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A. Department of Behavioral Sciences
   Degree Program: Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

B. Author of the Report: Dr. Jennifer Hicks
   Date of Report Submission: September 30, 2011

C. Mission Statement of the Department: A liberal arts education in general, and the study of psychology in particular, forms the core of a preparation for lifelong learning. It follows, then, that an important part of the college student’s education should be the development of a disciplined curiosity about the world. This disciplined curiosity should equip the student for informed citizenship with an appreciation of basic human values, an understanding of essential scientific knowledge about how the world works, and a sharpened sensitivity to human diversity. Instruction in psychology should be consistent with these general goals.

1. Program Goals:
   1.0 Knowledge Base in Psychology
   2.0 Thinking Skills
   3.0 Language Skills
   4.0 Information-gathering and Synthesis Skills
   5.0 Research Methods and Statistical Skills
   6.0 Interpersonal Skills
   7.0 Ethics and Values

2. Major Program Objectives and Learning Outcomes
   The objectives for the program were developed from the program goals set forth above, and are numbered respectively.

   Students will:
   1.1 develop a conceptual framework that embraces relevant facts, concepts, and current knowledge concerning the field of psychology.
   1.2 develop an understanding and appreciation of the history and evolution of the psychological discipline.
   2.1 develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills.
   2.2 Show evidence of the development of amiable skepticism related to research and theories.
   3.1 become familiar with and be able to comprehend the language of psychology and develop the ability to express psychological knowledge in writing.
   4.1 develop the ability to gather and use psychological information and resources.
5.1 develop an understanding and use of research and statistical methodology, including the potential for and limitations of each.

6.1 develop an increased awareness and understanding of interpersonal and intrapersonal skills, including human diversity and similarity, in relation to self and others.

7.1 develop an increased awareness of and ability to apply ethical principles of psychology.

**D. Assessment of Learning Outcomes**

**1.1 Standardized Senior-Level Assessment**

a. **Learning Outcome—Overall achievement of Psychology majors in subject area content** (Program Objectives: 1.1-7.1)

b. **Assessment Method**—The *Project for Area Concentration Achievement Test (PACAT)* was developed by Austin Peay State University in Clarksville, Tennessee. It is one of the most widely used objective tests demonstrating validity within the field of psychology. Senior Psychology majors participate in the PACAT. The Final Report for the academic year 2010-2011 included results from forty-four seniors who were assessed in the middle of the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters. The test was administered within the senior capstone course, Field Experiences in Psychology (PSY 4543), during both the fall and spring semesters of the 2010-11 academic year. Although this method of assessment was designed to target all senior psychology majors, the assessment has not been administered during the summer Field Experiences courses taught during the past 4 summer sessions. For this reason, a number of psychology graduates have not taken the assessment, and conclusions based on the data may be somewhat limited. The PACAT administered to SOSU students yields standard scores in 8 of 10 possible assessment areas, which are discussed in greater detail below. The standard scores are compared to a six-year cumulative sample from other institutions. Sample size varies from year to year, since every institution does not provide instruction and/or evaluation in all content areas.

c. **Results of Assessment**—The mean scores of SOSU students in each of the PACAT content areas from the 2007-2011 reports are summarized in Appendix A. The average national data uses standard scores with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100 for each content area.

**2.1 Analysis and Interpretation of PACAT Assessment**

a. **Results of PACAT Assessment Relative to Learning Outcomes**

   **Overall Achievement**—Comparison with National norms indicates that SOSU students are performing at .54 standard deviations below the national average with regard to overall performance on the PACAT. However, the 2010-11 overall score represented an increase of 42 points from the previous academic year.

   **Content Area Achievement**—SOSU students performed below the national average in all content areas assessed by the PACAT. However, the highest scores were obtained within the content areas of Developmental and Social, with students performing at .26-.3 standard deviations below the national performance averages in these areas, respectively.
Scores in 5 content areas fell between .53 and .68 standard deviations below the national average, including: Abnormal, Clinical/Counseling, Experimental Design, Personality, and Statistics. Achievement in the content area of History & Systems was lowest, at .93 standard deviations below the national performance averages.

**Content Areas Demonstrating Low Performance:**

**History & Systems Content Area**—The strongest trend in a downward direction occurred within the content area of History & Systems; however, this decline represented a variation of only .14 standard deviations from the previous year’s assessment.

**Personality Content Area**—Although PACAT scores in the area of Personality were lower than the national average (.62 sd), the score in this content area for 2010-11 was higher than that obtained during the 2009-10 academic year (+.35 sd). Further, Psychology of Personality is not a course that is required for the psychology major. As an elective course, students who participate in the senior-level assessment may or may not have completed coursework in this area. As such, no significant modifications appear to be indicated within this content area at the present time. However, the planned program modifications discussed later in this report will impact the majority of courses included in the Psychology Degree Plan, including Psychology of Personality.

**Abnormal and Clinical/Counseling Content Areas**—Despite the fact that scores on the PACAT were slightly lower than those from the prior year’s assessment in the content areas of Abnormal and Clinical/Counseling, they represented a change of only .02 and .03 standard deviations, respectively. Hence, no modifications appear to be indicated at the present time.

**Content Areas Demonstrating Higher Performance:** As discussed above, results of the PACAT 2010-11 assessment illustrated that student performance was highest in the following two content areas:

**Developmental and Social Psychology**—Both Developmental and Social content areas fell within the top two areas assessed, despite the fact that courses that cover these content areas are elective options for the degree plan. Although development courses fall under the elective category, all psychology majors are advised to enroll in one of the options within this category (Human Development, Child, Adolescent, and Child & Adolescent Development). Hence, it is unlikely that a psychology major would not complete a course in this content area during their undergraduate training. With regard to the content area of Social Psychology, it has been offered as an elective each year since the most recent full-time psychology faculty member began teaching in Fall 2008. The course has had strong enrollment each semester it has been offered, and the faculty member teaching the course has expertise in this particular content area. Further, many psychology majors either double-major or minor in sociology, where Social Psychology is also offered as an elective course. For this reason, psychology majors are more likely to have taken a course in social psychology than other elective courses.

