of 3.0 or above.</th>
<th>32 graduating psychology majors responded to the oral presentation item in the 2014-2015 survey and 20 students responded to the same item in the 2015-2016 survey. The GSS was administered and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2014-2015, on the presentation item (N = 32), M = 4.13 and SD = .83. 78.1% reported 4.0 or above.</td>
<td>In 2015-2015, on the presentation item (N = 20), M = 4.15 and SD = .75. 90% reported 4.0 or above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students thus exceeded acceptable levels of performance on the indirect GSS measure of Oral Communication. See SPSS output in Appendix E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect Measure: Marymount Alumni Survey – Psychology Program (2014 and 2015). There is one item on the Alumni Survey relevant to assessing Oral Communication (How well your education prepared you to deliver a coherent oral presentation). All items assessed via self-report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Measure: Marymount Alumni Survey – Psychology Program (2014 and 2015). There is one item on the Alumni Survey relevant to assessing Oral Communication (How well your education prepared you to deliver a coherent oral presentation). All items assessed via self-report.</th>
<th>With a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = Poor to 5 = Excellent, an acceptable level of performance is at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students reporting ratings of 3.0 or above. (No means were reported for this item.)</th>
<th>16 psychology major alumni responded to the oral presentation item in 2014 and 27 responded in 2015. The Alumni Survey was administered and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2014, out of the 16 psychology alumni who responded, 75% reported 4.0 or above on the presentation item.</td>
<td>In 2015, out of the 27 psychology alumni who responded, 77.8% reported 4.0 or above on the presentation item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students thus exceeded acceptable levels of performance on the indirect Alumni Survey measure of Oral Communication. See SPSS output in Appendix F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation of Results**

**Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):**

Both direct measures (faculty ratings of student presentations) and indirect measures (self-reports on the Graduating Student Surveys and Alumni Surveys) indicate that Psychology students are achieving the oral communication learning outcome (specific result details are listed in the Analysis column above and in Appendices B, E, and F). All means on these measures exceeded the performance standard means of 1.0 or 3.0 (standard varied by measure and semester). Furthermore, across all measures, the distributions exceeded the performance standard of 66% at or above 1.0 or 3.0 (standard varied by measure and semester), with actual values ranging from 75%-100%.
Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:
The results of this assessment indicate that developing students’ oral communication skills continues to be a strength of the Psychology program. The 10-item rubric has been in use since 2010, and students’ oral communication skills have consistently met and exceeded our performance standards since this time.

Although assessment rubric for this outcome is an improvement over the one used prior to 2010, we still plan to evaluate the rubric for possible updates. In Fall 2015, we modified the response scale to be more consistent with the scales used to assess our other outcomes (i.e., 5-point scales), and the next step is to reexamine whether the 10 items rated on the Oral Communication rubric are the strongest items to assess oral communication skill. To begin this process, we will statistically examine the internal consistency of the set to identify stronger and weaker items.

Updating this rubric as necessary will also help us as we work on the simultaneous task of boosting the number of outside faculty ratings of our student presentations and boosting inter-rater reliability among instructor and outside faculty raters. Though instructor and outside raters did not differ significantly in their ratings of student presentations (see Analysis column of table above), the inter-rater reliability between these two groups was not as desired, $r(16) = .38, p = .12$ (presentation scores were standardized before computing this correlation to adjust for the different response scales used). We will continue to monitor this inter-rater reliability issue as we include more outside faculty raters.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:
Because students exceeded expectations on both direct and indirect measures for this learning outcome and showed the same strong results as the last time the outcome was assessed, no program improvements are necessary. We will continue to encourage all faculty teaching psychology courses to use our Oral Communication rubric to grade presentations in their classes. By using this scoring rubric repeatedly throughout students’ careers, we aim to foster the skills necessary for strong oral presentations. The department will also discuss the possibility of collecting assessment data on presentations in lower-level courses to serve as a basis for comparison to the senior-level presentations already being assessed. Finally, as discussed above, we will examine the need for any changes to the oral presentation rubric items themselves.
Learning Outcome 2: Career Preparation (Application of Knowledge) - Students will apply specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting.

