

PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Submitted by Robert Santee

8/4/06

The undergraduate Psychology program assessment process is consistent with **Standard 4** of the *WASC Handbook of Accreditation/2001*. It “conducts sustained, evidence based, and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives” (see *Handbook* p. 29). The resulting evidence from the assessment process “is used to establish priorities at different levels of the” undergraduate Psychology program, and to make adjustments, if needed, accordingly. The Psychology program 1) has an understandable and coherent plan for assessing the attainment of educational objectives (**CFR 4.1**), 2), engages in planning and decision making processes that are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning (**CFR 4.3**), 3) assesses effectiveness, tracks results over time, and uses the results for program improvement (**CFR 4.4**), 4) has identified indicators and has collected data to support the assessment of student learning consistent with the institution’s and program’s purposes and educational objectives (**CFR 4.5**), 5) has clear, well established policies for gathering and analyzing information that leads to a program culture of evidence and improvement (**CFR 4.6**), 6) engages in an ongoing inquiry into the process of teaching and learning and utilizes the results of the inquiry for improvement in the processes associated with teaching and learning (**CFR 4.7**), and 7) includes appropriate stakeholders in the assessment of the effectiveness of the program (**CFR 4.8**).

MISSION

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology is designed to educate, within the context of Marianist educational values, students in both theoretical and applied aspects of psychology for the purpose of assisting them in adapting to various, interrelated environments.

MARIANIST EDUCATIONAL VALUES

The five characteristics of a Marianist Education are:

1. Educate for Formation in Faith

- a. Catholic Universities affirm an intricate relationship between reason and faith. As important as discursive and logical formulations and critical thinking are, they are not able to capture all that can be and ought to be learned. Intellectual rigor coupled with respectful humility provide a more profound preparation for both career and life. Intellectual rigor characterizes the pursuit of all that can be learned. Respectful humility reminds people of faith that they need to learn from those who are of other faiths and cultures, as well as from those who may have no religious faith at all.

2. Provide an Excellent Education

- a. In the Marianist approach to education, “excellence” includes the whole person, not just the technician or rhetorician. Marianist universities educate whole persons, developing their physical, psychological, intellectual, moral, spiritual and social qualities. Faculty and students attend to fundamental moral attitudes, develop their personal talents and acquire skills that will help them learn all their lives. The Marianist approach to education links theory and practice, liberal and professional education. Our age has been deeply shaped by science and technology. Most recently, information and educational technologies have changed the way faculty and students research and teach. At Marianist Universities, two goals are pursued simultaneously: an appropriate use of information technology for learning, and the enhancement of interaction between students and teachers. As Catholic, Marianist Universities seek to embrace diverse peoples and understand diverse cultures, convinced that ultimately, when such people come together, one of the highest purposes of education is realized: a human community that respects every individual within it.

3. Educate in Family Spirit

- a. Known for their strong sense of community, Marianists have traditionally spoken of this sense as “family spirit.” Marianist educational experience fosters the development of a community characterized by a sense of family spirit that accepts each person with loving respect, and draws everyone in the university into the challenge of community building. Family spirit also enables Marianist universities to challenge their students, faculty and staff to excellence and maturity, because the acceptance and love of a community gives its members the courage to risk failure and the joy of sharing success.

4. Educate for Service, Justice, and Peace

- a. The Marianist approach to higher education is deeply committed to the common good. The intellectual life itself is undertaken as a form of service in the interest of justice and peace, and the university curriculum is designed to connect the classroom with the wider world. In addition, Marianist universities extend a special concern for the poor and marginalized and promote the dignity, rights and responsibilities of all people.

5. Educate for Adaptation to Change

- a. In the midst of rapid social and technological change, Marianist universities readily adapt and change their methods and structures so that the wisdom of their educational philosophy and spirituality may be transmitted even more fully. “New times call for new methods,” Father Chaminade often repeated. The Marianist university faces the future confidently, on the one hand knowing that it draws on a rich educational philosophy, and on the other fully aware for that philosophy to remain vibrant in changing times, adaptations need to be met.

