1. Select Your Department	Behavioral Science
2. Has the program's purpose, SLOs, or program review year changed from the above document?	No
Upload the edited Purpose/SLO doc here.	app.captainform.com/upload_dld.php?fileid=e170d66f26b1ce164cf97f17625779bf
3. Will/did the department submit a program review this year? If yes, please attach the final review as a pdf document.	No
Upload program review pdf.	app.captainform.com/upload_dld.php?fileid=fc84330684d7401965850e713a45b161
1. Please select the type of direct evidence of student learning that was gathered THIS YEAR.	
-Capstone work product (e.g. written paper, presentation, research)	yes
Please describe any other direct evidence gathered this year	Student senior project rubric scores.
2. Please select the type of indirect evidence of student learning that was gathered THIS YEAR.	
-Interviews or focus groups that contain self-reports of SLO achievement	yes
-Alumni survey that contains self-reports of SLO achievement	yes
3. Please select how the evidence was evaluated, analyzed, or interpreted.	
-Used a rubric/scoring guide	yes
-Used qualitative methods on interview, focus group, open-ended response data	yes
Please describe any other methods not listed:	Please attached data sheet based on information from interviews with our students in PY/SO 474 and PY/SO 475. In addition, see transcription of interviews with alumni about internship exeriences.
4. Enter the number of students assessed for each SLO.	9
5. Summarize the results of the assessment activities including the percentage of students that met or exceeded each SLO and a list of student learning strengths and weaknesses.	Attachments provide detailed summaries. In regard to senior projects we edited the entire manual based on feedback from our seniors and moved up the date of advisor assignments. From our alumni we found that it was difficult to find an accurate list of who had done an internship or not. Some students had done internships for zero credit and were supervised by a former career services director. One faculty member who retired supervised several but there are no records. From this we have made appointed one member of the department to be the point person for all internships. In addition, all supervising faculty will make at least one site visit for each internship.
6. Please upload any supporting documentation (i.e. rubrics, data analysis, charts/tables, department minutes, etc.)	app.captainform.com/upload_dld.php?fileid=64e12b546a12d79f75b73f169e31884d
7. What describes how the program plans to use the results?	
-Assessment procedure changes (SLOs, curriculum map rubrics, evidence collected, sampling, communications with faculty, etc.)	yes
-Personnel or resource allocation changes	yes
Please describe any other uses not listed:	In regard to internships we reached three conclusions: 1. One faculty person volunteered to serve as the point of contact for all internships. This does not mean that this person will supervise all internships but all faculty will report internships that they are supervising to him on a semester by semester basis. 2. We need to develop a list of department specific questions for students to answer at the end of the internship. This is in process. 3. Advisors should make at least one site visit when feasible (sometimes students do internships out of state) and record their observations. In addition, we noted that it is almost impossible for our transfer students to be involved in an internships and grade in a timely fashion. We do not see this as an issue we can solve. In relation to our senior projects, based on student feedback, over the summer we revised the entire manual. Again, based on student feedback we assigned the primary supervising faculty earlier than we had done so last year. All but one student made the deadline of a completed IRB proposal. All are in the process of revision.

6. Is the department interested in learning how to apply for an assessment grant?	No
1. The department will submit a program review NEXT YEAR.	No
2. SLO(s) the department will assess NEXT YEAR is/are:	The general education SLO: understand themselves, others, and how individuals interact within social systems.
	While we know that the Assessment Committee has gotten tired of our emphasis on the senior project, we feel this is the best way to assess the quality of our program. This year we have a highly diverse group of 16 students and we are collecting information on all of them to assist our next year's group.
	Note: We will also reassess the same SLO as last year using the same methods.

3. Please select the type of direct evidence of student learning the department plans to use NEXT YEAR.

-Capstone work product (e.g. written paper, presentation, research)	yes
Please describe any other direct evidence planned for next year:	General education performance task with a rubric. At least 85% of majors will meet or exceed the basic performance level.
	Also, we will continue to use the rubric to assess student outcome. It is our expectation that 85% of students will meet or exceed expectation.