**Experimental Design and Statistics**—Although PACAT scores in the areas of Experimental Design and Statistics were lower than the national average, these scores were higher than those obtained during the 2009-10 academic year (+.11sd and +.44sd, respectively). Appendix A lists the scores for Experimental Design for the academic years 2006-07 through 2010-11. The lowest mean score in this time period for Experimental Design was 397 (15th %-ile) for the year 2006-07. The highest mean score ($M = 443; 28\textsuperscript{th} %-ile$) was for the year 2010-11. The PACAT mean score for Statistics
for the year 2006-07 was 438 (27th %-ile) and for 2010-11 was 446 (29th %-ile). These results generally coincide with the decision to hire a psychology professor with expertise in statistics and research. Student satisfaction as measured by the Undergraduate Psychology Program Student Survey (UPPSS) developed by the faculty indicates that students agreed or agreed strongly that the psychology program has helped them to develop understanding and skills over a broad range of areas (See Section 3.1 & 3.2).

b. Comparison with Previous 5 Years

**Overall Performance:** Comparison of the current year’s assessment with that of the previous year indicated an overall upward trend in scores (.42sd). Further, the overall performance score represented the highest score across the five-year span of time reported. The overall performance score was .33 standard deviations higher than the mean overall score across the previous 5 years (i.e., $M = 446$, as compared with $M = 412.6$, respectively).

**Content Area Performance**

**Increased Scores:** The strongest trends toward upward movement were observed in the content areas of Statistics (.44sd), Personality (.35sd), Developmental (.31sd), and Social Psychology (.25sd). Scores in Experimental Design also trended upward slightly (.11sd).

**Decreased Scores:** Scores within the areas of Abnormal and Clinical/Counseling were slightly lower than those obtained during the previous assessment year. However, this difference was less than .05 standard deviations for both content areas. Low performance in the content area of History & Systems, in combination with declining performance scores in this area across the past five years would seem to indicate a need to focus program modification planning efforts toward this specific area (See Section 3.1).

3.1 Program Modifications Related to Senior-Level Assessment

1. **Revised Senior-Level Assessment Instrument**—During the 2010-11 academic year, psychology program faculty members reviewed a sample copy of the PACAT exam, in order to determine whether the exam appeared to be an effective means of evaluating the performance of SOSU senior psychology majors. Faculty members unanimously agreed that the exam was problematic, for several reasons. First, many of the content areas assessed by the exam are offered only as electives within the SOSU psychology degree plan, and students are unlikely to have completed courses in all content areas assessed. Second, test items did not appear to reflect the primary content emphasized in specific courses taught at SOSU. Third, PACAT demographic measures do not provide adequate data for the purpose of comparing achievement of students across mode of instruction (FTF, IETV, or Web-Based), student status (transfer vs. non-transfer, remote site vs. primary site student, etc.), and course quality and rigor. For this reason, faculty members worked during the 2010-11 academic year to develop a senior exit exam that would more accurately reflect achievement of SOSU senior psychology majors. This exam will be piloted during the fall 2011 semester, and revisions will be made as the need is indicated. The process of development of the senior assessment during the 2010-11 academic year included:

a. Assignment of twelve specific content areas (Abnormal, History & Systems, Experimental Design, Educational/Developmental Psychology, Cognitive, Learning, Physiological, Social, Health & Wellness, Clinical/Counseling,
Testing, and Personality) to faculty members with specialized training and education corresponding to those areas.

b. Selection and/or development of 40 questions for each specific content area to be entered into a common test bank.

c. Random selection of 20 test items per content area each semester to develop a 240-item exam to be administered as the senior-level assessment measure within the context of the Field Experience capstone course.

d. Development of a demographic questionnaire designed to provide comparisons across format of instruction, student status, and student perceptions of course quality and rigor.

2. Assessment of Courses Taught by Adjunct Instructors Compared with Full-Time Faculty Members—Due to the shortage of full-time psychology program faculty, several courses included in the psychology degree plan have been taught exclusively by adjunct instructors over the course of the past 5 years, primarily including: History & Systems, Psychological Testing, and specific elective courses (Personality, Development, Learning, Cognitive, & Physiological). Data obtained from faculty course evaluations and verbal student feedback appeared to suggest that significant discrepancies exist between the quality of courses taught by adjunct instructors as compared with those taught by full-time faculty. As a result, a grade comparison was conducted across courses that are taught by both full-time and adjunct instructors (Abnormal, Statistics, & Research Methods). Results of this comparison indicated that the academic rigor associated with some courses taught by adjunct faculty members did not correspond with that observed in the same courses taught by full-time faculty members. Data indicated a limited and negatively skewed distribution within courses taught by adjunct faculty members, as compared with more normal grade distributions obtained in the same courses taught by full-time faculty members. The mean grade averages for classes taught by adjunct faculty were significantly higher than the mean grade averages for the same classes taught by full-time faculty. For this reason, the need for modifications to adjunct faculty orientation and clarification of expectations appears to be indicated. The following modifications are planned for the 2011-12 academic year:

a. Required alignment of adjunct syllabi with full-time faculty syllabi for the same courses.

b. Feedback provided to adjunct faculty regarding the need for increased academic rigor in certain courses (i.e., History & Systems, Abnormal, Statistics, & Research Methods).

c. Ongoing comparison of courses taught by both adjunct instructors and full-time faculty members in the form of grade distribution comparisons.

d. Ongoing review of adjunct faculty evaluations for the purpose of monitoring student perceptions of the academic rigor of courses.

e. Inclusion of survey items in the senior-level assessment exam that will allow for cross-comparison of student achievement, based on specific courses completed (those taught by adjunct instructors vs. those taught by full-time faculty).

3. Need to Hire Additional Full-Time Psychology Program Faculty—The issues of concern addressed above are further magnified by the heavy reliance of the
psychology program on adjunct instructors, due to a shortage of full-time faculty. Data from the Fall 2010 semester indicated that 52.4% of student credit hours in psychology were produced by adjunct faculty members, with only 47.6% of student credit hours being produced by full-time faculty members. This data is not in line with the stated goal of the university contained within the SOSU Vision 2010 and Vision 2015 Statements, which specifies the university goal to be, “Seventy-five percent of all courses taught and credit hours produced within each school be taught by full-time faculty.” However, since the Fall 2010 semester, the number of full-time faculty assigned to teach psychology courses has been even further reduced, with only 3 full-time faculty members currently teaching all courses for the major, including some courses that are crosslisted with Sociology. Further, demand for psychology courses has continued to increase, as evidenced by the Student Advisement Center’s request in the Fall 2011 semester for an increase in the number of general education course offerings. During the Fall 2011 semester, every available adjunct psychology instructors with interest in teaching a course was employed, but this did not result in all psychology course offerings being covered. Due to this fact, one full-time psychology faculty member is currently teaching at overload status, and there are no individuals remaining in the adjunct instructor pool of applicants. This issue poses several significant concerns for the psychology program, in that it becomes increasingly difficult to achieve quality control of the program. It is strongly recommended that the administration approve the hiring of additional faculty within the Psychology Program during the upcoming 2012-13 academic year. This recommendation has been put forth by Psychology Program faculty on several occasions in each of the following documents: POAR reports, the 2009-10 Psychology Program Review Summary, and the 2009-10 Five-Year Plan submitted to the Dean of the School of Education and Behavioral Sciences. Further, the consultant for the Psychology Program Review conducted during the 2009-10 academic year strongly recommended that immediate action be taken to address this particular program need area.

