Program Name: Psychology

Individual(s) Completing Report: Nabil Haddad, Greg Machek

Date Submitted: 4/11/2013

Instructions: Use the Educator Preparation System (Click to access E-PAS) to locate Key Assessments for your program. Complete the questions below with the key assessment data. The intent of continuous improvement is to look critically at your key assessment data and be mindful of that data while planning future activities. If you have questions, please contact Trent Atkins (243-4978).

1. Impressions Regarding Assessment Data

- Are your admissions data as you would expect? In no, please explain.
  
  The Psychology Teaching Major and Minor drew 11 students over the last 5 years (2007-2012). The overall GPA of the 11 applicants was well above the TEP criteria, indicating academically capable students are accepted into the TEP. Gender was satisfactorily distributed. One unexpected issue is that two applicants evidenced overall GPAs below TEP published standards, whereas TEP admission’s standards do not note exceptions to their minimum requirement (2.75).

- What strengths and/or weaknesses do you see related to candidates in your program based on an analysis of the Key Assessment data for:
  
  ▪ Content Knowledge data (Key Assessments 1 and 2):
    
    Key Assessment 1
    
    GPA in TPE required courses are generally in line with (a) psychology major average performance and (b) are generally very adequate. The two exceptions seem to be related to the two exceptions noted above: the cohorts entering with below minimum standard cumulative GPAs also evidence below average performance in required Psychology courses.

    Key Assessment 2
    
    GPA for TPE students acquiring a major in Psychology were also generally very impressive, indicating academically capable students. This is of importance given that these TPE students must essentially double major (adding an increased academic burden best taken on by capable students) because the limited demand for Psychology teaching in K-12 settings requires them to attain a second major endorsement outside of Psychology. Again, marginal, yet programmatic and institutionally acceptable scores were attained by the two lower scoring cohorts referenced previously.
Clinical Practice Data (Key Assessment 4, Performance Outcomes 1 & 2):

Key Assessment 4: Performance Outcome 1

Our understanding of the scoring rubric for field experiences indicates that all students were given supervisor ratings indicating competency. However, the rubric used for evaluation is dichotomous ("meets criteria" or "does not meet criteria") leaving little or no room for variability that may be more informative for tweaking instructional experiences or content.

Key Assessment 4: Performance Outcome 2

Our understanding of the scoring rubric for field experiences indicates that all students were given supervisor ratings indicating competency or "high" competency.

2. Describe at least one action activity where you will address the quality, accuracy, or meaningfulness of the results. You may use either Option A (Proposed Actions for Continuous Improvement) or Option B (Continuous Improvement Narrative).

Option A: Proposed Actions for Continuous Improvement

Based on your analyses from above, describe one to three actions your program will engage in to assist the PEU in continuous improvement efforts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Activity</th>
<th>Rational Based on Key Assessment Data</th>
<th>When Activity will be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide further admission standards (e.g. supporting documentation) that would help provide a rationale for acceptance of candidates that do not meet the TEP minimum 2.75 GPA requirement.</td>
<td>Two cohorts did not meet minimum TEP GPA requirements, yet were admitted. These students, collectively, achieved significantly lower on other academic indicators (e.g., Psychology major related coursework) than cohorts that did meet the required benchmark.</td>
<td>Dependent on TEP/Fall, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase variability in force-choiced evaluation scale for FE1.</td>
<td>The dichotomous scale (&quot;meets criteria&quot; or &quot;does not meet criteria&quot;) is not sensitive enough to provide informative feedback for possible programmatic changes.</td>
<td>Fall, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A meeting between the key parties will be scheduled to discuss content knowledge key assessments.
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Option B: Continuous Improvement Narrative

Detail your program plan for one to three improvements based on the analysis of your data. Need more room? Attach any additional information.

Given that we contribute only two courses to this program (Introduction to Psychology and Developmental Psychology), improvements in both offerings will occur pending the yearly assessment we undertake in all our offerings. The information from the scoring rubrics above will be considered at that time and changes in our instruction will be at least partially dependent on this feedback. However, the exact nature of such changes must await our more extensive assessment of these courses which will take into account the performance of the hundreds of students enrolled in these courses, not only the eleven whose data appear in this report.

3. Program Highlights

Based on Key Assessment data and other evidence (press releases, program documents, newspaper articles) please share one to five highlights about your program. Please provide links for external sources where possible:

Questions? Contact Trent Atkins (243-4978, trent.atkins@umontana.edu) or Bill McCaw (243-5395, bill.mccaw@umontana.edu).