4. Please select the type of indirect evidence of student learning that was gathered NEXT YEAR.

-Interviews or focus groups that contain self-reports of SLO achievement	yes
Please describe any other indirect evidence planned for next year:	We will do a mid-year and an end of year focus group with our seniors to find out what works and how we can be of help to them.
5. Based on previous assessment data, what percentage of students does the department expect to meet or exceed the SLO(s)?	85

Assessment Work Day
February 28, 2017

The department met to review our annual assessment plan and activities. We did hold a lunch for our students in PY/So 474 and asked for their insights into what worked for them and what did not work as well. Some things students mentioned included:

Indirect Assessment:

- Having different professors reading assignments early in the semester made it somewhat confusing as to what exactly the expectations were for the assignments. Things one person recommended were not considered necessary by another professor. We are aware this is a problem but do not have a really good solution. Until projects are better defined by the student we have no idea who the advisor for the project will be.
- Every one seemed on track until the first week of November and then just about everyone seemed extremely stressed and people started to miss deadlines.   Students suggested that the problem was not with the structure of the course but with their own schedules. Near the end of the semester other classes demand more of their time, fall sports are coming to an end or going into tournament play, and they procrastinate.   We pressed them on this point but did not get much more feedback other than we need to hold their feet to the fire which is difficult when they skip class because they do not have their work completed. We need to discuss this in the spring.
- We observed that students are not using the notebooks as much as we would like during the fall semester. Again, we need to address this in the fall. One thing we did put into place was to attach a fee to the class which will cover the cost of the binder and materials.
- Outcomes: Nine out of ten students met or exceeded expectations. The tenth student did not complete the senior project and will retake the course next spring.

Our 2016-2017 Assessment Plan is geared toward our SLO related to internships. As we looked at it today we realized that we really haven't done much on it. Today, we gathered as many students as we advised between 2012-2017 to create a list of advisees that have taken either PY 388 or SO 388. We have asked the registrar to provide us with a list of students who have enrolled in either of these classes as well. We hope through this process all students will be identified. The next step is to contact the director of Career Services to gather data for our direct assessment method which is employer ratings for the students. At a later meeting this spring we will need to discuss how we plan to gather evaluation information from our alums.

Two issues we have noted thus far:

- Students seem to be able to enroll in Internships without faculty knowledge.
- Few transfer students especially junior level transfers do not seem to be able to fit internships into their schedule if they want to graduate on time.

20 students were identified as having taken PY 388 or SO 388.

Career Connections Final Performance Appraisal (Internship)

This form should be completed by the student's direct supervisor at the conclusion of the internship.

Student: Employer:
Direct Supervisor: Date of
Review:

Rating Criteria

Unsatisfactory/(1) Strong Disagree: Student does not appear to understand requirements and does not meet standards

Basic/(2) Disagree: Student meets minimum standards of requirement. Demonstration of understanding is intermittent and/or not entirely successful.

Proficient/(3) Agree : Student clearly understands the requirements and consistently demonstrates ability to meet standards.

Distinguished/(4) Strongly Agree: Student demonstrates understanding of requirements and often exceeds requirements.

Not Observed: Standard was not observed.

	U/1	B/2	P/3	D/4	N/O
Program Outcome 3: During the internship, the student develops a better understanding of his/her professional opportunities through new experiences and relationships.					
Recognize other areas of employment within a company and industry					
Develop relationships with industry professionals and/or company leaders					
Program Outcome 4: During the internship, the student demonstrates professional performance and behaviors.					
Demonstrate an effective use of time and ability to handle multiple duties					
Demonstrate an ability to think critically, problem solve and work well with others					
Report to work on time and remain on task throughout the work day					
Demonstrate an understanding of professional workplace attire					

Career Connections Student Experience Assessment (Internship)

This form is to be completed by the student at the conclusion of his or her internship.

Student:
Employer:
Dates of Internship: **Semester of Internship:**
Workplace Supervisor:

Ranking Criteria
1 = Strongly Disagree   2 = Disagree   3 = Agree   4 = Strongly Agree N/A = Not Applicable

	1	2	3	4	N/A
Overall:					
I achieved my goals for the internship					
I was prepared for the internship					
I enjoyed the experience					
I felt the experience was beneficial					
The internship helped me in my professional goals					
I would recommend this employer for future internship opportunities					
Work Environment:					
The organizational structure was clear					
I had access to the necessary materials and equipment					
I felt valued and respected					
Interaction:					
My ideas and suggested were accepted and valued					
Co-workers showed support and provided feedback when necessary					
Support and Feedback:					
I had the opportunity network with co-workers outside of work					
I received adequate support from my supervisor					
My co-workers were friendly and helpful					
I had the opportunity to learn about other aspects of the company and industry					
I was able to meet and network with company					

Overall evaluation of the internship: (Please check one)
Superior   Excellent   Satisfactory   Unsatisfactory
Student's Signature

RUBRIC FOR SENIOR THESIS

(PY 475/SO 475)

I. Introduction: Up to 20 points

	Excellent	Proficient	Basic	Unsatis-factory
Title Page: Title, author's name, institutional affiliation				
Abstract: one paragraph summary of thesis				
Introduction: Presents a clear statement of the problem/ purpose				
Describes the significance of the problem				
Writes an engaging introduction directed toward thesis				