4. **Need to Hire an Additional Full-Time Faculty Member with Training and Expertise in the Areas of Research and Statistics**—At the time the newest full-time psychology program faculty member was hired to teach courses in statistics and research, two full-time faculty positions emphasizing these content areas had been requested and approved. However, only one of these positions was filled at that time, and to date, no additional faculty positions with such an emphasis have been advertised or filled. Hence, a single individual faculty member bears the majority of the responsibility for teaching the three required courses included in the statistics/research track. Given that each of these three courses is offered during both fall and spring semesters, the need for at least one additional faculty member with training in these content areas is still indicated.
2.1 Non-Standardized Senior-Level Assessment
   a. Learning Outcome—Professional Development and Competence of Senior Psychology Majors (Program Objectives: 1.1-7.1)
   b. Assessment Method—Field Experience Evaluations
      i. Student Field Experiences Evaluation (SFEE)—This non-standardized survey was developed by the department for the specific purpose of providing a quantitative evaluation of the professional development and competence of senior psychology majors as evaluated by their individual field-site supervisors. The SFEE consists of 20 items which yield scores in four primary clusters and 3 summary evaluation items, used to provide a more global assessment of the student’s overall professional performance and ability. The survey uses a 5-point Likert scale format, with responses ranging from Poor to Excellent and given respective values of two (2) to six (6). A rating of one (1) is reserved for No Basis for Evaluation or Not Applicable, and is not used in calculating mean scores and standard deviations. The SFEE is administered within the capstone field experience course that is required of psychology majors during the fall and spring semesters. The evaluation form is mailed to the primary field experience site supervisor for each student approximately four weeks prior to the end of the semester, with a postage-paid envelope included for return of the evaluation form. Results of the instrument are used for the primary purpose of evaluating student performance in the course and providing student course grades. However, results of the instrument are also used for the purpose of providing individual feedback to students regarding their professional strengths and weaknesses within the context of the exit interview for the Field Experience course.
      ii. Analysis of Experiences Assignment—This standardized written assignment required within the Field Experience course is used as a qualitative measure of student performance outcome. The assignment requires students to “synthesize [their] psychology course work and integrate these didactic experiences with the practical nature of the field experience course,” consistent with the objective of assessing professional development and competence. The subjective analysis provided by students is used by the department to obtain information about students’ perceptions regarding their chosen field of study, their expected success in the field, and how the program has benefited their professional development. Students are expected to complete a 4-5 page written assignment as a portion of the requirements for the Field Experience course, and they are unable to receive a passing grade in the course unless the assignment is completed. The assignment is typically due three weeks prior to the end of the semester, and students use the content of their paper to conduct a ten-minute oral presentation within the last few weeks of the course. Students are provided with written and verbal feedback on this written assignment during their exit interviews at the end of the semester. Although information obtained from this assessment is primarily used to provide a qualitative measure of student performance, it is also used as a tool to provide students with career guidance and an awareness of personal strengths and weaknesses.
c. Results of Assessment
   i. Student Field Experiences Evaluation (SFEE)—Mean scores and standard deviations in each evaluation area are provided below (See Table 1).

   Table 1. 2010-2011 Student Field Experience Evaluations (SFEE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Interaction Skills</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Client Background Information</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth &amp; Development</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Work Habits &amp; Appearance</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Summary Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Plan &amp; Conduct Agency Activities</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success in the Profession of Psychology</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s Overall Performance in Field Experience</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Note: 1 = No Basis for Evaluation, or Not Applicable, 2 = Poor, 3 = Below Average, 4 = Average, 5 = Above Average, 6 = Excellent

   ii. Analysis of Experiences Assignment—This assignment provides qualitative rather than quantitative data. The broad content areas that are commonly addressed within the assignment include: students’ perceptions of their preparedness for their field experience, coursework that was beneficial in the preparation process, ways in which students perceive that the field experience impacted their professional knowledge, performance, and career plans, and students’ personal reactions to their field experiences. Sample comments taken from student papers have been included as an attachment to this report (See Appendix C).

2.2 Learning Outcome—Professional Development and Competence of Senior Psychology Majors

   a. Analysis and Interpretation of Field Experience Assessment Measures
      i. SFEE—Scores on the SFEE are generally quite good, since the mean scores range in the Above Average to Excellent range ($M = 5.40$), as rated by external field site supervisors. A number of supervisors provided written feedback, and the majority of these comments were extremely positive and constructive in nature. Based on these results, it would seem that senior psychology majors are more than adequately prepared for their field experiences.
      
      ii. Analysis of Experiences Assignment—Comments taken from a sample of student papers appear to indicate a general perception that the field experience provides students with a valuable learning tool that cannot be replicated in the classroom.
environment through didactic instruction. Additionally, students often discuss learning about their personal career preferences and limitations as a result of the field experience. Such topics are often chosen by the instructor as points of discussion to be addressed during the individual exit interviews for the course, which serve to facilitate the provision of feedback and career guidance.

b. Comparison with Past 5 Years
i. SFEE—Results of SFEE supervisor ratings over the past five years have consistently been strongly positive, and many students (approximately 25-30% of those who complete a field experience each semester) obtain job offers from the field site at which they completed their experience. Low ratings have typically been associated with unprofessional behavior on the part of the student (i.e., excessive absences, tardiness, lack of communication with primary supervisor, etc.), rather than a lack of student preparedness. This would seem to suggest that while students obtain competence through their undergraduate coursework, professional behavior is largely impacted by individual differences across students. Further, students who are lacking in professional behavior appear to be the exception rather than the rule.

ii. Analysis of Experiences Assignment—Information gained from the analysis of experiences written assignment has fairly consistently identified several common areas of professional development and competence that occur as a result of undergraduate psychology coursework, including the field experience. A sample of comments representative of those contained in student papers submitted over the course of the past several years are included in Appendix B.

2.3 Program Modifications Related to Field Experience Measures—Given strong supervisor ratings of student performance at their field sites, in combination with positive feedback provided by students regarding the beneficial nature of the course, no modifications to field experience assessment methods are planned at the present time. Modifications implemented during the previous academic year involving increased provision of individual feedback within senior-level courses appear to be effective, as discussed later in the report.