Selected from *Characteristics of Marianist Universities: A Resource Paper*

Published in 1999 by Chaminade University of Honolulu, St. Mary’s University and University of Dayton

Program Student Learning Outcomes

Student will demonstrate an understanding of

- 1. The Scientific Method and its Application in the Field of Psychology**
 - a. Skills and competencies in this area are primarily developed in the required courses of PSY 315 Statistics and PSY 316 Research Methods in Psychology. They are also addressed in all psychology courses. **Six Credits.**
- 2. Life Span Development**
 - a. Skills and competencies in this area are primarily developed in the required courses of PSY 200 Life Span Development, PSY 321 Personality, and PSY 424 Abnormal Psychology. **Nine Credits.**
- 3. Applied Psychology**
 - a. Skills and competencies in this area are primarily developed in the required courses of PSY 434 Organizational Psychology and PSY 451 Health and Stress Psychology. **Six Credits.**
- 4. Counseling Theory**
 - a. Skills and competencies in this area are primarily developed in the required course of PSY 406 Counseling Psychology. **Three Credits.**
- 5. Social and Cross-Cultural Psychology**
 - a. Skills and competencies in this area are primarily developed in the required course of PSY 322 Social Psychology. With the exception of PSY 315 Statistics, cross-cultural issues are discussed in all classes. **Three Credits.**
- 6. Psychology as an Integrated System**
 - a. Skills and competencies in this area are primarily developed in the required course of PSY 490 Senior Seminar in Psychology. **Three Credits.**
- 7. Specific Focuses in Psychology**
 - a. Skills and competencies in this area are primarily developed in the three required elective courses in Psychology. **Nine Credits.**

These Program Student Learning Outcomes are operationalized through the syllabi as Course Student Learning Outcomes. In addition, each Psychology Program course syllabi has a linking statement to one or more of the Program Student Learning Outcomes.

Assessment

Program student learning outcomes are assessed individually in specific coursework (course student learning outcomes) and cumulatively in the Capstone Course PSY 490 Senior Seminar in Psychology:

PSY 490 Senior Seminar in Psychology (3). This is a capstone course that collaboratively explores the relationship between the core and elective psychology

courses for students majoring in psychology. This course will guide the student toward developing an understanding of the relationship and application of the course work they have taken in the field of psychology. Students will write a research paper that integrates the core and elective courses relative to a common thread weaving through the field of psychology. Students will also write a paper that examines the relationship between the field of psychology and the five Marianist educational values.

Analysis

The undergraduate Psychology program is consistent with the WASC requirement for having a mission statement that clearly describes its purpose (Standard I, CFR 1.1). The undergraduate Psychology program is consistent with the WASC requirement of developing indicators to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes (Standard I, CFR 1.2). This information is published in the Chaminade University General Catalog.

Action Plan

The Psychology program is currently developing a *Course Syllabi Content Requirement Manual*. This manual standardizes basic requirements for all syllabi including Marianist Educational Values, course student learning outcomes and linking statements. This manual is expected to be completed prior to the start of the Fall 06 term and distributed to all faculty (full-time and adjunct). (CRF 4.3).

Course Evaluation and Learning Outcome

Courses offered by the Psychology Program are available to all students in regard to meeting the General Education requirement, upper division credit requirement, and overall credit requirement at Chaminade University. At the end of each course, all students (majors and non-majors) in the undergraduate psychology classes, both on campus and off campus, fill out the University *Course and Instructor Evaluation Form* (Reliability= .95). The students respond on a 5 item Likert Scale with 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4=agree, and 5= strongly agree. Data on this form has been collected by the university since 2000 up to the current time period. A master university file was developed to include all the results in one file. This master university file is currently being updated to complete 2003-2005 and incorporate 2006. An examination of the Spring 2006 individual *Course and Instructor Evaluation Form* for all psychology faculty indicates the results are consistent with table below. Data on the chart below represent 2000-2005 with 2000-2002 being fairly complete and 2003-2005 being approximately 50% complete.

