

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Psychology

Department: Psychology

Degree or Certificate Level: BA

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization or subject to state/licensure requirements? No

If yes, please share how this affects the program's assessment process (e.g., number of learning outcomes assessed, mandated exams or other assessment methods, schedule or timing of assessment, etc.):

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please provide the complete list of the program's learning outcome statements and **bold** the SLOs assessed in this cycle.)

1.

Spring Capstone symposium) and capstone impact essay ratings on relevant rubric items made typically by two faculty members will be summarized by department personnel. Due to personnel shortage, ratings from one faculty member were used. The Undergraduate program coordinator will summarize the data and share with faculty and relevant others to determine what the next steps will be.

2.A2. Capstone Judge ratings of 4 or better on items B1 & B2 will be considered success (acceptable or higher). Each poster was judged by 1 faculty member and 1 graduate student.

2.C2. Reviewer rubric items for capstone impact essays relevant to this outcome will be used. The rubric will follow the judges form where 4 or higher will represent indication of achievement of critical reflection of a capstone project.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

1. For Spring 2023, we had 9 PSY4960 (advanced research) senior impact essays. PSY4960 projects entirely reflect peer-collaboration work with each project having multiple authors.

Essay content were evaluated for (a) science, (b) social responsiveness, (c) personal/professional development, and (c) and other factors not captured in the other three categories. The latter category was used sparingly. Each component is worth a maximum of 4 points, for a total possible maximum of 16.

The average score across these capstones was 00.44 with scores ranging from 9 to 15. The relatively low scores reflect the conservative usage of the final category (other), which had an average rating of .8 out of 4 due to the high number of 0's. All other categories had similar average ratings (3.3 to 3.7), suggesting room for improvement in how they reflect on their work.

2. Capstone judge ratings for the following items were used. We had 11 PSY4960 poster ratings derive from our Spring Capstone symposium.

B1. Overall presentation style ratings (max = 7).

B2. Overall rating for the presentation content (max = 7).

The average score across all capstones was 6.4 for B1 and B2. Although all posters received a rating of 4 or higher, there is indication of room for improvement.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you? Address both a) learning gaps and possible curricular or pedagogical remedies, and b) strengths of curriculum and pedagogy.

The data suggest that our students are doing well with respect to presenting a complex psychology research project. The capstone course is instructor-intensive and the results suggest that our instructional team is effective at engaging our students to be good critical thinkers and high-quality presenters.

Our capstone impact essay scores suggest that students performed better relative to the BA students.

This is likely do to the clearer articulation of culul9g4.9 (c)-2 (h.)-6.6 (N)2.6 (ev)-2 (e)10.5 (j)2.6 (c)thele.9 (e t)-6.6

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss the results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

The contents of the capstone impact essay used is not faculty-involved, meaning that faculty are instructed to allow students to submit an essay “in their own voice” and that content editing should be avoided. There are ways the capstone impact essay reflective content can be improved, and we will discuss this in our undergraduate program meeting during the Fall 2023 semester.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? Tf0 Tc 0 Tw 0.824 0 0 11.04 369.12 706.92 TmpvedTw 4.556416(ni).9 (edyd()Tj-0.n)10.5 (y)-2 (oud

Guidelines for the Capstone Impact Essay

In architecture, a capstone is the crowning element of

Eligibility

- x All students participating in class sections of capstone courses



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 Acceptably executed (barely meets minimum standards)
- 5 Well-executed (somewhat exceeds minimum standards)
- 6 Very well-executed (mostly exceeds minimum standards)
- 7 Superior execution (far exceeds minimum standards)

PHYSICAL POSTER RATINGS

A1. POSTER: Visual Format (40%)

A1a	Text readability Quality of text readability from about 6 feet away	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A1b	Effectiveness of the layout Flow of the layout	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A1d	Appropriateness of images, tables, and figures							

A1*

A2

A2a	Quality of information related to real-world event Clear presentation with relevant details	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A2b	Critical presentation of empirical literature Empirical literature presents multiple perspectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A2c	Connection between psychological theory and/or concepts to action plan Psychological research/concepts clearly presented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A2d	Presentation of interviews Interviews appropriately incorporated into project	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A2e	Action plan quality Action plan logically follows the evidence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A2*	Overall rating for the poster content Overall quality of the information presented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Spring 2020 Psychology Capstone Symposium
Project Ratings Form: Practicum Capstone Projects

Poster Number _____

Judge Number _____

RATING SCALE

- 1 Extremely poorly executed (completely misses minimum standards)
- 2 Poorly executed (mostly misses minimum standards)
- 3 Somewhat poorly executed (somewhat misses minimum standards)
- 4 Acceptably executed (barely meets minimum standards)
- 5 Well-
- 6
- 7

A1a Text readability
Quality of text readability from about 6 feet away 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A1b 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A1d 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A1* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A2a Quality of information related to practicum experience
Clear presentation with relevant details 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A2b 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A2c 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A2d 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A2e 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A2* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

RATING SCALE

- 1 Extremely poorly executed (completely misses minimum standards)
- 2 Poorly executed (mostly misses minimum standards)
- 3 Somewhat poorly executed (somewhat misses minimum standards)
- 4 Acceptably executed (barely meets minimum standards)
- 5
- 6
- 7

B1a 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

B1b 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

B1* Overall presentation style ratings. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Overall quality rating of the oral presentation

B2a 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

B2b 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

B2* 1 2 3 4 5 6 7


OVERALL STUDENT LEARNING 24y3d 46(h)0.7 (o)1.6 (l)-7

C1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

C2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

C3 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

C4 Overall, how well did students demonstrate their ability to apply psychological concepts, principles, and skills to their capstone project? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7



Acceptably executed (barely meets minimum standards)

Well-executed (somewhat exceeds minimum standards)

Very well-executed (mostly exceeds minimum standards)



Superior execution (far exceeds minimum standards)



PHYSICAL POSTER RATINGS



Quality of text readability from about 6 feet away



[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]