3.1 Non-Standardized Program Assessment
a. Learning Outcome—Quality of Professional Development Training (Addresses Program Objectives 1.1-7.1)

b. Assessment Methods:
   i. Undergraduate Psychology Program Student Survey (UPPSS)—This evaluation form was designed by the department to gather information related to students’ perception of the degree to which stated goals and objectives of the Psychology Program were met (See Appendix C). The survey consists of 20 items, assessing responses according to a 5-point Likert scale. Response choices range from Agree Strongly = 1 to Disagree Strongly = 5.

   ii. Student Field Experience Site Evaluation (SFSE)—This 13-item self-report evaluation form designed by the department requires students to rate the quality of various aspects of their field experiences. The use of this instrument lends itself strongly to the evaluation of specific field sites, which accomplishes three primary purposes:
1. Preserving a written record of sites that have maintained good standing in terms of providing students with adequate and ethically appropriate supervision.

2. Providing future students with information about the common experiences that are unique to particular field sites.

3. Providing information to the department regarding the variety of professional opportunities available to psychology majors within the local area.

iii. **Analysis of Experiences Assignment**—In addition to providing for the assessment of professional development and competence among students (discussed in the previous section), this assignment provides qualitative information regarding students’ subjective perceptions of their Field Experience Sites (See Appendix B for student comments).

iv. **Individual Exit Interviews**—Individual student exit interviews with the instructor of the Interviewing Skills and Field Experience courses target three primary areas: 1) providing students with feedback regarding both their performance in the course and recommendations regarding areas for improvement, 2) allowing students to provide informal feedback to instructors regarding the SOSU psychology program, the quality of the field experiences sites and supervisors, and recommendations for improvement, and 3) planning for graduate training and career options, based on individual interests and personal strengths.

3.2 **Results of Assessment**

i. **UPPSS**—Results of the Undergraduate Psychology Program Survey indicated that students are satisfied overall with their undergraduate training in psychology. Results of the Undergraduate Psychology Program Survey indicate that the total mean rating of all items was 4.51, with a standard deviation of .46. This rating indicates that on average, students agreed or agreed strongly that the psychology program has helped them to develop understanding, skills, and the ability to apply such skills across a broad range of areas. A detailed summary of each item, mean ratings, and standard deviations for those items is provided as an attachment (See Appendix C).

ii. **SFESE**—A detailed summary of each item, mean ratings, and standard deviations for those items is provided below (See Table 2). Eighty-six percent of all students assessed (N=44) reported that they would recommend their field site to other students. Furthermore, the lowest mean score (M = 4.02) indicated that students, on average, were either satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of various aspects of their field experiences.
Table 2. 2010-11 Student Field Experience Site Evaluations (SFESE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction With Field Site</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Program Staff</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Quality</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Clients</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Experience Opportunities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of Supervision</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation of Site to Other Students</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Percentage Yes</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Very Unsatisfied; 3 = Somewhat Satisfied; 5 = Very Satisfied

iii. Analysis of Experiences Assignment—Consistent with the previous year’s report, subjective comments provided by 44 students within the context of the Analysis of Experience written assignment indicated that students perceived several areas of benefit to the field experience course. Particular areas identified included: an increased sense of confidence, providing real-world experience, providing the opportunity to apply skills learned in the classroom setting, providing knowledge and guidance in career opportunities, facilitating personal growth, and providing a sense of personal reward and career satisfaction (See Appendix B). Negative student comments primarily related to increased awareness of the demands of the profession; however, students also related the benefit of gaining this knowledge prior to seeking employment in a specific agency.

iv. Individual Exit Interviews—The primary feedback obtained from the individual exit interviews served to identify an area of concern for several students with regard to their field experiences. Specifically, several students stated that at some agencies, primary supervisors were not often present to observe their performance, despite the fact that they were directly responsible for providing evaluations for these students. This is an area of feedback that is consistent with information received from exit interviews that occurred during the previous academic years, and it is a planned target area for program modifications during the upcoming year.

3.3 Analysis and Interpretation

a. Learning Outcome—Quality of Professional Development Training
   i. UPPSS—Based on the results of the UPPSS for the 2010-11 academic year, it appears that psychology majors, on average, hold fairly positive perceptions of the program as a whole. The mean score for each individual item was greater than 4.16, indicating that students as a whole agreed or agreed strongly that the
psychology program helped them in each specific area that was assessed. Two of the three lowest ratings were obtained within the areas of understanding and use of research and statistical methods. These results appear to provide further support for the previously recommended modification of hiring a full-time faculty member with training and expertise in the area of statistics and research. A third area students rated low was in application of psychological theory to practice. However, students with a bachelor’s degree in psychology are not able to practice as counselors or psychologists without graduate training. For this reason, it is not a primary goal of the psychology program to prepare students for professional practice. Hence, low ratings in this area do not seem to reflect negatively on the overall quality of the psychology program.

ii. **SFSESE**—Quantitative data from the SFSESE for the 2010-11 academic year strongly indicated that students were satisfied with their field experience opportunities, in that 86.4% of students surveyed indicated that they would recommend the site to other students. Although this percentage is slightly lower than in previous years, this information is consistent with both the previous year’s data on the SFSESE, as well as qualitative data obtained from the Analysis of Experiences Assignment over the past several years.

iii. **Analysis of Experiences Assignment**—As discussed previously, qualitative information based on the analysis of experience written assignment indicated general student satisfaction with their field experiences and perceptions that such an experience helped to prepare them well for their future careers.

iv. **Individual Exit Interviews**—Information provided by the instructor of the Interviewing Skills and Field Experiences courses indicates that overall, the majority of students are accomplishing the following objectives during the course of their undergraduate psychology training:

1. Identification of future career goals and specific strategies for accomplishing these goals (i.e., obtaining employment with a bachelor’s degree, obtaining acceptance into graduate training programs, etc.).
2. Confidence in knowledge and skills learned within the program.
3. Awareness of ethical standards in psychology and how such standards are applied in both research and practice
4. Job opportunities obtained by a number of students as a direct result of their field experiences.
5. Successful application to graduate programs in psychology and related fields (i.e., counseling and social work).

b. **Comparison with Previous 5 Years**—Information gathered from all forms of assessment (UPPSS, SFSESE, Analysis of Experiences Assignment, & Individual Exit Interviews) was relatively consistent with that obtained across a larger span of time. Results generally consistently provide positive measures of the quality of professional development training within the psychology program. Data obtained regarding this particular learning outcome have indicated that this program area has been a consistent strength of the program for quite some time. Data from the 2010-11 academic year is no exception; ratings on all assessment instruments were as strong or stronger than in years past, including data from the most recently implemented program modification, which was the inclusion of individual exit interviews in senior-level courses.
3.4 Program Modifications Related to Professional Development Training Measures—

There was only one issue of concern raised by students within the context of their individual exit interviews. Specifically, some students reported limited availability of their primary supervisors at some specific field experience sites. During the previous year’s assessment, insufficient orientation of students to their field sites was an additional area of student concern. Based on these specific areas of feedback, the following program modifications were implemented during the 2010-11 academic year:

1. Increased communication between field site supervisors and course instructors.
2. Provision of specific feedback to field site supervisors, based on student evaluations.

