

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Psychology Major & Minor, 2012-2013**

**Date:** Thursday, May 2, 2013

**Time:** 3:30 – 4:30 PM

**Place:** Laurentide Room 1008

**Attendance:** Provost Beverly Kopper; Dean Mary Pinkerton; Department Chair during self-study Joan Cook; Interim Department Chair Barbara Beaver; faculty and staff in Psychology Carolyn Morgan, Meg Waraczynski, Kim Knesting-Lund, David Havas, Shen Zhang, & Chris Neddenreip; Audit & Review Chair Greg Cook.

- 1) Call to order & introductions.
- 2) Greg commended the department for many strengths noted by the review team, including their strong focus and faculty participation in assessment, demonstrated use of assessment data, emphasis on and campus leadership in assessing critical thinking, increased use of qualitative data (recommended in the last audit and review), and their participation in the campus “Learning by Degrees” project with HLC to test the Degree Qualifications Profile.
- 3) From the Program:
  - a) Joan, Barbara, and others discussed main accomplishments and progress achieved during the review period (2007-2012): assessment as an ongoing and sustainable program for improvement, the graduate program in School Psychology was chosen as the campus nominee for the Board of Regents Teaching Excellence Award for 2013, successful and ongoing searches for new faculty members, psychology scholarships and the psychology club for students, involvement in undergraduate research, students are now enrolling in the Psychological Sciences emphasis, and the department was granted a new FTE faculty line in experimental psychology.
  - b) Barbara discussed main areas where improvement is still desired, including the need to solidify staffing, engaging new staff in strategic planning for the future of the department, and ways to accommodate the growing numbers of students (Fall 2013 courses are nearly all full at this point in registration).
- 4) Discussion of Review Team’s evaluation:
  - a) Program Goals: The group discussed the department’s process for setting goals for the program and monitoring progress toward achievement of the goals. The department discusses goals they want to establish for the annual report (late spring semester), they discuss goals and action steps during their August department retreat, and they systematically discuss and review progress in department meetings throughout the year. The department is considering how to revise and improve the department retreat process. They’ve begun to establish smaller working groups within the department to explore and develop goal topics. They use a D2L site for storing and sharing department documents and projects. [Your work on program evaluation is a commendable area for this audit and review.]

- b) Assessment of Student Learning: The group discussed the department's program to assess student learning in the major. Multiple methods are used including direct, indirect, quantitative and qualitative methods. Department members discussed the local value of using assessment data to improve teaching and learning and the fact that their program seems valuable and sustainable. [Your work on assessment of student learning is an especially commendable area for this audit and review.]
- c) Learning by Degrees DQP project: Greg expressed appreciation for the department's participation in the campus project testing the Degree Qualifications Profile with the Higher Learning Commission. When asked about the utility of the DQP as a tool, department members indicated that the DQP is unnecessarily overwhelming for students and faculty to understand and use. They indicated that LEAP is a strong focus for their department and for the campus, and they don't anticipate using the DQP in many ways except where it already overlaps with or complements LEAP. Department members commented that the Learning by Degrees project was very useful in helping the department reflect on curriculum and other aspects of the program.
- d) Enrollments: Although not required in the self-study, enrollment data were provided in Appendix B, p. 22. Enrollment in the major has increased 40% during the review period, growing from 314 majors in 2007 to 527 in 2012. The number of minors also increased 33%. Courses are already nearly full for Fall 2013. A new FTE faculty position was granted to the department recently, and this will help.
- e) Staffing, Turnover, Future Plans: A new faculty position was added to the department recently, and there are several searches taking place this year.
- 5) Recommended Actions: The evaluation report (below) lists two recommended actions related to use of the advisory board and assessment of student learning.
- 6) Recommended Result: Continuation without qualification (again!).
- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
  - **Next full self-study will be due in October, 2017, but your department's DQP report can be submitted in lieu of the self-study. The next full self-study will therefore be due in Fall of 2022.**
- 7) Adjourn.