Overall Evaluation of All Psychology Courses and Instructors by Students 2000-2005

Question	Number of student evaluations	Mean	Standard deviation	% agreeing or strongly agreeing
Course requirements clearly stated	6358	4.54	.728	93.9%
Class time used productively	6312	4.39	.855	87.4%
Instructor consistently well prepared	6330	4.48	.802	90.3%
Academic requirements were challenging	4356	4.46	.781	90.4%
Instructor demonstrated knowledge of subject	6345	4.63	.696	94.2%
Overall quality of instructor's teaching was high	6340	4.42	.886	87.5%
I (student) gained a significant amount of knowledge from course	6354	4.40	.872	87.6%
Overall good course	6356	4.39	.892	87.5%
Recommend instructor's course to other students	6355	4.40	.954	85%

Analysis

The evidence indicates that the overall Psychology course work, student learning and instructors/teaching (CRF 4.6, 4.7), from the perspective of the students, are quite good. Consistent with WASC Standard 2 (the program actively involves students in learning, challenging them to achieve high expectations (CRF 2.5)), the academic requirements in the undergraduate Psychology coursework are clearly viewed as being challenging. Regarding student learning outcomes at the course level, the students indicated they gained significant knowledge and thus, from their perspective, have learned (CRF 4.4, 4.6, 4.7). This being the case it is also clear that

the Psychology Program is effectively contributing to the General Education program, the upper division credit requirement, and the overall credit requirement (Standard 2, CFR 2.2. Guideline: the institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level).

Action Plan

When the university master file is completed and updated, the above table will be revised. It should be noted however, given the large N size, the above results are expected to remain relatively constant (4.3). Consideration will be given to exploring with CUH the possibility of indicating major on the *Course and Instructor Evaluation Form*. This will allow data from the forms to be separated in to psychology majors only, thus giving us a better picture of program performance in these areas. (CRF 4.3).

The only psychology class that is restricted to students majoring in psychology is PSY 490 Senior Seminar in Psychology. This is the undergraduate **Psychology Program’s capstone course** and is the major source of cumulative evidence relative to assessing program student learning outcomes. The data from this class was isolated out from the master file for comparison. The data combines both the day undergraduate program and the evening Accelerated Undergraduate Program (AUP). The **bold** represents the overall psychology course evaluation (all students taking psychology classes).

Comparison of Evaluation of the Psychology 490 Course and Instructors by Psychology Students 2000-2005 with Overall Evaluation

Question	Number of student evaluations	Mean	Standard deviation	% agreeing or strongly agreeing
Course requirements clearly stated	112	4.47/ 4.54*	.968	88.4%/ 93.9%
Class time used productively	112	4.44/ 4.39	.928	85.7%/ 87.4%
Instructor consistently well prepared	111	4.72%/ 4.48	.690	95.5%/ 90.3%
Academic requirements were challenging	112	4.64/ 4.46	.781	91.1%/ 90.4%
Instructor demonstrated knowledge of subject	112	4.77/ 4.63	.696	96.4%/ 94.2%
Overall quality of instructor’s teaching was high	111	4.68/ 4.42	.886	92.8%/ 87.5%
I (student) gained a significant amount of knowledge from course	112	4.54/ 4.40	.872	91.1%/ 87.6%
Overall good course	112	4.41/ 4.39	.892	85.7%/ 87.5%
Recommend instructor’s course to other students	112	4.52/ 4.40	.954	87.5%/ 85%

***Bold indicates Overall Evaluation**

An examination of the Spring Day 2006 Psy 490 class and the Spring Evening AUP Psy 490 class indicates that the results are fairly consistent. In the Spring Evening class one student answered 8 questions with **neutral** and one question (class time used productively) with **disagree**. Given the other students responses to the questions, the responses of the one student in question appear to represent a response pattern, having nothing to do with the actual class or instructor, and thus are suspect. The Spring Evening AUP Psy 490 class results are in **bold**.