4.1 Academic Productivity of Students

a. Addresses Program Objectives 1.1-7.1

b. Assessment Methods:

i. **Student Research Projects**—Students are able to complete both individual and group research projects in the context of either volunteer work with a full-time faculty member or

ii. **Oklahoma Psychological Society Conference (OPS)**—Each year, those undergraduate students who have completed independent research projects are provided with the opportunity to submit and present their research results at the annual OPS Conference. Undergraduate poster and paper submissions are compared with those submitted by students across the state of Oklahoma. These projects are then judged by a panel of faculty members, and the top five presentations in each category receive cash money awards.

iii. **Advanced Research Courses**—Students have the option of enrolling in the research track capstone course series (Advanced Research Methods and Advanced Research Project) in the place of Interviewing Skills and Field Experience as arranged courses. This was due primarily to the departmental loss of a faculty member who regularly worked with undergraduate students on both individual and team research projects. Prior to the 2009-10 academic year, the series of advanced research courses listed on the Psychology Degree Plan had not been available to students in several years. However, during the Summer 2009 semester, a newly hired faculty member began working with students on a team research project and with an individual student in the context of the research track series of courses.

4.2 Assessment Results (Qualitative data for all assessment methods above)—

i. **Student Research Projects**—No students sought out the opportunity to work with a full-time faculty member on independent or group research projects during the 2010-11 academic year. However, students completed both independent and group research projects in the context of the Research Methods course required for completion of the psychology major.

ii. **Oklahoma Psychological Society Conference (OPS)**—No students presented their individual or group research project results during the 2010-11 academic year at OPS during the 2010-11 academic year.
iii. Advanced Research Courses—Although one student enrolled in the Advanced Research Methods course during the Fall 2010 semester, he did not complete the course or enroll in the Advanced Research Project course. The student opted to pursue the alternate Clinical/Counseling track by completing the Interviewing Skills/Field Experience course series instead.

4.2 Analysis and Interpretation

a. Learning Outcome—Academic Productivity of Students

i. Student Research Projects—Although no students worked with full-time faculty on research projects during the 2010-11 academic year, all psychology majors are required to complete an individual or group research project within the context of Research Methods, which is a required course for the major. It is important to note again that there is only one full-time faculty member with training and expertise in the area of research, and that there are only three full-time faculty members total. Hence, the lack of student research being conducted may be more reflective of a lack of faculty availability to work with students on independent research projects than a lack of interest on the part of the students.

ii. Oklahoma Psychological Society Conference (OPS)—Although no SOSU students presented their research at the 2010-11 state research competition, SOSU psychology students have a strong performance history within the area of research presentations and awards at state competitions. These achievements provide a qualitative basis of comparison for interpreting standardized student scores in the content area of Experimental Design, in that many of the students within the department have exhibited skills in applying their didactic training in the area of research. It is anticipated that several students will present their research project results during the Spring 2012 semester.

iii. Advanced Research Courses—Although no students completed the two courses required in the research track during the 2010-11 academic year, the renewed availability of this course series is expected to strengthen the overall psychology program in several ways. First, it will allow us to attract and train students who have professional interest in areas other than Counseling/Clinical Psychology. Second, it will likely provide students with skills that will strengthen our overall departmental assessment outcomes in the areas of statistics, research, and critical thinking.

b. Comparison of Performance Across the Past Five Years

i. Student Research Projects—The lack of student participation in independent research projects during the 2010-11 academic year is not consistent with data from years past. For this reason, it is recommended that this assessment area be closely monitored to ensure that the trend of declining student participation in research does not continue. It is also unclear at the present time whether the trend is due to student preference or limited faculty availability, which will be discussed in greater detail in section 4.4 below.

ii. Oklahoma Psychological Society Conference (OPS)—Although no SOSU students presented their research at the 2010-11 state research competition, SOSU psychology students have a strong performance history within the area of research presentations and awards at state competitions. These achievements provide a
qualitative basis of comparison for interpreting standardized student scores in the content area of Experimental Design, in that many of the students within the department have exhibited skills in applying their didactic training in the area of research. Again, it is recommended that this assessment area be closely monitored to ensure that the trend of declining student participation in research does not continue.

iii. Advanced Research Courses—The prior academic year, in which a student completed the research track series of courses represented the first time the courses had been offered in several years. Further, the majority of students elect to enroll in the Interviewing Skills/Field Experience course series, due to professional employment goals related to counseling and clinical work. Hence, lack of student enrollment in this course series during the 2010-11 academic year is neither atypical nor particularly concerning at the present time. However, it is important to note the larger context of declining interest in student research participation across all three areas of assessment. For this reason, several modifications are recommended below:

4.4 Recommended Program Modifications—Student performance in the area of academic productivity has been strong throughout the past five years, despite the fact that the advanced research course track series was unavailable until Fall 2009. However, there is a specific modification recommended within this area that has been addressed by program faculty within both the Psychology Program Review conducted during the 2009-10 academic year and the Five-year program plan submitted annually to the Dean of the School of Education and Behavioral Sciences.

1. Incentive for Faculty to Provide Instruction for the Advanced Research Series of Courses—Currently, faculty agree to supervise student research on an arranged basis, on top of their current teaching load without additional compensation. Given the shortage of faculty within the psychology program and associated work overloads, this practice is unlikely to encourage instructors to work with students on independent research projects. It is recommended that an incentive plan be developed for faculty who provide instruction in arranged research courses.

2. Recommended Hiring of Additional Full-Time Faculty Member with Expertise and Training in the Area of Research & Statistics—As stated previously, the shortage of full-time psychology program faculty in general and faculty with training and expertise in the area of research and statistics in particular, present great difficulty in managing regularly scheduled course enrollment. It is simply not feasible to anticipate that the current number of full-time faculty members will additionally be able to provide mentorship in student research activities on top of their current instructional and advising loads. This recommendation is further emphasized by data obtained from the UPPSS indicating lower levels of student satisfaction with their training in the areas of statistics and research than all other areas but one.

3. Assessment of Student Interest in Independent Research Participation—As it is unclear whether the declining participation of students in research activities is a result of student preference or lack of faculty availability, it is recommended that student interest in participating in research be assessed. Several questions designed to obtain data focused on clarifying this issue will be included on the demographic
questionnaire administered within the context of senior-level assessment during the upcoming Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters.

