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I. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (suggested length of 1-2 pages)

A. Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)

List all your PLO in this box. Indicate for each PLO its alignment with one or more institutional learning outcomes (ILO). For example: “PLO 1. Apply advanced computer science theory to computation problems (ILO 2 & 6).”

1. Identify key concepts, principles, and applications of psychology’s content domains.
2. Apply scientific reasoning to interpret psychological phenomena and to design and conduct basic psychological research (ILO 1: Critical Thinking).
3. Evaluate the ethics of psychological science and practice.
4. Demonstrate effective communication skills (ILO 2: Written Communication).
5. Describe career options within psychology.

B. Program Learning Outcome(S) Assessed

List the PLO(s) assessed. Provide a brief background on your program’s history of assessing the PLO(s) (e.g., annually, first time, part of other assessments, etc.)

During the 2016-2017 school year, we assessed PLO 4 using the CSUEB ILO Written Communication Rubric with our advanced research classes (PSYC 491/493). During the 2017-2018 school year, we created a 15-question online multiple-choice test to evaluate PLOs 1 and 2 in beginner and advanced students. This year (2018-2019), we further developed the online multiple-choice test to assess a broader range of content areas under PLO 1 and added questions to assess PLO 3 (described below).

C. Summary of Assessment Process

Summarize your assessment process briefly using the following sub-headings.
Instrument(s): (include if new or old instrument, how developed, description of content)

During the 2017-2018 school year, we created a 15-question online multiple choice test by selecting questions from practice GRE Psychology Subject tests. We focused the questions on three topic areas: research methods, social psychology, and personality psychology. This year, we reduced the number of questions per content area to four (from five) and added more content areas to better reflect our entire curriculum. Thus, we ended up with 28 questions assessing seven topics, five related to PLO 1 (content domains: social psychology, personality psychology, cognitive psychology, physiological psychology, and conditioning and learning), one related to PLO 2 (research methods), and one related to PLO 3 (ethics). We also added demographic questions.

Sampling Procedure:

Our sample largely came from the PSYC 200 and the PSYC 491A-F/493A-B courses, with the former representing students at the beginning of their psychology career and the latter representing students at the end. We provided all professors of these classes with a link to our online assessment and they shared this link with their students. In addition, we emailed psychology majors who were in their first semester at CSUEB with a link to complete the assessment. Completion was anonymous and voluntary.

Sample Characteristics:

To make scores directly comparable, all analyses include only those people who completed the entire assessment (N = 152; out of 170 who completed at least one question). The sample was mostly Female (72%; with 22% Male, 2.7% Nonbinary, and 3.3% Prefer not to state) and ages ranged from 18 to 61 years old (M = 24.88, SD = 6.58). The ethnic breakdown was similar to that of CSUEB as a whole (32% Hispanic/Latino, 20% White, 18.7% Asian, 11.3% Black/African American, 6% Prefer not to state, 4.7% More than one, 3.3% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 2.7% Other, and 1.3% American Indian/Alaskan Native. Most of our sample indicated they were currently taking one of the PSYC 491/493 courses (68.4%), with 24.3% taking PSYC 200, and 7.2% taking neither course (likely from our email list to new students). Lastly, 63.8% of the sample identified as transfer students.

Data Collection: (include when, who, and how collected)

The online assessment took place toward the beginning of Spring 2019 semester for students in PSYC 200 and in their first semester at CSUEB, and toward the end of the semester for those in the 491/493 courses. Students completed the assessment online.

Data Analysis:

We summed the number of correct responses (out of 28) and compared the total score of our advanced students (PSYC 491/493) to the total score of our beginner students (those in PSYC 200 combined with those who answered they were in neither course). Our advanced students
scored significantly higher \((M = 14.08, SE = 0.44)\) than our beginner students \((M = 11.06, SE = 0.59)\), \(t(150) = 3.98, p < .001, d = 0.71\).

On methods questions alone (designed to assess PLO 2), advanced students again scored significantly higher \((M = 2.36, SE = 0.10)\) than our beginner students \((M = 1.90, SE = 0.15)\), \(t(150) = 2.55, p = .01, d = 0.44\). Similarly, on ethics questions alone (designed to assess PLO 3), advanced students again scored significantly higher \((M = 2.90, SE = 0.10)\) than our beginner students \((M = 2.31, SE = 0.15)\), \(t(150) = 3.27, p = .001, d = 0.57\). Finally, on questions assessing the remaining content (designed to assess PLO 1), advanced students again scored significantly higher \((M = 8.82, SE = 0.35)\) than our beginner students \((M = 6.85, SE = 0.44)\), \(t(150) = 3.26, p = .001, d = 0.59\).

D. Summary of Assessment Results

*Summarize your assessment results briefly using the following sub-headings.*

**Main Findings:**

Our advanced students outperformed our beginner students.

**Recommendations for Program Improvement:** *(changes in course content, course sequence, student advising)*

Although our results indicate that students know more at the end of the psychology program than they do at the beginning, overall scores on the assessment were still low (advanced students got about 50% of questions correct), indicating that we should put effort into increasing retention.

**Next Step(s) for Closing the Loop:** *(recommendations to address findings, how & when)*

We will discuss results from the 2018-2019 assessment during a faculty meeting fall semester.

We discussed the results of the previous year’s (2017-2018) assessment of PLOs 1 and 2 at a departmental faculty meeting on October 29, 2018. We had not found significant differences between our beginner and advanced students and thought the data collection and assessment instrument could be improved in numerous ways to better represent student growth. First, we wanted to increase our sample size. We had only included advanced students from our social and personality research classes, thus limiting our pool. Second, we decided to assess PSYC 200 students earlier in the term (before they learned about methods). Third, we decided to make content area questions more difficult so a student would have to have advanced knowledge to answer correctly. Lastly, we decided to broaden out the assessment to include other content areas and have the faculty who teach those courses select the questions. We met all of these objectives and found significant differences between our beginner and advanced students this year (on the 2018-2019 assessment).

**Other Reflections:**
Now that we have made progress on creating an assessment that is more reflective of the content in the major, we can now work on improving teaching practices to raise the overall score among advanced students. In addition, this year we also participated in the university assessment of ILO 2: Written Communication. Specifically, we recruited six PSYC 491/493 classes to turn in their final research papers for evaluation. In the future, we should align the ILO assessment with our PLO assessment for more efficient use of student and faculty time.

E. Assessment Plans for Next Year

*Summarize your assessment plans for the next year, including the PLO(s) you plan to assess, any revisions to the program assessment plan presented in your last five-year plan self-study, and any other relevant information.*

During spring semester of 2020, we plan to evaluate PLO 2 with an assignment in which students read a research article and answer open-ended questions about the conclusions that can be drawn from the findings. Although we could use the research method questions currently included in our online assessment, we believe the open-ended instrument will give us a greater depth of information about our students’ knowledge. We will also submit this instrument to the university assessment committee as they are evaluating the Critical Thinking ILO (ILO 1), and we have been selected for evaluation.