Program: MS Experimental Psychology  
Assessment Coordinator: Alex Czopp, Program Advisor

Program Mission:  
The Master of Science in Experimental Psychology program follows a student-centered mentorship model that provides rigorous training and experiences to develop and implement independent, theoretically driven empirical science.

Program Student Learning Goals:  
The faculty and curriculum within the MS in Experimental Psychology are intended to foster:  
A. Advanced understanding of psychological theory  
B. Effective application of research design & quantitative skills  
C. Engagement in independent original research

Program Student Learning Objectives:  
To meet the Mission and Goals, students graduating from the program should be able to:  
1. Identify and evaluate theories, concepts, and processes within neuroscience, cognitive, developmental and social areas of psychology  
2. Design and conduct original psychological research  
3. Analyze and interpret psychological data  
4. Communicate effectively through writing and presenting research

Please respond to the following:  
1. Describe the level of faculty participation on this assessment.  

As program advisor, I developed an initial mission statement, goals, and objectives. I then met with the faculty members of the department’s MS Experimental Psychology Program committee, and revisions were made based on our meetings and discussions. After feedback from Elizabeth Bolan and Ruth Sofield, the goals and outcomes were clarified and again discussed among the committee members.

2. Describe the frequency of evaluating the program SLOs.  

As this is the first year we have established clear SLOs, our initial assessment has been through faculty and student feedback. Student graduating from the program have provided a writted assessment of the extent to which the program accomplished each of the SLOs.
3. How are the assessments meaningfully connected to improvement efforts?

Our program underwent significant changes to our curriculum two years ago. Students graduating this spring are the first cohort to complete the new curriculum. Their feedback is essential to assessing the structure and sequences of courses within the curriculum. For example, students reported that the new scholarship and communication classes were especially helpful in preparing them for proposing their thesis in a timely manner and helping them graduate on time.
**Student Learning Objectives Assessed This Year:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>SLOs Assessed</th>
<th>Results and Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: assessment of written thesis by thesis committee</td>
<td>(list the numbers from above)</td>
<td>Example: Faculty evaluated early thesis drafts using a common rubric. Results indicate that 70% of the students are writing at an adequate level for demonstrating mastery of approaches to data analysis. In response, the 502 course will have a greater focus on nonparametric statistics using data from previous theses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studeng written feedback regarding all SLOS</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td>students reported that the new scholarship and communication classes (PSY 585, 586) were especially helpful in preparing them for proposing their thesis in a timely manner and helping them graduate on time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improvements Implemented Since Last Report:**

This is the first report.
## Graduate Program Self-Assessment Report Rubric

The Graduate Council, in coordination with the University Accreditation and Assessment Advisory Committee (AAAC), will use this rubric in responding to the program assessment reports. Keep these criteria in mind as you complete your report. As part of your Closing the Loop report, please complete a self-assessment using this rubric. Simply circle whether you believe your Student Learning Assessment is at Best Practice, At Standard, Developing, or Unacceptable using the descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Faculty Participation</strong></td>
<td>Broad faculty participation</td>
<td>Select faculty participation with departmental discussion.</td>
<td>Select faculty participation.</td>
<td>Minimal faculty participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency and Meaningfulness of Assessment</strong></td>
<td>1. All degree or program SLOs assessed twice in a 5-year cycle corresponding with the Graduate Council program review schedule. 2. Assessments meaningfully connected to improvement efforts.</td>
<td>1. All degree or program SLOs assessed at least once in a 5-year cycle corresponding with the Graduate Council program review schedule. 2. Assessments meaningfully connected to improvement efforts.</td>
<td>Some SLOs not assessed, but selected SLO assessments meaningfully connected to improvement efforts.</td>
<td>Some SLOs not assessed, and elected SLO assessments not meaningfully connected to improvement efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td>1. SLO assessment includes meaningful direct measures with threshold designations. 2. Indirect measures meaningfully supplement direct measures.</td>
<td>SLO assessment includes 1 meaningful direct measure for each outcome.</td>
<td>SLO assessment includes direct measures but they are not sufficiently meaningful.</td>
<td>No direct measures of student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting Results</strong></td>
<td>Reported results detail meaningful conclusions sufficient to support data-informed and measurable improvements.</td>
<td>Reported results permit actionable improvements but in a manner that is inferential rather than measurable.</td>
<td>Reported results are not sufficiently specific or meaningful to permit data-informed improvements.</td>
<td>No results reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage of Implementation of the Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Improvement is fully implemented; program is prepared to evaluate the effect of the improvement upon student achievement.</td>
<td>Improvement is largely implemented (e.g., proposed curriculum change was approved by the department/college and sent to the Graduate Council/ACC).</td>
<td>Program has a plan for implementing the improvement.</td>
<td>Program has no plan for implementing the improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>