E. Specific Modifications to the Overall Program

1. Reorganization of Departmental Programs Aligning Programs with Accreditation Standards—Although there is no accreditation for bachelor-level psychology programs, the counseling program within the department has been undergoing the process of working towards CACREP accreditation. This process impacted the psychology program in the following two ways during the 2010-11 academic year:
   a. Reduction in the number of full-time psychology faculty due to reassignment to other course topic areas. (Dr. Jon Reid was reassigned to teach COUN courses only during the fall and spring semesters, and Dr. Deana Williams has been reassigned to coordinate and teach courses for the Native Studies minor program.)
   b. Removal of crosslisted PSY/COUN course offerings, resulting in fewer faculty members available to teach PSY courses.

2. Loss of Full-Time Faculty Members—As noted above, the number of psychology program faculty members was further reduced from 5 to 3.5 full-time faculty members during the 2010-11 academic year. Since Fall 2005, the number of full-time faculty assigned to teach psychology courses in the Department of Behavioral Sciences has decreased from six to three full-time faculty members. This dramatic reduction in available faculty has had and will continue to have a significant impact on course delivery options, increased reliance upon adjunct instructors, increased faculty advisement loads, and decreased quality control of the overall program.

3. Development of an Orientation and Support Plan for Adjunct Faculty—Increased planning and communication efforts with regard to adjunct instructors have included the following:
   a. Orientation of Adjunct Faculty Members—An adjunct instructor orientation meeting was held in Fall 2010, in order to provide adjunct instructors with documents and information necessary to successfully teach their courses. In addition, full-time faculty attended the meeting to increase communication and rapport, as well as to assist adjunct instructors in problem-solving various common challenges in the instructional environment. During this time, adjunct instructors were informed regarding expectations for their performance and specific policies pertaining to their responsibilities as instructors of psychology courses (i.e., absence policy, posting of grades and privacy policies, etc.).
   b. Provision of Model Syllabi and Course Grading Rubrics to Instructors of Each Course—An adjunct orientation packet was developed, containing documents pertaining to assessment requirements for specific courses, information to be included in syllabi, and sample grading rubrics for courses requiring a portfolio component or assessment criterion. All new adjunct instructors are provided with a packet when they agree to teach a psychology course for the first time.
   c. Increased Monitoring of Faculty Evaluations and Cross-Comparison of Adjunct Faculty Evaluations with those of Full-Time Instructors—The
significant shortage of full-time psychology program faculty poses a great concern from the standpoint of program quality control. For this reason, faculty evaluations are being more closely monitored, in order to develop an understanding of how instructor education and training may be differentially impacting the quality of course instruction and student achievement. One area of particular concern that was recently assessed pertains to the following:

**Grade Comparisons Between Courses Taught By Adjunct vs. Full-Time Faculty for the Same Courses**—This assessment resulted in the identification of instructors who do not appear to be applying an adequate level of academic rigor to the implementation of their courses. Specifically, as previously discussed in Section 3.1.2, the grade comparisons revealed that average grade scores taught by adjunct professors were significantly higher than distributions of courses taught by full-time faculty in certain identical course content areas. This information was previously discussed in the context of planned psychology program modifications for the upcoming 2011-12 academic year.

4. **Development of a Two-Year Course Rotation Plan for Remote Sites**—A draft rotation was developed during the 2009-10 academic year, and was implemented during the 2010-11 academic year and up to the present time. Minor modifications to the plan were made during that time, primarily related to identifying the type of course instructional format that would best fit the content of the course (i.e., Interviewing Skills is not a course that lends itself to online or IETV instructional formats).

5. **Hiring of Full-Time Psychology Faculty Member**—In Fall 2008, a full-time psychology program faculty member with expertise and interest in the areas of research and statistics was hired and assigned to teach the statistics and research series of courses listed on the psychology degree plan. It was anticipated within the 2008-09 POAR report that this faculty hire would result in improved scores on senior-level assessment results within these specific content areas over time. However, the report suggested that the impact of this new hire would likely not be realized until the academic year 2010-11, due to the fact that the majority of students who had recently completed a course in Statistics would not have participated in senior-level assessment until that time.

**Effectiveness of Specific Modifications:**

1. **Reorganization of Departmental Programs Aligning Programs with Accreditation Standards**—This modification, which relates primarily to allocation of resources, has had an extremely negative impact on the psychology program, primarily in relation to the reduction in number of full-time faculty members discussed below. It is anticipated that the planned organizational structure will likely ultimately serve to benefit both the psychology and counseling programs in the future. However, current resources are insufficient to adequately administer the psychology program effectively.

2. **Loss of Full-Time Faculty Members**—As noted above, the number of psychology program faculty members was reduced from 5 during the academic year 2008-09 to 3.5 during the academic year 2009-10 and have further decreased to 3 up to the present time. Psychology faculty resources are currently extremely lacking, despite
extremely high student enrollment and an increased number of course offerings. This situation has posed several problems for the psychology program, including: heavy student advising loads that greatly exceed the recommendation contained within the University Policies & Procedures Manual, insufficient number of faculty to cover course demand, lack of faculty with training and expertise in specific areas of instruction, and the inability to provide for adequate quality control of the psychology program. The following have resulted from the loss of full-time faculty members:

**Increased Reliance Upon Adjunct Instruction**—At this point, it is necessary to employ a higher number of adjunct instructors than full-time faculty each semester to cover all courses that are offered. This presents a significant challenge for the coordination of the psychology program.

**Limited Course Offerings**—For purposes of program quality control, it is important to assign faculty members to teach specific courses that correspond to their educational and training background. We need additional professors with specific expertise. For example, we do not have enough professors with the needed training in Cognitive Psychology and Physiological Psychology. The Southeastern professor with training in Cognitive Psychology and Physiological Psychology must be assigned to the research sequence courses because no one else is available to teach these courses. Further, there is a very high demand for the core research courses, because they are required for completion of the psychology degree. Similar statements can also be made about Industrial/Organizational Psychology. Our course offerings for Psychology majors are severely limited, as noted by the consultant in the most recent Psychology Program Review.

**Program Quality Control and Successful Implementation of Program Planning Efforts**—Insufficient numbers of full-time faculty necessarily impact the quality of academic programs in a negative manner, due to each of the issues discussed above.

**Decreased Academic Productivity among Full-Time Faculty Members**—As a result of heavy advising loads, coordination of adjunct faculty activities, and assessment responsibilities, full-time faculty members lack available time to focus on independent research activities and other professional responsibilities.

3. **Development of an Orientation and Support Plan for Adjunct Faculty**—Due to the high number of adjunct instructors currently utilized within the program, it was deemed necessary to address the program quality control from a training perspective. An orientation and support plan was developed by full-time program faculty members during the Spring 2009 semester, and it was implemented during the 2009-10 academic year up to the present time. Although the impact of this program modification may not be realized for some time in quantitative and standardized assessment outcome data, the modification has resulted in increased communication between full-time and adjunct faculty instructors. Verbal feedback provided by adjunct instructors regarding this modification has been extremely positive in nature. As discussed previously, recent data based on grade comparisons between courses taught by adjunct instructors and full-time faculty members has indicated modifications in assessment practices that will be implemented during the 2011-12 academic year. However, no data are available at the present time.