**Summary Report**  
**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater**  
**Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies**  
**Undergraduate Programs, 2012-2013**  
**Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Program Psychology Major X Minor X

**Evaluations submitted by:** Linda Yu, Todd Loushine, Jim Kates, Julie Letellier, Greg Cook.

**Review meeting attended by:** Linda Yu, Todd Loushine, Jim Kates, Julie Letellier, Greg Cook (Chair).

## I. Program Purpose & Overview

### A. Centrality

| Criterion                                                                                                                                               | Patterns of Evidence |                       |                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                         | No/Limited Evidence  | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.                                              |                      |                       |                     |
| 2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.                                                                  |                      |                       |                     |
| 3. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant. |                      |                       | 5                   |

Comments:

- The program responded to the recommended actions from the 2007-2008 review, most notably by holding an advisory board meeting (and using their feedback) and by continued improvement in assessment. Several areas of qualitative data are emphasized in the current self-study.

### B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

| Criterion                                                                                                                                                                   | Patterns of Evidence |                       |                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                             | No/Limited Evidence  | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.                                                                                            |                      |                       | 5                   |
| 2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.                                                                                   |                      |                       | 5                   |
| 3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and/making decisions about changes to the program goals.                                                      |                      |                       | 5                   |
| 4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a "vision" for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there. |                      |                       |                     |
| 5. The program achieved or maintained accreditation (if applicable) and/or earned recognition or awards.                                                                    |                      |                       |                     |

Comments:

- Mission statement is clear and concise and addresses the functions of teaching/learning, graduate education, research, and service.
- Specific goals are set annually for the program, and methods for assessing achievement are listed for each goal.
- An annual August retreat is used to discuss potential goals for the program. Subsequent department meetings are used to set goals and monitor achievement of the goals. A plan is established each year, demonstrating a systematic process and commitment to goals. Well done!

## II. Assessment: Curriculum & the Assessment of Students' Learning

### A. Curriculum

| Criterion                                                                                                                                                                                            | Patterns of Evidence |                       |                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                      | No/Limited Evidence  | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).                                                    |                      |                       |                     |
| 2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA.                                                                    |                      |                       |                     |
| 3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.                                                                                                                             |                      |                       | 5                   |
| 4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities. |                      |                       |                     |
| 5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable).                                                                |                      |                       |                     |

Comments:

1. The department offers BA, BS, and BSE majors with several emphases available, along with four minors.
5. Although increased technology (web-enhanced, hybrid, and online) is mentioned in Program Goals (2011-2012) (on pg. 30); I was unable to find any evidence of course offered, or description of how the department plans to develop/administer this goal.

### B. Assessment of Student Learning

| Criterion                                                                                                                                                                                       | Patterns of Evidence |                       |                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                 | No/Limited Evidence  | Some/Partial Evidence | Sufficient Evidence |
| 1. The program has clearly articulated learning outcomes for students; courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes; and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period. |                      |                       | 5                   |
| 2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.                                                                  |                      |                       | 5                   |
| 3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.                                                                                   |                      |                       | 5                   |

|                                                                                                                                                          |  |  |   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes. |  |  | 5 |
| 5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.       |  |  | 5 |
| 6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.                                                 |  |  | 5 |

## Comments:

1. Learning outcomes (objectives) are listed clearly on p. 2. Outcomes are listed in categories of subject matter, cognitive development, and skills—using these categories very effectively. One suggestion is to revise SK2 on searching for information to update the reference to CD-ROM technology.
1. Learning outcomes are aligned with those suggested by the professional organization: American Psychological Association. Outcomes reflect rigor in the program.
2. Are the learning outcomes the same for both majors and minors?
2. Learning objectives are aligned with LEAP ELOs, see p. 36, Appendix D.
2. Sharp focus on Critical Thinking skills seems logical in light of LEAP and DQP initiatives. As you continue this work, it might be useful to incorporate the Advisory Board's emphasis on "strategic thinking" (long-term, goal directed, accounting for potential consequences).
2. The department has a well-designed assessment plan.
4. Multiple methods are used to assess student achievement of the SLOs: an in-house content exam, Psychological Skills Test, Psychological Critical Thinking Exam, course-embedded assessment of critical thinking, evaluations from field training supervisors, a senior exit survey, and several faculty surveys.
4. Department appears to have made significant progress in collecting qualitative assessment data and rendering it in a manner that will have tangible results.
4. Critical thinking is a special focus of assessment efforts, providing data on student learning along several sub-areas of critical thinking. This allows the department to drill into ways to improve specific areas of thinking for students. Impressive!
4. A meeting was held with an advisory board in 2009, informing several changes in the program. When will the next advisory board meeting be held? Your Advisory Board may not need to meet in person again immediately, but do keep them informed and be sure to actively solicit their input. I was impressed by the board's ability to identify important skills for psychology graduates who will work in fields that lie outside most faculty members' experience (e.g. law enforcement).
4. The department took steps to assess student performance on an overall content exam (in-house exam) comparing majors with non-majors (majors performed better), students who took few vs. many psychology courses (those who took more courses did better), and for particular areas in psychology

(students who took courses in the area performed better than those who did not). Conclusions are informed by statistical analyses—good practice. See Appendix G.