Comparison of Spring Day 2006 and Spring Evening (AUP) 2006 Psychology 490 Class

Question	Number of student evaluations	Mean	Standard deviation	% agreeing or strongly agreeing
Course requirements clearly stated	11/ 9	4.73/ 4.67	.467/ .707	100%/ 88.9%
Class time used productively	11/ 9	4.55/ 4.56	.522/ 1.014	100%/ 88.9%
Instructor consistently well prepared	11/ 9	4.73/ 4.67	.467/ .707	100%/ 88.9%
Academic requirements were challenging	11/ 9	4.64/ 4.67	.505/ .707	100%/ 88.9%
Instructor demonstrated knowledge of subject	11/ 9	4.82/ 4.67	.405/ .707	100%/ 88.9%
Overall quality of instructor's teaching was high	11/ 9	4.64/ 4.67	.505/ .707	100%/ 88.9%
I (student) gained a significant amount of knowledge from course	11/ 9	4.82/ 4.56	.405/ .726	100%/ 88.9%
Overall good course	11/ 9	4.82/ 4.67	.405/ .707	100%/ 88.9%
Recommend instructor's course to other students	11/ 9	4.73/ 4.67	.467/ .707	100%/ 88.9%

Analysis

The evidence indicates that the evaluation of the Psychology 490 class course and instructor by psychology students alone are consistent with the Overall Evaluation of all psychology classes by both psychology majors and non-psychology majors. The evidence from the Psychology 490 class indicates that student learning and instructors/teaching (CRF 4.6, 4.7), from the perspective of the students, are quite good. Consistent with WASC Standard 2 (the program actively involves students in learning, challenging them to achieve high expectations (CRF 2.5)), the academic requirements in the Psychology 490 class are clearly viewed as being challenging. Regarding student learning outcomes, which in the case of Psychology 490 must be viewed a cumulative, the students indicated they have gained significant knowledge and thus, from their perspective, have learned (CRF 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

Action Plan

When the university master file is completed and updated, the above table will be revised. It should be noted however, given the large N size, the above results are expected to remain relatively constant. Consideration will be given to exploring with CUH the possibility of indicating major on the *Course and Instructor Evaluation Form*. This will allow data from the forms to be separated in to psychology majors only, thus giving us a better picture of program performance in these areas. (CRF 4.3).

Cumulative Evaluation of Program Student Learning Outcomes

In the capstone course Psychology 490, all psychology students are asked to fill out the *Psychology Program Exit Evaluation* (reliability=.95). Aside from demographic information and three comment questions, the program evaluation survey consists of 31 Likert scale questions. The structure of the Likert Scale is 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4=agree, and 5= strongly agree. The first 18 questions have the cue of “Because of my course work in Psychology at Chaminade University, I am able to demonstrate an understanding of...” The remaining 13 questions have cues such as *allowed me, provide me, and helped me*. Available data is from 2005 and 2006. Given the N size of program evaluations, the data from the undergraduate day and the evening AUP undergraduate psychology program across 2005 and 2006 has been combined to provide an overall evaluation of the psychology program. 22 of the 31 questions that best assess the Psychology Program Student Learning Outcomes have been selected for the following table.

Combined 2005-2006 Day and AUP Cumulative Evaluation of Psychology Program Student Learning Outcomes

Question	Number of Student Evaluations	Mean	Standard Deviation	% agreeing or strongly agreeing
Human Development	47	4.25	.53	95.7%
Dynamics of Social and Cross Cultural Foundations	47	4.14	.72	85.1%
Abnormal	47	4.21	.58	91.5%
Human behavior from a Social Perspective	47	4.34	.52	97.9%
Personality	46	4.21	.55	93.5%
Scientific Method	46	4.15	.69	82.6%
Research	45	4.04	.82	82.2%
Statistics	46	3.67	1.15	67.4%
Critical Thinking	46	4.28	.65	89.1%
Ethics	46	4.45	.62	93.5%
Cross-Cultural Issues	46	4.08	.83	78.3%
Attitudes and sensitivities to relate effectively with others (individuals and groups)	46	4.36	.67	93.5%
Interpersonal skills necessary to relate effectively with others (individuals and groups)	46	4.34	.76	91.3%
Critical Thinking to Relate Effectively with Others	46	4.34	.64	91.3%
Skills and competencies for integrative approach to health and stress management	48	4.29	.65	89.6%
Apply Psychological Principles to Organizational Structures	48	4.00	.74	81.3%
Solid Foundation in Psychology	48	4.27	.67	91.7%
Integrate Sub-Disciplines in Psychology	48	4.33	.55	95.8%
Integrate Marianist Values into Psychology	48	3.98	.97	72.9%
See Relationship between Gen Ed Courses and Psychology Courses	48	4.16	.85	79.2%

