

Mission

The goal of the Psychological Science program is to educate you in the scientific study of the mind and human behavior.

Academic Year 2024-2025

Bachelor Psychological Science Learning Outcomes

Use and Apply Key Concepts, Theories, and Empirical Findings **NOT MET**

Students will accurately use and apply key concepts, theories, and empirical findings to describe, explain, and predict psychological phenomena, taking into consideration diverse individual and/or cultural perspectives.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
<p>PLO 1 Rubric</p> <p>Direct - Assignment</p> <p><i>Adv Sem in Psychological Scien: PSY 4904</i></p> <p>Target</p> <p>80% of students sampled will achieve a score of 3 or above on each criterion.</p> <p>PSY PLO 1 Rubric 4325.pdf</p>	<p>NOT MET</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Results are recorded in bold italic inside of the rubric. 19 total artifacts were assessed (18 papers, 1 poster). This sample was 53% of the total capstone artifacts collected from two advanced seminars, one internship seminar, and one independent study (36 total).</p> <p>Concept Description, Explanation & Application</p> <p>53% earned 3 or better 100% earned 2 or better</p> <p>Predictive Analysis</p> <p>16% earned 3 or better 90% earned 2 or better</p> <p>Individual and Cultural Perspectives</p> <p>5% earned 3 or better 5% earned 2 or better</p> <p>PSY Capstone SP25 Pilot PLO 1 Results.pdf</p> <p>Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our goal was 80% of students meeting a 3 (refining) or better on each criterion. Students did not meet this goal on any criterion.• Student performance was strongest on the Concept Description, Explanation & Application criterion.• Student performance was weakest on the Individual and Cultural Perspectives criterion.• There may be a misalignment between this PLO rubric and assignment/grading criteria. Have we set the bar too high with the rubric, or too low in the assignments?• Notes on piloting this rubric:<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ We need to better define predictive analysis. Hypothesis? Implications? Future directions?◦ It will be necessary to better define each criterion by adding descriptions to the rubric.	<p>Revise Measurement / Assessment</p> <p>IN PROGRESS</p> <p>This was a pilot assessment of new departmental PLO rubrics. Evaluators noted some difficulties with deploying the tools. Collected artifacts should include the artifact assignment prompts and grading rubrics to allow for assessment of alignment between the PLO rubrics and assignment criteria.</p> <p>Recommended Due Date: 05/29/2026</p>

Locate, Evaluate, Summarize, and Synthesize Research Literature **NOT MET**

Students will locate, evaluate, summarize, and synthesize research literature with appropriate citation.

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
<p>PLO 2 Rubric</p> <p>Direct - Assignment</p> <p><i>Adv Sem in Psychological Scien: PSY 4904</i></p> <p>Target</p> <p>80% of students sampled will achieve a score of 3 or above on each criterion.</p> <p>PSY PLO 2 Rubric 4325.pdf</p>	<p>NOT MET</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Results are recorded in bold italic inside of the rubric. 19 total artifacts were assessed (18 papers, 1 poster). This sample was 53% of the total capstone artifacts collected from two advanced seminars, one internship seminar, and one independent study (36 total).</p> <p>Literature Search & Source Evaluation 63% earned 3 or better 100% earned 2 or better</p> <p>Summary & Synthesis 47% earned 3 or better 100% earned 2 or better</p> <p>Citation 42% earned 3 or better 95% earned 2 or better</p> <p>PSY Capstone SP25 Pilot PLO 2 Results.pdf</p> <p>Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our goal was 80% of students meeting a 3 (refining) or better on each criterion. Students did not meet this goal on any criterion, but nearly all students met at least a 2 (developing) on all three criteria. • There may be a misalignment between this PLO rubric and assignment/grading criteria. Have we set the bar too high with the rubric, or too low in the assignments? • Notes on piloting this rubric: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ For the Literature Search & Source Evaluation criterion, the quality of citations were used as a proxy to evaluate student artifacts. We may wish to consider evaluating both process (e.g., research process journals, annotated bibliographies) and product (final papers, posters, or presentations). ◦ For the Citation criterion, we should clarify that these are in-text content citations used when and where appropriate, which is distinct from citation mechanics (which are measured in PLO 5). ◦ It will be necessary to better define each criterion by adding descriptions to the rubric. 	<p>Revise Measurement / Assessment</p> <p>IN PROGRESS</p> <p>This was a pilot assessment of new departmental PLO rubrics. Evaluators noted some difficulties with deploying the tools. Collected artifacts should include the artifact assignment prompts and grading rubrics to allow for assessment of alignment between the PLO rubrics and assignment criteria.</p> <p>Recommended Due Date: 05/29/2026</p>

Demonstrate Written and Oral Presentation Skills **NOT MET**

Students will demonstrate effective written and oral presentation skills using conventions of scientific communication (e.g., APA style).

MEASURES	RESULTS	ACTIONS
<p>PLO 5 Rubric</p> <p>Direct - Assignment</p> <p><i>Adv Sem in Psychological Scien: PSY 4904</i></p> <p>Target</p> <p>80% of students sampled will achieve a score of 3 or above on each criterion.</p> <p>PSY PLO 5 Rubric 4325.pdf</p>	<p>NOT MET</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Results are recorded in bold italic inside of the rubric. 19 total artifacts were assessed (18 papers, 1 poster). This sample was 53% of the total capstone artifacts collected from two advanced seminars, one internship seminar, and one independent study (36 total).</p> <p>Written Communication 37% earned 3 or better 100% earned 2 or better</p> <p>Oral Presentation Not assessed, as all artifacts were papers or posters.</p> <p>APA Style 21% earned 3 or better 100% earned 2 or better</p> <p>PSY Capstone SP25 Pilot PLO 5 Results.pdf</p> <p>Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our goal was 80% of students meeting a 3 (refining) or better on each criterion. Students did not meet this goal on any criterion. No oral presentations were assessed. • There may be a misalignment between this PLO rubric and assignment/grading criteria. Have we set the bar too high with the rubric, or too low in the assignments? • Notes on piloting this rubric: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The APA Style criterion is targeting the mechanics of APA style. The descriptor for 3 should read "generally follows," and the descriptor for 2 should read "attempts to follow." ◦ It will be necessary to better define each criterion by adding descriptions to the rubric. 	<p>Revise Measurement / Assessment</p> <p>IN PROGRESS</p> <p>This was a pilot assessment of new departmental PLO rubrics. Evaluators noted some difficulties with deploying the tools. Collected artifacts should include the artifact assignment prompts and grading rubrics to allow for assessment of alignment between the PLO rubrics and assignment criteria.</p> <p>Recommended Due Date: 05/29/2026</p>

Assessment Plan Summary

This was a pilot assessment of new departmental PLO rubrics. Evaluators noted some difficulties with deploying the new tools. Collected artifacts should include the artifact assignment prompts and grading rubrics to allow for assessment of alignment between the PLO rubrics and assignment criteria. While our target of 80% of students meeting at least a 3 (refining) on all criteria was not met for any criterion, we now have a place to begin examining and comparing our PLO rubrics and capstone assignment criteria. This result is also not surprising given last year's results with our previous capstone assessment tool. We anticipated low marks and a period of adjustment to the new outcomes measurements. Present results suggest there may be a misalignment between PLO rubrics and assignment/grading criteria. We must examine whether we have set the bar too high with our rubrics, or too low

with our assignments. Discussion of instructional and assessment methods within the department is also warranted to ensure alignment with our intended program outcomes.