

# End of the Academic Year 2012-2013 – End of This Cycle

## Results & Improvement Plan for Next Year

The template has 9 pages. Please return this completed form with the dean signatures or their E-mail approval(s) copied & pasted in at the end. by **May 10, 2013** to Jessica King in the Valencia Institutional Assessment (VIA) Office ([jking84@valenciacollege.edu](mailto:jking84@valenciacollege.edu)) Please see the VIA website for this form, your plans, and related materials: [www.valenciacollege.edu/via](http://www.valenciacollege.edu/via) --> left tab LOA)

**If you are working on several programs please submit a template for each one; each labeled for the specific program.**

Academic Program / Discipline Area (for General Education) or Co-Curricular Program Area- Psychology				
Planning Team Leader(s) <sup>1</sup>	Campus	E-mail Address	Phone Extension	Mail Code
Note from Planning Team Fall 2011: Please note, with respect to the designation of Planning Team Leaders: The Planning Team came to a consensus that Planning Team Leaders should include representation from each of the three major campuses (East, Osceola, and West). Those selected, or volunteering, for the role of Planning Team Leader are to be a non-tenure track full time faculty members (tenured or four-month). It was the determination of the Planning Team that tenure-track faculty should be encouraged to concentrate on the completion of their ILP.				
Sean P. Jennings	West	<a href="mailto:sjennings6@valenciacollege.edu">sjennings6@valenciacollege.edu</a>	X1072	4-32
Derek Schorsch	East / Winter Park		X2786	3-29
Pierre Lubold	Osceola		X1203	6-2
Planning Team Members <sup>2</sup>	Campus	E-mail Address	Phone Extension	Mail Code
The Planning Team came to the consensus that all tenured, tenure-track, and full-time four-month faculty are considered members of the planning team. As the work being conducted for these Assessment Plans impacts all tenured and tenure-track faculty, they all should play an active role in the work being conducted.				
Debra Hollister	Lake Nona		X7412	7-1
Diana Ciesko	East / Winter Park		X2601	3-29
Eric Model	West		X5105	4-32

<sup>1</sup> Planning Team Leaders assume the responsibility for coordinating activities associated with the expectations for the design, approval and implementation of Assessment Plans.

<sup>2</sup> Planning Team membership, whenever possible, should reflect the ***Principles for selection of members for assessment plan work teams***. For faculty teams the principles include: College-wide representation where possible; Full-time faculty from the respective program / discipline (tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure earning 4 / 8 / 10 month faculty); Adjunct faculty when an adequate number of full-time faculty do not teach in the program / discipline; Faculty from both disciplines or programs when an outcome is assessed in two programs or a program other than the primary discipline. For plans developed in Student Affairs planning teams should include the following: College-wide representation where possible; Staff from the targeted program area; Part-time Student Affairs professionals when an adequate number of full-time staff do not work in the targeted program area; Faculty / staff from other program / discipline areas working on the same or similar outcomes; Students representation when possible.

## Six Items Documenting Results

Please fill in the blue shaded areas with brief sentences. A second page is provided for longer comments.

### Documenting the Assessment Process

1. In a sentence or two, what did you do and who was responsible for coordinating the collection of student artifacts / data?

**We had planned on incorporating adjunct faculty into the existing plan for Fall 2012 and evaluating the whole process in Spring 2013**

2. At what point in the academic year / semester were the student artifacts / data collected? How many students were assessed?

**Artifacts were collected each semester.**

### Improvement Plan and Use of the Assessment Results – Next Year’s Cycle

3. What were your results? (Please e-mail the data and copies of instruments when you submit this form if possible, for example rubric scores in an Excel sheet.) How did this compare with any predictions that you made in the Fall?

**Our methodology was not sensitive enough to yield clear results. Based upon our lack of progress utilizing a single objective measure for all faculty to measure Scientific Reasoning, we determined the results of the process clearly indicated we needed a new approach.**

4. What are the changes / improvements you plan to make within the curriculum (targeted courses), co-curricular program, or student activity over the next year? (Please use the following page if you need more space for your response.)