Analysis

The cumulative evidence indicates that the psychology majors perceive they have, in general, learned relative to the program student learning outcomes. Relative cumulative strengths are noted in human development, social perspective, personality, ethics, counseling skills, stress management, skill development for

integrating the various sub-disciplines in psychology, and overall solid foundation in psychology. Challenges are noted in statistics and integrating Marianist Values into psychology. (CRF 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

Action Plan

At the 8/15/06 meeting of the psychology department the results of the above analysis will be discussed with the faculty. Challenges will be addressed. (CRF 4.3).

Overall Program Evaluation

As part of the *Exit Evaluation*, students are asked 1) to indicate if they would recommend the overall psychology program and 2) to evaluate the overall program. These two questions will be examined in four tables. The first table will be a combination of the day and evening (AUP) programs regarding overall recommending the program. The second table will compare the day and evening (AUP) programs regarding recommending the program. The recommending the program question is rated on a Likert Scale where 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4=agree, and 5= strongly agree. The third table will be a combination of the day and evening (AUP) programs regarding overall evaluation of the program. The fourth table will compare the day and evening (AUP) programs regarding evaluation of the program. The evaluating the program question is rated on a Likert Scale where 1= poor, 2= below average, 3= average, 4=Good, and 5= excellent.

Combined 2005-2006 Day and AUP Recommending of Overall Psychology Program

Question	Number of Student Evaluations	Mean	Standard Deviation	% agreeing or strongly agreeing
I would recommend the Psychology program at Chaminade to Others	47	4.23	.75	85.1%

Comparison of 2005-2006 Day and AUP Recommending of Overall Psychology Program

Question	Number of Student Evaluations	Mean	Standard Deviation	% agreeing or strongly agreeing
I would recommend the Psychology program at Chaminade to Others	28/ 19*	4.32/ 4.1	.77/ .73	89.3%/ 78.9%

***Bold represents the evening AUP Psychology Program**

Analysis

The overall evidence indicates that the majority of students would recommend the undergraduate psychology program. At the comparative level, 3 of the day students indicated they would not recommend the psychology program while 4 of the evening AUP students indicated they would not recommend the psychology program. Given the data, the day and evening students are viewed as essentially being the same regarding the recommendation of the psychology program. (CFR 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)

Action Plan

At the 8/15/06 meeting of the psychology department the results of the above analysis will be discussed with the faculty. (CRF 4.3).

Combined 2005-2006 Day and AUP Evaluation of Overall Psychology Program

Question	Number of Student Evaluations	Mean	Standard Deviation	% evaluating good or excellent
Overall I would rate the Program	46	4.05	.68	78.3%

Comparison of 2005-2006 Day and AUP Evaluation of Overall Psychology Program

Question	Number of Student Evaluations	Mean	Standard Deviation	% evaluating good or excellent
Overall I would rate the Program	27/ 19	4.05/ 4.05	.62/ .77	81.5%/ 73.7%

***Bold** represents the evening AUP Psychology Program

Analysis

The overall evidence indicates that the majority of psychology students rated the undergraduate psychology program as good or excellent. 100% of the day and evening (AUP) students rated the psychology program as average or better. There were 5 students from the day and 5 students from the evening (AUP) who rated the psychology program as average. Essentially there is no difference in program rating between the day and evening students. (CFR 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)

Action Plan

At the 8/15/06 meeting of the psychology department the results of the above analysis will be discussed with the faculty. (CRF 4.3).

