

Department: Psychology
 Chair: Dr. Jack McGuire
 Participating Faculty: W. Wooten W. Burroughs, B. Fritzsche, E. Shirkey, G. Stone-Romero

I.E. MEASURES: March 2000

Program Name & CIP Code: Industrial/Organizational, 42.0901 Level: Master of Science

Example of Linkage between Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose,
 Departmental/Program Intended Outcomes/Objectives, Assessment Criteria and Procedures,
 Results, and Use of Results at our University

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose	Departmental/Program Intended Outcomes/objectives	Assessment Instrumentation & Procedures	Assessment Results	Use of Results
<p>The curriculum of the Master's program in Industrial/Organizational Psychology is designed to provide knowledge of the areas of I/O psychology including 1) employee assessment, 2) selection and training procedures, 3) job analysis and 4) research/data analysis, and a review of the current practices and procedures used in the discipline for problem solving in organizations.</p> <p>Criteria include: Completion of coursework with a minimum GPA of 3.0, completion of practicum with a minimum rating of 3.0 on a 5 point scale from academic and onsite supervisors, completion of empirical thesis with unanimous vote from thesis committee, and completion of qualifying examinations with overall grade of B with no more than one grade (out of 4 questions) of B- or less</p>	<p>1. I/O students demonstrate mastery of core I/O knowledge base in both (a) basic content area and (b) non-quantitative content area, receiving a minimum of 3.0 in content area courses, with the objective of 80% of students meeting this criteria.</p> <p>2. I/O students successfully complete an independent thesis research project. 2a.: unanimous approval of the proposal plan, with 80% of students meeting this criterion and 2b.: unanimous approval of the oral defense, with 80% of students meeting this criterion the thesis [1st attempt]</p> <p>3. I/O students demonstrate the ability to apply content and quantitative knowledge in applied settings, (a) producing work products receiving ratings of 3.0 out of 5.0 from academic supervisor, and (b) receiving performance ratings of 3.0 out of 5.0 from onsite supervisors.</p>	<p>1a. Comprehensive examination designed and scored by I/O faculty for non-quantitative subsection.</p> <p>1b. Comprehensive examination designed and scored by I/O faculty for the "quantitative" subsection</p> <p>2a. 3-member faculty thesis committee vote on acceptability of the thesis proposal plan at the thesis proposal meeting.</p> <p>2b. 3-member faculty thesis committee vote on the acceptability of the final oral defense/examination of the thesis</p> <p>3a. Practicum coordinator grades work products against program objectives using 5.0 scale.</p> <p>3b. Onsite supervisor rates student performance and contributions using a behaviorally anchored r five point rating scale.</p>	<p>1a. Ten out of eleven students (91%) sitting for the content examination received satisfactory scores.</p> <p>1b. Eight out of nine students (89%) sitting for the quantitative examination received satisfactory scores.</p> <p>2a. Nine of nine students (100%) defending thesis proposals received "unanimous" or "with minor revision" approval.</p> <p>2b. Ten out of eleven students (82%) defending theses received "unanimous" or "with minor revision" approval.</p> <p>3a. All 13 students (100%) taking practicum presented acceptable works products.</p> <p>3b. All 13 students (100%) received ratings from site supervisors of 4.5 or higher.</p>	<p>1. Objectives 1a and 1b were met. Continue to monitor measures and adjust objectives and criteria upward as necessary. Review curriculum against national standards to identify need to revise or expand content areas. Compare results with other institutions for similar feedback. Provide specific feedback to students and faculty regarding problematic content areas.</p> <p>2. Objectives 2a and 2b were met. Continue to monitor these measures. Provide formal feedback to students regarding thesis process. Monitor objectives at least 1 more review period prior to consideration of replacing objectives.</p> <p>3. Objectives 3a and 3b were met. Review of rating suggest areas of where curriculum content can be made more congruent with applied practicum situations. Continue to monitor measures and share results with participating sites Monitor objectives at least 1 more review period prior to consideration of new objectives.</p>