Assessment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the data collected and student population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Describe the analysis process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct Measure: Internship site supervisors evaluated MU psychology interns on their performance. Relevant survey items assessed knowledge and learning, work quality, ethics, and client interaction (see highlighted items of Appendix C). These ratings were provided in PSY 400 (Internship) over 4 semesters (2014-2016).

With a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = Poor to 5 = Excellent, an acceptable level of performance is a mean of at least 3.0 and at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students earning ratings of 3.0 or above.

Site supervisors evaluated 41 PSY interns in 4 sections of PSY 400 over 4 semesters (2014-2016).

7 evaluation items were examined (Ethics, Beginning Knowledge, Ending Knowledge, Work Quality, Client Rapport, Cultural Sensitivity, and Overall Performance).

Each item was rated on a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = Poor to 5 = Excellent.

Since the supervisor evaluation form changed between the F14 and S15 terms, F14 items must have a parallel item on the revised version to be included in this analysis.

Data for the 7 relevant items on the site supervisor evaluation were entered into SPSS for each of the 41 students. Means (M), standard deviations (SD), and frequencies (f) were calculated for each relevant item. Summary statistics appear in Appendix D.

- For Item 6–Ethics, M = 4.69 & SD = .57. 100% of the students scored 3.0 or above.
- For Item 8a–Beginning Knowledge, M=3.20 & SD=1.11. 65% of the students scored 3.0 or above.
- For Item 8b–Ending Knowledge, M = 4.55 & SD = .55. 100% of the students scored 3.0 or above.
- For Item 10a–Work Quality, M = 4.60 & SD = .63. 97.5% of the students scored 3.0 or above.
- For Item 14a–Client Rapport, M = 4.58 & SD = .60. 100% of the students scored 3.0 or above.
- For Item 14b–Cultural Sensitivity, M=4.65 & SD = .54. 100% of the students scored 3.0 or above.
- For Item 18–Overall Performance, M = 4.78 & SD = .42. 100% of the students scored 3.0 or above.

These data indicated that students exceeded acceptable levels of performance for each item, except for Beginning Knowledge, which is understandable. Of note: Students’
ending knowledge was rated as significantly higher than their beginning knowledge, $t(39) = -9.27$, $p < .001$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Measure: Marymount Graduating Student Survey – Psychology Program (2014-2015 and 2015-2016). Assessed items relevant to Career Preparation (when defined as “applying specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting”). All items rated via self-report.</th>
<th>With a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = Poor to 5 = Excellent, an acceptable level of performance is a mean of at least 3.0 and at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students with ratings of 3.0 or above. With the item scored yes/no, an acceptable level of performance is at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students saying “Yes.”</th>
<th>The number of students responding ranged from 17-53 and depended on the item. The GSS was administered and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Two relevant items (Quality of preparation in program to a) solve problems in field using knowledge and skills and b) apply knowledge and skills to new situations) appeared on both GS Surveys and were scored on a 5-point scale. One relevant item (The internship experience allowed you to apply critical thinking skills) appeared only on the 2015-2016 survey and was answered in a Yes/No format.</th>
<th>Item - Solving problems in field using knowledge and skills. • In 2014-2015, $M = 4.40$, $SD = .76$, and $N = 32$. 84.4% reported 4.0 or above. • In 2015-2016, $M = 4.43$, $SD = .60$, and $N = 21$. 95.2% reported 4.0 or above. Item - Applying knowledge and skills to new situations. • In 2014-2015, $M = 4.34$, $SD = .65$, and $N = 32$. 90.6% reported 4.0 or above. • In 2015-2016, $M = 4.43$, $SD = .60$, and $N = 21$. 95.2% reported 4.0 or above. Item - The internship experience allowed you to apply critical thinking skills. • In 2015-2016, of the 17 students who responded, 81% said “Yes.” These data indicated that students exceeded acceptable levels of performance for these 3 relevant items on the indirect GSS measure. See SPSS output in Appendix E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Measure: Marymount Alumni Survey – Psychology Program (2014 and 2015). Assessed items relevant to Career Preparation (when defined as “applying specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting”). All items rated via self-report.</td>
<td>With a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = Poor to 5 = Excellent, an acceptable level of performance is at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students reporting ratings of 3.0 or above. (No means were reported for this item.)</td>
<td>The number of students responding ranged from 16-27 and depended on the item. The Alumni Survey was administered and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The two relevant items (How well your education prepared you to a) solve problems in your field and b) apply knowledge and skills to new situations) were scored on a 5-point scale.</td>
<td>Item – Solving problems in your field. • In 2014, of the 16 psychology alumni who responded, 68.8% reported 4.0 or above. • In 2015, of the 26 psychology alumni who responded, 84.6% reported 4.0 or above. Item - Applying knowledge and skills to new situations. • In 2014, of the 16 psychology alumni who responded, 75% reported 4.0 or above. • In 2015, of the 27 psychology alumni who responded, 85.2% reported 4.0 or above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indirect Measure: PSY 497 Focus Groups. Associate Dean Melideo or her designee conducted focus groups in 2 sections of PSY 497 during the Spring 2015 semester.