Integrative Capstone Course

The primary source of cumulative direct evidence of program student learning outcomes for the Psychology Program is obtained from **Psychology 490 Senior Seminar in Psychology**. The *WASC Evidence Guide* (2002) notes that a capstone course is an acceptable modality for demonstrating cumulative evidence for program student learning outcomes regarding *knowledge and skills taught throughout the program's curriculum* (p.8). The *Evidence Guide* states

Evidence offered in support of student learning in the accreditation process should not be limited to that of a single course or sub-field of the discipline (**unless the course used as a setting for assessment is designed as an integrative capstone course whose coverage is itself comprehensive** (p. 8).

Relevant evidence.....include the following.....curricular features such as capstone courses or presentations that require students to demonstrate what they have learned in various courses (p.10).

Where does good evidence come from? Assessment results such as.....exercises in capstone courses (p. 18).

The course description of the capstone course in the Psychology program states

PSY 490 Senior Seminar in Psychology (3). This is a capstone course that collaboratively explores the relationship between the core and elective psychology courses for students majoring in psychology. This course will guide the student toward developing an understanding of the relationship and application of the course work they have taken in the field of psychology. Students will write a research paper that integrates the core and elective courses relative to a common thread weaving through the field of psychology. Students will also write a paper that examines the relationship between the field of psychology and the five Marianist educational values.

This course meets WASC requirements for obtaining evidence relative to program student learning outcomes. While the course activities themselves provides a comprehensive and cumulative examination and assessment of the required program coursework relative to program student learning outcomes, the two integrative papers serve as the primary example of direct evidence relative to program student learning outcomes.

42 integrative psychology discipline papers (a research paper that integrates the core and elective courses relative to a common thread weaving through the field of psychology) and 45 Marianst Values papers (a paper that examines the relationship between the field of psychology and the five Marianist educational values) from 2005-2006 were examined by the psychology program coordinator. This examination occurred after the instructor

had assigned grades for the class. There was a considerable range of quality in the papers. Some were quite good while others were certainly problematic. The program learning outcomes, especially the integrative component, were evident.

Analysis

While the capstone class itself and the exercises within the class, especially the two integrative papers, tap into, examine and assess the Psychology Program Student Learning Outcomes, there is still a need for an additional more objective quantitative tool to provide further evidence of Program Student Learning Outcomes. The initial review of the papers also indicated that the majority of the papers available for review were from the evening (AUP) students. A secondary review of the papers by a staff member also indicated that the majority of the papers were from the evening (AUP) program.

Action Plan

A 50 item multiple choice exam assessing program student learning outcomes will be developed and administered to the students in the Spring Day 2007 Psychology 490 class. This same exam will be administered during the first offering in 2007 of the Psychology 490 class to the evening (AUP) students. A rubric and more systematic approach will be developed for evaluating the two papers. In addition, a better tracking and collection system will be developed to make sure that all papers, especially those from the day students, are received and stored in the Psychology program office in a timely manner.

CONCLUSION

The WASC evidence guide indicates that good evidence can be direct or indirect, and qualitative or quantitative (pp. 7, 11, 12, 22). There is considerable indirect evidence indicating that the Psychology Student Learning Outcomes are being met. Evidence has been presented demonstrating that students perceive they are being challenged by their coursework and that they have gained knowledge (student learning outcomes). Evaluation of the Psychology Program instructors and courses is positive. The majority of the Psychology students assessed recommends the Psychology Program and rates it as good or excellent.

The primary source of direct assessment of program student learning outcomes is the capstone course (Psy 490) which is consistent with WASC requirements for obtaining evidence relative to program student learning outcomes. The format of the course, the exercises in the course and the two papers provide evidence relative to program student learning outcomes being met.

A number of action plans were generated from the various analyses of the evidence. The most important one is the creation of a 50 item multiple choice exam to provide further evidence that program student learning outcomes are being met.

This document has been sent to all Psychology full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff for input. It has been shared with members of the CUH WASC Steering Committee, CUH President, EVVP, Assistant to the Provost (Graduate), and Associate Provost (Undergraduate).