II. Literature Review: Up to 20 points

	Excellent	Proficient	Basic	Unsatis-factory
Uses enough scholastic sources (at least 10 articles/books)				
Relevance of sources to the problem/topic				
Effectively analyzes and evaluates the existing literature; not simply summarizes.				
Demonstrates reviewed information consistently related to thesis: relationship of the problem to previous research				
Uses correct citing format				

III. Hypothesis: Up to 8 points

	Excellent	Proficient	Basic	Unsatis-factory
Defines concepts or variables : independent and dependent variables are distinguished				
Clearly states the hypotheses selected for test (null and alternative hypothesis)				

IV. Research Design and Data Collection: Up to **16** points

	Excellent	Proficient	Basic	Unsatis-factory
Describes research subjects/population				
Describes research design (survey, experiment, field observation, etc.)				
Reports apparatus/instruments (scale, index, etc.)				
Describes procedures (Could someone replicate your research ?)				

V. Research Findings: Up to **8** points

	Excellent	Proficient	Basic	Unsatis-factory
Describes and analyzes research results (appropriate use of tables, graphics, etc.)				
Compares research results with previous research				

VI. Discussion and Conclusion: Up to **8** points

	Excellent	Proficient	Basic	Unsatis-factory
Contains thesis and summary				
Discusses research implications with regard to theory and possible limitation of research				

VII. Reference and Appendix: Up to **8** points

	Excellent	Proficient	Basic	Unsatis-factory
Reference: uses correct format, lists all sources cited within text				
Appendices: a copy of consent form, questionnaire, and transcripts (interview)				

VII. Style: Up to **20** points

	Excellent	Proficient	Basic	Unsatis-factory
Overall Quality: Challenging, creative, logical				
Format: follows APA style or ASA style				
Thesis Organization: follows the format, margin, paging, binding, etc.				
Clarity: clear and coherent paragraphs				
Conventions: grammar/spelling/punctuation				

Rating Descriptions [From WAART]

■ **Excellent**

The student demonstrates an exemplary understanding of underlying concepts and practices them with exceptional skill. This student's work has some quality that makes it really stand out.

■ **Proficient**

The student clearly understands the underlying concepts and does a good job of putting them into practice, consistently and effectively.

■ **Basic**

The student appears to understand underlying concepts and attempts to put them into practice in the assignment, but this attempt is intermittent or not entirely successful. Additional experience and guidance may help the student develop this skill.

■ **Unsatisfactory**

The student does not appear to understand the concepts underlying the activity. The student needs to work on fundamental practices in order to grow in this area.

Assessment Work Day
February 28, 2017

The department met to review our annual assessment plan and activities. We did hold a lunch for our students in PY/So 474 and asked for their insights into what worked for them and what did not work as well. Some things students mentioned included:

Indirect Assessment:

- Having different professors reading assignments early in the semester made it somewhat confusing as to what exactly the expectations were for the assignments. Things one person recommended were not considered necessary by another professor. We are aware this is a problem but do not have a really good solution. Until projects are better defined by the student we have no idea who the advisor for the project will be.
- Every one seemed on track until the first week of November and then just about everyone seemed extremely stressed and people started to miss deadlines.   Students suggested that the problem was not with the structure of the course but with their own schedules. Near the end of the semester other classes demand more of their time, fall sports are coming to an end or going into tournament play, and they procrastinate.   We pressed them on this point but did not get much more feedback other than we need to hold their feet to the fire which is difficult when they skip class because they do not have their work completed. We need to discuss this in the spring.
- We observed that students are not using the notebooks as much as we would like during the fall semester. Again, we need to address this in the fall. One thing we did put into place was to attach a fee to the class which will cover the cost of the binder and materials.
- Outcomes: Nine out of ten students met or exceeded expectations. The tenth student did not complete the senior project and will retake the course next spring.

Our 2016-2017 Assessment Plan is geared toward our SLO related to internships. As we looked at it today we realized that we really haven't done much on it. Today, we gathered as many students as we advised between 2012-2017 to create a list of advisees that have taken either PY 388 or SO 388. We have asked the registrar to provide us with a list of students who have enrolled in either of these classes as well. We hope through this process all students will be identified. The next step is to contact the director of Career Services to gather data for our direct assessment method which is employer ratings for the students. At a later meeting this spring we will need to discuss how we plan to gather evaluation information from our alums.

Two issues we have noted thus far:

- Students seem to be able to enroll in Internships without faculty knowledge.
- Few transfer students especially junior level transfers do not seem to be able to fit internships into their schedule if they want to graduate on time.

20 students were identified as having taken PY 388 or SO 388.