The focus groups produce open-ended, qualitative data. There is no objective performance standard, though goal is to detect themes in the responses. Approximately 30 students gave open-ended responses to 8 questions and were also allowed to make general comments at the end of the focus group. Student responses were transcribed by the focus group moderator into an electronic file with no identifying information included. See Appendix G for student responses to the two questions pertaining to career preparation.

These data indicated that students exceeded acceptable levels of performance for these 2 relevant items on the indirect Alumni measure. See SPSS output Appendix F.

The two relevant questions were:
- Q4: How well prepared do you feel to apply the knowledge and skills that you have gained as a psychology major to your internship setting?
- Q6: How well do you think the Department of Psychology has prepared you for what comes next for you after graduation, either graduate school or employment?

There was a lot of variability in student responses, with about a 50-50 balance of positive and negative comments. An example of a positive comment was: “We do use the skills we have learned.” An example of a negative comment was: “Well, mine was in a school and I really felt like I could have done with some help from the education department. I feel like the student teachers would have been far better prepared.”

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

Both direct measures (site supervisor ratings of student intern performance) and indirect measures (self-reports on the Graduating Student Surveys and Alumni Surveys) indicate that Psychology students are achieving this learning outcome (specific result details are listed in the Analysis column above and in Appendices D, E, and F). All means on these measures exceeded the performance standard mean of 3.0, with actual values ranging from 3.20 – 4.78. Furthermore, on all but one item, the distributions exceeded the performance standard of 66% at or above 3.0 (or at least 66% saying “Yes” – standard varied by measure), with actual values ranging from 65%-100%. The pattern (65% being rated a 3.0 or higher) is reasonable for the one item that was below the performance standard (Level of Site Knowledge at Beginning of Internship) because site knowledge would be expected to be lower at the beginning of the internship and higher at the end (as the data supported).

Though the results of the Focus Group responses show a balance of positive and negative feedback, students clearly did not always directly address the specific questions asked. For example, the question “How well prepared do you feel to apply the knowledge and skills that you have
gained as a psychology major to your internship setting?” maps directly onto the specific focus of our Career Preparation outcome, but it prompted responses such as: “Two hundred hours was a lot” and “The paperwork for the course was easy.”

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

The results of this assessment indicate that Psychology students are successful in applying their specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting. For example, the Psychology program emphasizes abiding by ethical principles, displaying cultural sensitivity in social interactions, thinking critically in every context, and writing factually. Both the direct and indirect measures assessed here show that Psychology students are strong and score above our performance standards in these areas.

Although the supervisor evaluation surveys of intern performance were revised for the Spring 2015 term, the department still plans to evaluate the survey for possible updates. Career Preparation is a broad learning outcome, and the department has intentionally focused it more specifically on students’ ability to apply their psychological knowledge in the internship setting. However, it is worth considering whether this focus is too narrow. For example, certain questions in the Graduating Student Survey and the Alumni Survey (quality of preparation in program to apply knowledge and skills to new situations and to solve problems in field using knowledge and skills) are relevant and important. Do we mean to include or exclude such items in our assessment? The department will consider these issues carefully. Finally, the Focus Group content and process may need some revision to produce more specifically useful data.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Because students exceeded expectations on both direct and indirect measures of assessment for this learning outcome, no program improvements are necessary. We will consider whether the Career Preparation outcome is appropriately focused (as discussed above), and we will consider possible revisions to the site supervisor evaluation (of intern performance) and to the focus group content and process.