4. An interesting finding is suggested on p. 51: students who took psych course at UWW performed better in the course areas than did students who transferred those psychology courses into UWW or took AP credit for the courses. This is an interesting and important aspect to assess and understand.
4. It would be helpful to include the program's student learning objectives in the field training evaluation (Appendix H, p. 78)—at least those SLOs that are most relevant to field training.
5. Faculty discuss assessment data and draw conclusions about both specific areas of learning to improve (e.g., sub-areas within critical thinking) as well as more general aspects of the program (e.g., the limited verticality in the curriculum).
6. I'd like to see more discussion of how assessment results are shared with stakeholders (students, alumni, etc.).

### **III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation**

#### **A. Trend Data**

Comments:

1. Although not required in the self-study, graduation and enrollment data are provided in Appendix B, p. 22. Enrollment in the major has increased 40% since 2007 (314 majors in 2007 to 527 majors in 2012). The number of minors also increased 33%.

#### **Strengths of the Program:**

- A strong focus on assessment and discussion of data among faculty members—toward improvement of teaching and learning.
- Department demonstrates good use of assessment data—closing the loop to improve instruction and the curriculum. A regular, annual process is demonstrated.
- Good faculty cooperation and participation in the assessment process.
- The program emphasizes critical thinking and has developed a strong system to assess and teach CT.
- Assessment plans are developed annually—demonstrating a good systematic and sustainable process. Same for setting annual program goals.
- Both direct and indirect assessment tools are used.
- Curriculum review and improvement
- Qualitative assessment of student learning outcomes
- Establishment and pursuit of excellence
- Participation in DQP project.

#### **Areas for work or improvement:**

- The emphases in the major should be included in the assessment system: define student learning outcomes that are unique to each emphasis, and collect and use data related to these outcomes.
- The field training evaluation instrument would be a good place to include selected student learning objectives.
- Continue to work with the advisory board—there’s been no meeting since 2009.
- It might help to communicate assessment results to alumni and other external stakeholders.
- An advisory board has been established with a clearly defined mission. The program might consider increasing the size of the board.
- More evidence of external assessment.
- Tactical goals/objectives for improving online, hybrid, and web-enhanced courses and/or curriculum.

#### **Other comments/questions:**

- The department’s desire to achieve “verticality” in students’ learning process is admirable, but it might be best to take this process one step at a time, so it does not cause bottlenecks that result in longer time and credits to degree.

#### **Recommended Actions:**

1. Work with the advisory board more frequently for meaningful feedback for the program on mission, student learning, and post-graduation opportunities in graduate school and employment.
2. Continue your excellent and detailed work in assessment of student learning. Continue your focus on an annual plan, emphasizing a system that is systematic, sustainable, and provides data that can be used meaningfully for improvement. Same for setting annual (or regular) program goals. Going forward, your assessment system should also include learning outcomes that are unique to each emphasis in the major, with data collection and use of data. We commend you for your extensive work in assessment and program evaluation.

#### **Recommended Result:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Insufficient information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.
- \* Continuation without qualification.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Continuation with minor concerns.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress reports to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress in addressing the major concerns.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee’s discretion.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee’s discretion.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Non-continuation of the program.

**\*The next full self-study is due 2017-2018. The Psychology Department participated in the “Learning by Degrees” campus improvement project for HLC accreditation during 2012-2013. This project involved extensive assessment of student learning related to outcomes in the Lumina Degree Qualification Profile (DQP), department reflection on how their curriculum aligns with the DQP, and feedback on the DQP framework. It is agreed that the department’s report for the**

**DQP project can be submitted in lieu of their next self-study (due in 2017-2018), per Dean John Stone (accreditation project Chair), Greg Cook (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs), and Joan Littlefield Cook (Psychology Department Chair). The department's next full self-study will therefore be due in Fall of 2022.**