**The new approach will require a written assignment for all courses.**

5. What changes, if any, will be made to the common course outlines, the catalog, etc.

**There will be no need to change course outlines or the catalog as assessment does not drive the train but rather quantifies what we are already doing.**

### Next Steps – Planning for Next Year’s Cycle— Academic Year 2013-2014 (see below for detailed planning)

6. What are your next steps – acting on the results? (These steps will guide others in the next cycle... moving the process forward.) If these steps include the development and implementation of a new assessment, include that information here. If you plan to change the current assessment or the program learning outcome that you focus on, you will want to do that here.

**We have created a rubric across essential abilities psychology students need to master. The rubric is congruent with APA. The rubric clearly delineates distinct levels of competence from Freshman level through graduate school. The rubric the Valencia faculty will be using will be focused on what we refer to as Lower Division I (freshman) and Lower Division II (sophomore), as those levels reflect the level of our students.**

The purpose of having the full rubric (freshman through graduate) is to demonstrate and reflect where in the process our population of students are and how our assignments are preparing them appropriately to be “transfer ready”. Please see the attached rubrics. Each instructor will be required to create a written assignment that can be evaluated using the rubric. Results will be collected by Derek Schorsch, who will also create a tool the faculty will use to report results as well as manage the database. The rubric will be used for all courses. The Lower Division I (freshman) will be used in General Psychology and Psychology of Adjustment courses as those courses do not require a prerequisite. All other psychology courses require General Psychology as a prerequisite and therefore will use Lower Division II (sophomore) criteria. The current assessment plan is for full-time (tenured, tenure track, and full-time non-tenure earning) faculty to create assignments for the General Psychology course this Fall. During the semester we will introduce and train adjunct faculty on how to create and evaluate assignments. Adjunct faculty will be expected to incorporate the rubric in Spring 2014 for General Psychology and Developmental Psychology. Please note we will now be measuring 2 Learning Outcomes, ‘Scientific Reasoning’ and ‘Information Literacy’ through the use of the rubric. We will be measuring both Learning Outcomes in all courses offered by the Department / Discipline of Psychological Sciences. It is our intention by the Spring of 2014 all General Psychology and Developmental Psychology courses by Psychological Sciences will have measured 2 Learning Outcomes. In the Fall of 2014 all courses shall implement the rubric. Therefore all courses taught by all instructors in the Psychological Sciences will have demonstrated 2 learning outcomes by Fall 2014.

Please include the name of the person completing this page and your program:

Sean P. Jennings

### Additional Space for Comments Reporting on Prior Year (if needed)

3) *If you have additional comments for the following question, please share them here:* What were your results?

**Results were inconclusive due to the flaws of the old instrument.**

4) *If you have additional comments for the following question, please share them here:* What are the changes / improvements you plan to make within the curriculum (targeted courses), co-curricular program, or student over the next year?

**Implementation of new measure.**

6) *If you have additional comments for the following question, please share them here:* What are your next steps – acting on the results? If these steps include the development and implementation of a new assessment, include that information here. If you plan to change the current assessment or the program learning outcome that you focus on, you will want to do that here.

**See above.**

# Planning for AY 2013-2014 Learning Outcomes and Performance Indicators

**Complete only the sections that apply to your work.**

<b>Academic Program / Discipline Area (for General Education) or Co-Curricular Program Area:</b>	
<b>Psychological Sciences</b>	
<b>Targeted Program Learning Outcome(s)</b> <b>(How many will you be assessing this coming year?):</b>  <b>Scientific Reasoning</b>  <b>Information Literacy</b>	<b>Targeted Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity associated with the Academic Program:</b> PSY2012 – Fall 2013, pilot study with full-time faculty only PSY2012 & DEP2004 – Spring 2014, all faculty All courses – Fall 2014, all faculty will use rubric
	<b>Targeted Outcome(s) within the Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity identified above:</b> By Fall 2014 all courses will measure Scientific Reasoning and Information Literacy through the use of a written assignment measured with the rubric.
<b>Performance Indicators for the Program Learning Outcome(s) selected:</b> See rubric	<b>Performance Indicators for Outcome(s) within the Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity selected:</b>
<b>External Standard(s) in the field or discipline</b> (please contact Laura Blasi <a href="mailto:lblasi@valenciacollege.edu">lblasi@valenciacollege.edu</a> with any questions about this): <b>Rubric is congruent with APA and Bloom’s revised taxonomy</b>	<b>See rubric</b>
<b>Common Assessment</b> (What assessment method (written assignment, speech, test, etc.) will you use to assess student ability related to the program / course outcome(s) selected): <b>Faculty will create individualized written assignments based upon rubric</b>	
<b>Description of the Proposed Common Assessment</b> (Common assessments should be designed to ensure a balance between (1) the need for a consistency within the program in order to ensure comparable student artifacts and (2) the need for reasonable flexibility in order to encourage faculty judgment in the design and delivery of learning activities): <b>See rubric</b>	
<b>Proposed Assessment Instrument</b> (In some cases the assessment method may not need an associated assessment instrument – e.g., multiple choice tests): <b>See Rubric</b>	

