

## BAAP Annual Learning Results Summary, AY 2016-17

The following table summarizes the assessment of PLOs for the Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology (BAAP) program for assessment cycle (2017). This process is conducted regularly as part of the annual learning results assessments, which measure two or three PLOs for each program each year. This summary report is to be submitted to the EEC upon its completion.

<b>Program</b>	Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology
<b>Assessment Period</b>	Summer 2016 to Spring 2017
<b>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</b>	<p>PLO 3 - Identify and use theoretical frameworks and practical skills for effective critical inquiry and information literacy.</p> <p>PLO 4- Develop professional competencies in applied psychology.</p>
<b>Standards of Success</b>	<p>PLO 3: To measure PLO 3, artifact scores for the APSY 490B Week 6 Practicum Report #3 assignment will be 'Satisfactory' or higher as measured by the writing assignment rubric. Satisfactory equates to an 80% level.</p> <p>PLO 4: To measure PLO 4, artifact scores for the APSY 300 Research Project Part 5 assignment will be 'Satisfactory' or higher as measured by the writing assignment rubric. Satisfactory equates to an 80% level.</p>
<b>Evidence</b>	<p>PLO 3: Sample size: All APSY 490B Week 6 Practicum Report #3; contingent on the number of enrolled students.          Sample size = 14 artifacts (48% of 29 total artifacts)</p> <p>PLO 4: Sample size: All APSY 300 Week 6 Research Project Report; contingent on the number of enrolled students.          Sample size = 26 artifacts (41% of total 64 artifacts)</p>
<b>Assessment Tool</b>	<p>PLO 3: Direct-assessment rubric for evaluating artifact; inter-rater reliability exercise conducted.</p> <p>PLO 4: Direct-assessment rubric for evaluating artifact; inter-rater reliability exercise conducted.</p>
<b>Assessors</b>	Dorie Richards Diane Apegian Shannon Hunt (tie-breaker)
<b>Results</b>	<p>PLO 3: Out of 15 randomly assigned artifacts, 12 passed, 2 failed, 1 was thrown out (wrong artifact pulled)          86% pass rate.</p> <p>PLO 4: Out of 26 randomly assigned artifacts, 11 passed, 15 failed          42% pass rate.</p>

<p><b>Discussion of Results</b></p>	<p><b>PLO 3:</b> There was an 86% consistency between Assessor 1 and Assessor 2. This demonstrates a high correlation between the two scorers, indicating that this direct method of assessment was standardized properly.</p> <p>Students are able to effectively apply practical skills in a direct service setting and display effort in research and application of information in order to best serve identified populations. These results emphasize that the practicum experience is an effective culmination of students' overall course work. While the artifacts were strong in identification and use of practical skills, critical inquiry, and information literacy, the theoretical application lacked depth.</p> <p><b>PLO 4:</b> There was an 65% consistency between Assessor 1 and Assessor 2, indicating an above average correlation and that the inter-rater reliability is valid; however clarification may be needed in the rubric or assessment process.</p> <p>All assessors concur that the amount of course content related to the research process did not provide enough of a foundation for students to effectively complete a research proposal based on NIH and IRB standards.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Changes</b></p>	<p><b>PLO 3:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) PLO 3 be re-worked so that these three specific learning objectives are not combined in one PLO. It is probable that one of the learning objectives could be grouped in another PLO, or another PLO created all together.</li> <li>2) Instructions for the practicum report be reviewed and edited in order to guide students towards appropriate integration of theoretical principles as it relates to the skills used during direct service.</li> </ol> <p><b>PLO 4:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Incorporate more course content explaining the research process and how it articulates to a research proposal. Audio and/or video explanation may better articulate the process and expectation for learners.</li> <li>2) Including an appropriate sample research proposal will be an effective guide for students.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Rationale for Proposed Changes</b></p>	<p><b>PLO 3:</b> Of the three criteria stated above (practical skills, information literacy, theoretical frameworks), the artifacts had a tendency to lack content related to theoretical frameworks. Since the students excelled in the other areas, it seems apparent that instructions need to better clarify the requirements regarding theoretical application. *Note, 490B was recently refreshed and this change has already been integrated. The updated course was launched in Spring 2 2018.</p> <p><b>PLO 4:</b> According to the results measured against the performance levels of an 80% minimum pass rate for this criterion, the evidence demonstrates that the PLO 4 for ASPY 300 was not met. Providing more thorough articulation of the research and proposal process for learners will create a proper foundation of understanding in order to guide learners towards effective demonstration and outcomes of the research process and proposal.</p> <p>There were a number of missing required components in the artifacts. Providing an appropriate sample of the assignment in the course creates a visual guide for students. This can assist students in identifying correct steps to take in the research process and necessary content in</p>



	<p>the proposal. The overall outcome can lead to successful achievement of PLO 4, as well as successful comprehension of the assignment, research process, and articulation of content within the proposal.</p>
<b>Financial Resources Required</b>	<p>PLO 3: Since this course was recently refreshed and launched in Spring 2 2018, there is no need to hire an SMC to make edits to the course, therefore no financial obligation is required. If identified as a next step, drafting a new PLO/edits to the current PLO will be conducted among in-house faculty and administration.</p> <p>PLO 4: Minimal, included in normal course revision budget.</p>
<b>Annual Learning Report Approved</b>	<p>June 6, 2018</p>
<b>Follow Up (Closing the Loop)</b>	<p>For the BAAP 2015 Annual Assessment, the recommendation has been to revise APSY 475, so that it builds a stronger foundation with the concepts, has clearer instructions for the assignments and develops the writing skills of the students. APSY 475 is on the waiting list for a course revision but has been pushed back due to other BAAP courses that are in need of revisions first.</p>