4. **Development of a Two-Year Course Rotation Plan for Remote Sites**—Input from remote site coordinators and students has consistently been overwhelmingly positive
regarding the number and diversity of course offerings available. However, it is important to note that program coordinators and department chairs do not have the responsibility of approving course offerings from semester to semester, and it is unknown whether all recommended course offerings included in the plan will be approved in upcoming semesters.

5. **Hiring of Full-Time Psychology Faculty Member**—PACAT scores from the 2010-11 academic year indicated that two content areas taught by the newest psychology program faculty member increased from the 2009-10 assessment period (Statistics: +.44sd, and Social Psychology +.25sd). It is anticipated that this trend will continue to result in rising scores in these specific content areas over the course of the next few years, and results will continue to be closely monitored.

F. **Additional Assessment Techniques for IETV courses**

Of the 34 psychology courses taught during the Fall 2010 semester, 6 were IETV. During the Spring 2011 semester, 7 of the 34 courses taught were IETV (See Table 3).

**Important Note:** Psychology is a degree plan that includes some courses that are difficult to administer via non-traditional formats (i.e., Interviewing Skills, Senior Seminar, Field Experience, etc.). The courses that serve as the primary sources of data used to evaluate the program have not yet been offered as online courses, including the Interviewing Skills (PSY 4443), Senior Seminar (PSY 4981), and Field Experience (PSY 4543) capstone courses. Further, there is no plan in place to develop these courses in the online format, due to the nature of the content comprising these courses (i.e., experiential vs. didactic learning). However, during the 2010-11 academic year, these courses were taught as IETV courses, in which students were required to attend some dates at the Durant campus. Based on instructor and student feedback, this instructional format proved to be successful, and all senior-level capstone courses are currently being offered in IETV format each semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Semester Offered</th>
<th>IETV (# of Sections)</th>
<th>Course Offered Face-to-Face (Y/N)</th>
<th>Total # of Students</th>
<th>Total # of Remote Site Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3123</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3313</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4313</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4443</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4543</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4981</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2333</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3123</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3373</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4353</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4443</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4543</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4981</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Courses Taught Face-to-Face vs. IETV

**Note:** The following table represents only a sample comparison of courses taught in both Face-to-Face and IETV formats in Fall 2010, but it does not include all courses for the 2010-11 academic year, for two reasons. First, information regarding the specific data that would be need to be included in the POAR report for the 2010-11 academic year was not available to program coordinators in advance, which prevented data collection. Faculty have been advised regarding the assessment information that will be needed for the upcoming academic year, and that information will be included in the 2011-12 academic year POAR Report. Second, the majority of psychology courses are taught by adjunct instructors, and not all of these individuals provided data to the psychology program coordinator for comparison purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Semester Offered</th>
<th>IETV (§ of Sections)</th>
<th>Course Offered Face-to-Face (Y/N)</th>
<th>Percentage of Objectives Met for Face-to-Face Sections</th>
<th>Percentage of Objectives Met for IETV Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3123</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3313</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4313</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4443</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4543</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4981</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2333</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3123</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3373</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4353</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4443</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4543</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4981</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis and Interpretation:** Based on the data provided above, it would seem that student performance in IETV courses is equivalent overall to that of courses taught face-to-face. However, it is important to note the difficulty associated with comparing results across these sections, given that enrollment is typically much smaller for remote sections. As such, overall percentages are more likely to be negatively impacted in smaller courses by poor performance of a much smaller number of students. Although this outcome was observed in only one course content area (PSY 4313), a data comparison conducted across a greater span of time may lead to more accurate results upon which to base conclusions for the purpose of program planning.

**Modifications Planned:** For the 2011-12 academic year, all instructors have been provided with model syllabi and asked to align their syllabi with these models. Additionally, instructors have been asked to gather data regarding specific outcome variables based on the learning objectives in their syllabi. Faculty have been encouraged to develop and use grading rubrics that will lead to ease of data collection and comparison for future reporting.
and program planning purposes. It is anticipated that increased standardization of course delivery and assessment will result in greater quality control of the psychology program.

**G. Contribution of Each Faculty Member**—The instructor of the Field Experience course fulfilled the responsibility of administering several assessment instruments (i.e., SFEE, SFSESE, and the Analysis of Experience Assignment) during the fall and spring semesters of this senior-level capstone course. Further, undergraduate faculty members administered the PACAT assessment and Undergraduate Psychology Program Student Survey (UPPSS) to senior psychology majors on the same dates as the university junior-level assessments. A rough draft of this report was e-mailed to each member of the Department of Behavioral Sciences, and faculty members were asked to provide feedback and suggestions for revision and modification. Feedback was then incorporated into this report.

**Full-Time Psychology Faculty Members and Designated Assessment Responsibilities:**

**Dr. Blythe Duell**

Undergraduate courses taught during the 2010-11 academic year: PSY 1113, PSY 2333, PSY 3313, PSY 3393, PSY 3433, PSY 4453

Assessment Responsibilities:
1. Participation in psychology faculty meetings involving textbook review and selection, program planning, and psychology assessment requirements.
3. Review of the POAR and provision of feedback.

**Dr. Charla Hall**

Undergraduate Courses taught during the 2010-11 academic year: PSY 1113, PSY 2113, PSY 3513, PSY 4973

Assessment Responsibilities:
1. Participation in psychology faculty meetings involving textbook review and selection, program planning, and psychology assessment requirements.
2. Development of senior-level assessment questions for the following content areas: Health & Wellness, Testing, and Physiological.
3. Review of the POAR and provision of feedback.

**Dr. Jennifer Hicks**

Undergraduate Courses taught during the 2010-11 academic year: PSY 4313, PSY 4443, PSY 4543, PSY 4973, PSY 4981

Assessment Responsibilities:
1. Psychology Program Coordinator and author of the POAR
2. Participation in psychology faculty meetings involving textbook review and selection, program planning, and psychology assessment requirements.
3. Responsible for adjunct faculty orientation, course monitoring, and assessment implementation.
5. Administration of senior-level assessment instruments and exit interviews within the context of Interviewing Skills (PSY 4443—capstone course)
6. Responsible for incorporating feedback provided by psychology faculty members into the POAR.

Dr. Ed Mauzey
Courses taught during the 2010-11 academic year: PSY 4970 (arranged course only)
(Assigned to teach COUN courses only)
Assessment Responsibilities:
1. Chair of the Department of Education and Behavioral Sciences.
2. Provision of assessment data and feedback.
3. Overall monitoring of the programs within the department, including psychology.