# Implementation Process

## Collection of Student Artifacts

What information needs to be communicated to students concerning the assessment process (informed consent, etc.)?

**The faculty created written assignment**

How will student artifacts or data associated with student performance be collected?

**Faculty will report needed information to Derek Schorsch. Professor Schorsch will create form to report needed information.**

If student artifacts are to be collected based on a random sample of students registered for the course or participating in the program / activity, what characteristics should the sample include?

**If a random sample is chosen, we will make sure it is representative to the population (population defined as all students taking that particular course).**

How will information about faculty / staff participation in the assessment project be communicated?

**Faculty representative (Derek Schorsch) will create a results update and forward to discipline chairs / campus coordinators. At end of year, assessment cycle, we will communicate how process is working to the appropriate personnel.**

Who will be responsible for coordinating the collection of student artifacts?

**Derek Schorsch**

At what point in the academic year / semester will the student artifacts be collected?

Data will be collected at end of each term, when in the term faculty collect and score their assignments will be up to the faculty member.

### Program Level Assessment / Evaluation of Student Artifacts and Analysis of Results

When will student artifacts be assessed / evaluated?

During the semester at the faculty member's discretion. The results of the semester will be evaluated the following semester after all information has been collected.

Which faculty or staff from the program/discipline will evaluate student artifacts?

All full-time faculty will be involved in assessing the results.

What training / preparation / information will faculty or staff need in order adequately assess / evaluate the student artifacts collected?

The training required will be developed by local psychology faculty.

When will the results / data associated with the assessment plan be analyzed?

Each year in May on Assessment Day.

What are your predictions regarding student performance? (What do you expect to see when you analyze your results?)

We require a baseline prior to any predictions.

What training / preparation / information will faculty or staff need in order to analyze the results data associated with this assessment plan?

None at this time

What additional sources of data might allow faculty / staff to better understand and act on the results of this assessment plan?

**None at this time**

In order to ensure curricular and programmatic alignment, who else should be included in this conversation (e.g., faculty from related discipline areas in General Education)?

**Library Services**

How will the assessment results be disseminated to stakeholders (Faculty, Staff, Advisory Boards, etc.)?

**A summary analysis will be provided to Deans and Institutional Assessment department.**

### Approval Process

Activities Associated with the Approval of Assessment Plans	Completion Date	Person Responsible	Results
Draft assessment plan is circulated for input to reviewers appropriate to the program / discipline (including Deans / Directors responsible for supporting and promoting the work necessary for the implementation of the Assessment Plan)	05/10/2013		
College-wide live or e-mail / Blackboard discussion will be coordinated to consider input received (if needed)	05/03/2013		
Draft assessment plan is revised to reflect input	05/03/2013		

Faculty vote on the Assessment Plan using the Current voter eligibility list for curriculum ( <a href="http://valenciacollege.edu/faculty/forms/voterlists/">http://valenciacollege.edu/faculty/forms/voterlists/</a> )			<b>We do not vote, we gain consensus</b>
---	--	--	--

## Dean / Director Support

The Dean(s) responsible for supporting and promoting the work necessary for the implementation of the Assessment Plan need to indicate their support for the plan. Please copy and paste in E-mail approval (as applies) at the end of the document and then send the form complete to us or obtain, scan, and send handwritten signatures and then send.

Dean / Director East / Winter Park Campus	Signature
Dean / Director Osceola / Lake Nona Campus	Signature
Dean / Director West Campus	Signature

