Assessment Report
July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013

PROGRAM ASSESSED: Department of Psychology Ph.D. in Human Factors and Industrial/Organizational Psychology

ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR: Scott Watamaniuk

YEAR 1 of a 1-YEAR CYCLE

1. ASSESSMENT MEASURES EMPLOYED

   A. Faculty Evaluation. Faculty provided an annual assessment of each student. This assessment described progress towards the expectations that are listed in the statement of outcomes. The letters are produced by the Human Factors and Industrial/Organizational Area Leaders with the area faculty and a final review and approval by the entire faculty and the Graduate Program Director. This ensures consistency across both areas of the program.

   B. Publications/Presentations. A count of the number of journal articles and presentations/posters made at professional meetings was made for graduate students. This count included contributions of both co-authorship and authorship. The information was solicited from graduate faculty and students; it was collated and summarized by the Graduate Program Director.

   C. Course Work. Each semester, graduate students were evaluated in the courses that they completed. The Graduate Program Secretary maintains a record of graduate courses that were completed and the grades that were assigned. In addition to grades, explicit feedback was provided with respect to the learning outcomes. The learning outcomes that were emphasized varied from course to course. For example, some courses included writing projects, some included presentations, some included design projects, etc. Feedback in each course addressed the learning outcomes appropriate for the specific projects.

   D. Program Milestones. Milestones in each student's program of study include: a) first-year research experience, b) master's thesis proposal defense, c) master's thesis final defense, d) qualifying exam reading list approval, e) qualifying exam completion, f) dissertation proposal defense, g) dissertation final defense. There are departmental forms that need to be completed for each of these milestones; students, faculty, committee members, Area Leaders, and the Graduate Program Director are all responsible for filling out, submitting, and approving these forms. The forms are submitted to the Graduate Program
Secretary who keeps the records and summarizes progress towards these milestones.

E. **Employment.** Personal contacts (and trade publications) are used to keep track of employment outcomes. Employment data are obtained directly from graduates (e.g., e-mails/phone calls), advisors, and supplementary sources (e.g., the directory of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society). All members of the graduate faculty staff, faculty, and students contribute.

2. **ASSESSMENT FINDINGS** *(based on 33 out of 59 full- and part-time students)*

A. **Measure 1: Faculty Evaluation.** The results from the faculty assessment of the graduate students showed that virtually all are meeting or exceeding the expectations listed in the statement of outcomes. Only a small number of students were not making good progress and were given clear goals, specific directions, and deadlines for correcting their situation were given in writing to the students.

B. **Measure 2: Publications/Presentations.** A total of 13 journal articles or book chapters were published with graduate students as authors/co-authors. Our graduate students appeared as the lead author in 3 of these publications. Nine of our graduate students were listed as a co-author in these publications.

A total of 38 presentations, posters, or proceedings were completed with graduate students as presenters. Our graduate students appeared as the lead presenter in 25 of these presentations. 24 of our graduate students were listed as a co-author in these presentations and 5 of these graduate students appeared as the lead presenter on one or more presentation.

C. **Measure 3: Course Work.** Each quarter, graduate student grades are evaluated. The program expectations are very high. The average GPA during the assessment period was 3.89 (out of 4) for all students and courses with grades reported.

D. **Measure 4: Program Milestones.** 42 of our graduate students completed at least one major milestone in the assessment period. The program now has 30 students who have completed all master's degree requirements and entered candidacy for the Ph.D. Three students completed the Ph.D., though there are currently 20 students who have passed their qualifying exam and 9 who have successfully defended their Ph.D. proposal. Our expectation is that on average, about six students will complete the Ph.D. each year.
Milestone Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>First-year Research experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Master's Thesis Proposal Defenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Master's Thesis Final Defenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Qualifying Exam Reading Lists Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Qualifying Exams Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dissertation Proposal Defenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dissertation Final Defenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Measure 5: Employment. 33 students either obtained employment in the field or maintained outside employment previously obtained (Arbuckle, Behymer Bennett, Clark, Cooper, Crary, Delgado, Dean, Douglas, Edman, Filipkowski, Gabbard, Garrett, Hoepf, Holt, Kalinoski, Kegley, Kirkendall, Leonard, Mateo, McEwen, McIntire, Meckley, Neriani, Nigam, O’Brien, Riffle, Russell, Robinson, Saffell, Steinke, Winterbottom, Wright).

3. PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

Early in the Spring semester, graduate students completed an online survey (developed by our graduate students in 2011) to assess areas of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the program. The Graduate Program Director and area leaders then met with the graduate students in an informal feedback session and to brainstorm about things we could do to improve the graduate program. Student concerns revolved around issues of 1) communication, 2) funding decisions and identifying internships and job opportunities, and 3) improving student culture by increasing collegiality and interaction amongst current graduate students and faculty, and 4) guidance on classes to take.

We have addressed the communication issue by a) encouraging the students to select an ombudsman early in the Fall semester to provide an anonymous communication channel to program faculty/leaders, b) starting in the summer of 2013, we instituted a mid-year graduate student check-in process whereby all graduate students were contacted by a program leader (director and area leaders) to check on progress and program concerns – this will become a standard practice to take place in early Spring semesters, and c) we discussed establishing a formal mentoring program, and adding a Q&A forum (with a panel of current graduate students) during orientation week for the new graduate students. The funding process, and the uncertainties that the faculty face in terms of grants and contract start dates etc., were communicated to the students and assured students that those on external funding are not at a disadvantage. To enhance the culture, we have re-established our department annual picnic, have offered pizza at our Friday Brown Bag presentations to encourage attendance (which has worked very well), and rekeyed the door to create easier access to a graduate student lounge.
Finally, we have created sample templates of course sequences for a PhD student, in a variety of area specializations, covering 4 years which would allow for the completion of all program requirements, and a comprehensive listing of courses that will be offered (and when) for the next 5 years.

4. ASSESSMENT PLAN COMPLIANCE

The program completed all planned assessment activities.

5. NEW ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENTS

The new focus on assessment of learning outcomes.
Program Level Assessment Report for 2012-2013

A. ACTIONS TAKEN TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING
What actions did you take in 2012-2013, based on previous assessment findings, to improve student learning in your program? (Refer back to plans indicated in “Response to Assessment Findings” in 2011-2012 Assessment Report.)

B. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSED AND EXAMINED
Which Program Level Student Learning Outcomes did you assess and examine during 2012-2013? List the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes using the format of “Graduates will be able to __________________.”

1. Graduates will be able to communicate effectively (orally). Started November, 2013

2. Graduates will be able to communicate effectively (written). To be initiated April, 2014

C. METHODS FOR COLLECTING DATA
Which students were included in the assessment? (For example, all seniors completing Course X in Spring 2013, all graduating seniors, etc.)

All current graduate students in our program were included in the assessment, although some specific assessments were carried out on only a subset of the students.

The oral communication assessment is new and was started late Fall 2013 and included all students who defended their Master’s thesis or PhD dissertation. Students were assessed via a survey filled out by all faculty attending the public defenses. This resulted in only a small number of students being assessed thus far. We will use this assessment tool throughout this academic year and then revisit and modify as needed. The results of this assessment tool will be reported in the report for the next academic program year.

D. ASSESSMENT MEASURES
• What key assessments/assignments/student work did you examine to directly assess the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes listed above?

We developed an assessment instrument that was designed to assess the oral communication skills of students as presented during their public thesis or dissertation defense. Attending faculty were given the survey prior to the start of the presentation to familiarize them with the skills being assessed. These were then collected after the presentation and collated.

• What, if any, indirect assessments (e.g. exit survey, alumni survey, focus groups, etc.) did you use to indirectly assess the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes listed above?
E. **SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS**
What did you find from your assessments? What did your data reveal about how well students are achieving the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes that you listed above?

*These outcomes assessments were not started until November, 2013, and hence there are no data from the 2012-13 academic year.*

F. **DISCUSSION OF RESULTS**
How were results shared? With whom were they discussed?

*We plan on having the entire graduate faculty discuss the results during our annual graduate student evaluation meetings.*

G. **ACTIONS PLANNED TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING**
Based on what you learned from your assessment of the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes, what actions do the faculty in your program plan to take to improve student learning in your program/area? Describe the steps faculty have taken/will take to use information from the assessments for improvement of student performance and the program. List additional faculty meetings or discussions and planned or actual changes to curriculum, teaching methods, approaches, or services that are in response to the assessment findings.

H. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (recommended)**
Please attach minutes of program faculty meeting where discussion of results and action planning occurred and any other relevant documents.

*I have attached the oral communication survey that we developed.*