Dr. Jon Reid
Courses taught during the 2010-11 academic year: N/A (two summer courses)
(Assigned to teach COUN courses only during the Fall/Spring semesters)
Assessment Responsibilities:
1. Participation in psychology faculty meetings involving textbook review and selection, program planning, and psychology assessment requirements.
2. Review of the POAR and provision of feedback.

Dr. Deana Williams
Courses taught during the 2010-11 academic year: PSY 1113, PSY 2243, PSY 3373, PSY 4313, PSY 4973
(Recently reassigned as Program Coordinator/Assistant Professor of Native Studies Minor)
Assessment Responsibilities:
1. Participation in psychology faculty meetings involving textbook review and selection, program planning, and psychology assessment requirements
2. Development of senior-level assessment questions for the following content areas: Abnormal, Personality, and History & Systems
3. Review of the POAR and provision of feedback.

Summary of Program Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths
1. Compatibility with the overall Mission of SOSU
2. Program faculty qualifications, diversity of training, commitment to the program, and dedication to students and the university are very strong.
3. Increased student achievement in both overall scores on the PACAT and specific content areas representing strengths of the program (Social Psychology, Developmental Psychology, Research Methods, and Statistics). These strengths are strongly linked with specific content areas taught by full-time faculty members with specialized training.
4. Level of student preparation for graduate counseling or psychology training appears to be quite strong, as indicated by student report, field experience evaluation scores, and senior-level assessment in the Clinical/Counseling content area.
5. Creative use of available resources in such a manner that program goals are largely able to be met, despite the shortage of full-time faculty members.

Weaknesses
1. Extreme shortage of full-time faculty members in comparison with the number of course offerings and student program majors.
2. High reliance on adjunct instructors.
3. Additional need for full-time faculty with training and expertise in the areas of Research Methods and Statistics, Cognitive, and Physiological Psychology.
4. Evaluation of the effectiveness of modifications to the program is limited by two primary factors: 1.) recent implementation of modifications that prevents substantial conclusions based on available data, and 2.) heavy reliance on adjunct instructors, which impacts the quality control of the program.

Relevant Constituents and Stakeholders of this Report
Relevant constituents and stakeholders of the psychology program outcome assessment report include:
1. Prospective and current psychology program majors and minors
2. Psychology faculty members
3. Faculty members within the Department of Behavioral Sciences
4. Field Experience agencies and supervisors
5. Graduates of the psychology program
6. Potential employers of psychology majors
7. Graduate students in psychology and counseling programs
8. The public at large, due to the fact that psychology is a profession of service
9. The scientific community utilizing information obtained from psychological research studies

Methods of Sharing This Report With Constituents and Stakeholders
It is anticipated that the current document will be made available for public viewing on the departmental website. In addition, current students may request their individual scores on the PACAT exam. Many of the students who attend the SÖSU graduate program in Community Counseling are former psychology majors, and this connection between two related programs within the department serves to provide graduate students and alumni with updated information about the psychology program. Perhaps more importantly, however, the psychology program serves as a foundation of preparation for students within graduate programs at Southeastern.

Ongoing Commitment to Continue the Assessment Process
The psychology faculty recognize the importance of assessment both within our profession and within the field at large. Recent program modifications have been directly tied to information obtained from previous assessment reports, and modifications are planned for the upcoming academic year based on this information as well. Assessment is a vital and necessary component of a quality academic program, and it is hoped that future modifications based on program outcome assessment results will serve to strengthen our program, our university, and the community at large.
Psychology Program Coordinator  

Chair, Department of Behavioral Sciences  

Dean, School of Education and Behavioral Sciences  

Date
## Appendix A
Senior-Level Standardized Assessment Results (PACAT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>2006-07 Mean Score</th>
<th>2006-07 %-ile</th>
<th>2007-08 Mean Score</th>
<th>2007-08 %-ile</th>
<th>2008-09 Mean Score</th>
<th>2008-09 %-ile</th>
<th>2009-10 Mean Score</th>
<th>2009-10 %-ile</th>
<th>2010-11 Mean Score</th>
<th>2010-11 %-ile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical/ Counseling</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Design</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History &amp; Systems</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Learning/ Cognition</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>416</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>413</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>404</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>446</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scores range from approximately 200-800. (Mean = 500; standard deviation = 100).
Appendix B
Analysis of Experiences Assignment

Student Comments Across 4 Broad Areas:

**Perceptions of preparedness for the field experience:**
“Abnormal Psych was one of the main classes that really helped me to understand the diagnoses and Axes [of the DSM-IV-TR] used at my field site.”
“I was exposed…to several different factors that I have been studying during my work at SOSU.”
“I have taken many classes here at SOSU in the psychology field. In each class I have learned something new and can in some way relate it to my life and my field site.

**Beneficial coursework:**

**Perceptions of the impact of the field experience on professional knowledge, performance, and career plans:**
“This experience has changed my attitude about working with children. I used to say that I did not want to work with children [but now] I see the joy and excitement that some of them have.”
“This experience has helped me a great deal to feel I have gotten my feet wet to a degree and feel a bit more confident to have learned some of the structure of an agency of this type.”
“Before it was just text, and now I feel like I can really grasp what I have been taught the last four years here at SOSU.”

**Personal reactions to the field experience:**
“I’ve loved my experience at [my field site]. [It has been] a great place to get experience and learn about the Counseling profession.”
“I felt if nothing else that I learned a good amount [about the field] I had wanted to explore before attempting it.”
“For the most part, I think the field experiences course has impacted me positively, in terms of learning about the site and gaining knowledge of it as a potential career possibility.”
“My field experience was very eye-opening. I knew after about 50 hours that counseling was not the road that I wanted to go.”
“In my culture, mental illnesses are negatively interpreted, [and] people will turn to witchcraft doctors sometimes…I have come to realize that going to counseling will represent a challenge for me if I ever decide to go back in my country since there is no place for our field there.”
Appendix C

Mean ratings of the Undergraduate Psychology Program Student Survey (UPPSS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Rating</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Minimum Item Rating</th>
<th>Maximum Item Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual knowledge in psychology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for history &amp; evolution</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of history &amp; evolution of psychology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving skills</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension of the language of psychology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written expression of knowledge</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to collect information</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use psychological resources</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of research &amp; statistical methods</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of research &amp; statistical methods</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentials &amp; limitations of research</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of interpersonal &amp; intrapersonal skills</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of inter/intrapersonal skills</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use Interpersonal &amp; Intrapersonal skills</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of ethical principles</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of ethical principles</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-world experience in psychology</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation of psychological practice</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of psychological theory to practice</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UPPSS Total</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5 = Agree Strongly; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neutral; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Disagree Strongly)