IPP Learning Outcomes Report

Program: Psychology MA Program, Industrial-Organizational (I-O) Option

Department: Psychology

Number of students enrolled in the program in Fall, 2011: 15 (Appendix A)

Faculty member completing template: Rachel August and Greg Hurtz Date: 1/25/12

Period of reference in the template: 2006-07 to present

1. Please describe your program’s learning-outcomes trajectory since 2006-07: Has there been a transformation of organizational culture regarding the establishment of learning outcomes and the capacity to assess progress toward their achievement? If so, during which academic year would you say the transformation became noticeable? What lies ahead; what is the next likely step in developing a learning-outcomes organizational culture within the program?

[Please limit your response to 200 words or less]

The Industrial-Organizational Option has recently been shaped by the Psychology Department Self Study (2006), the Psychology Department Program Review (2007), and ongoing assessment initiatives (2007-present). The organizational culture consequently developed has become a more purposeful one, with greater focus on training students toward more specific program outcomes. We have begun to use more specific measurement tools, both for the I-O option and department-wide, to assess those outcomes. We see two immediate steps in the near future: (1) continued development of methods and instruments to assess learning outcomes, and (2) tightening the feedback loop between data collected via assessment and any needed program change.

2. Please list in prioritized order (or indicate no prioritization regarding) up to four desired learning outcomes (“takeaways” concerning such elements of curriculum as perspectives, specific content knowledge, skill sets, confidence levels) for students completing the program. For each stated outcome, please provide the reason that it was designated as desired by the faculty associated with the program. [Please limit your response per outcome to 300 words or less]

a) Competence in Acquiring, Reviewing, and Evaluating Information from the Psychological Literature. Competence in acquiring, reviewing, and evaluating information from the psychological literature is one of the areas identified as an I-O Option student learning objective. This objective is a primary value because all professionals working in the field of I-O must be able to make decisions about organization scenarios, and identify key features of those scenarios, based on solid scientific evidence found in the I-O psychology literature. Without knowledge of such literature and the ability to evaluate it, I-O professionals run the risk of making poor decisions for organizations. This could have negative ramifications for the organization, much less create legal problems for the I-O professional.
b) Competence in Generating and Articulating Research Problems and Designing Sound Research Studies. Competence in generating and articulating research problems and designing sound research studies is one of the areas identified as an I-O Option student learning objective. This objective is a primary value because professionals working in the field of I-O must frequently design research studies in order to create effective interventions for organizational change, evaluate training programs, and assess issues of fairness and equity in personnel matters (e.g., recruiting, selection, promotions). It is essential that we train our students, who will ultimately become I-O professionals, with these skills so that the research studies they design in professional settings are valid and reliable.

c) Competence in Analyzing and Interpreting the Results of Data and Drawing Inferences and Conclusions from Empirical Results. Competence in analyzing and interpreting the results of data and drawing inferences and conclusions from empirical results is one of the areas identified as an I-O Option student learning objective. This objective is a primary value because organizations rely on I-O psychologists to make sound recommendations for organizational change and interventions based on data collection and analyses. I-O students in training must master this skill in order to provide useful information to the organizations for which they ultimately work.

d) Competence in Writing Psychological Reports and Giving Professional-level Oral Presentations. Competence in writing psychological reports and giving professional-level oral presentations is one of the areas identified as an I-O Option student learning objective. This objective is a primary value for the program because professionals in the field of I-O regularly provide organizations with written feedback on research conducted in reference to organizational needs. In addition, I-O professionals regularly provide oral feedback to organizational officials about the findings of research conducted in reference to organizational needs. Students require this competency to meet the needs of the profession they will ultimately enter.

3. For undergraduate programs only, in what ways are the set of desired learning outcomes described above aligned with the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals? Please be as specific as possible. [Please limit your response to 400 words or less]

N/A

4. For each desired outcome indicated in item 2 above, please:
   a) Describe the method(s) by which its ongoing pursuit is monitored and measured.
b) Include a description of the sample of students (e.g., random sample of transfer students declaring the major; graduating seniors) from whom data were/will be collected and the frequency and schedule with which the data in question were/will be collected.
c) Describe and append a sample (or samples) of the “instrument” (e.g., survey or test), “artifact” (e.g., writing sample and evaluative protocol, performance review sheet), or other device used to assess the status of the learning outcomes desired by the program.
d) Explain how the program faculty analyzed and evaluated (will analyze and evaluate) the data to reach conclusions about each desired student learning outcome.

[Please limit your response to 200 words or less per learning outcome]

1) Competence in Acquiring, Reviewing, and Evaluating Information from the Psychological Literature (AYs: 2007-Present, e.g., http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/Reports/07-08/07-08%20Psychology.pdf). This is an ongoing annual assessment project.
   a. Methods. I-O graduate student thesis/projects are reviewed by committee members who rate the students on two dimensions (Literature Review, Presentation of Context for Thesis/Project).
   b. Sample. N=27 I-O master’s students with ratings from 1-3 thesis committee members (N=61 ratings).
   c. Instruments. Competence in Acquiring, Reviewing, and Evaluating Information from the Psychological Literature are part of an instrument that assesses nine dimensions of the program’s missions and goals that are rated on a 4-point Likert scale where 1=Below Minimal Competence, 2 = Minimal Competence, 3=Satisfactory Competence, and 4=High Level of Competence (Appendix B).
   d. Analysis and Conclusions. Means = 3.63 and 3.60 for Literature Review and for Presentation of Context, respectively, showing that students performed well in the early stages of the research process. The program has been successful in having students achieve program learning goals in areas of knowledge, explanatory skills and research skills.

2) Competence in Generating and Articulating Research Problems and Designing Sound Research Studies (AYs: 2007-Present, e.g., http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/Reports/07-08/07-08%20Psychology.pdf). This is an ongoing annual assessment project.
   a. Methods. I-O graduate student thesis/projects rated by committee members on Description of Research Problem/Purpose and Methodology Addressing Problem/Purpose for Thesis/Project.
   b. Sample. N=27 I-O master’s students with ratings from 1-3 thesis committee members (N=61 ratings).
   c. Instruments. Competence in Generating and Articulating Research Problems and Designing Sound Research Studies are part of an instrument that assesses nine
dimensions rated on a 4-point Likert scale where 1=Below Minimal Competence, 4=High Level of Competence (Appendix B).

d. Analysis and Conclusions. Means for two areas ranged from 3.65 (Description of Research Problem/Purpose) to 3.40 (Methodology Addressing Problem/Purpose), showing that students performed well in the middle stages of research process. The program has been successful in having students achieve program learning goals in areas of knowledge, explanatory skills and research skills.

3) Competence in Analyzing and Interpreting the Results of Data and Drawing Inferences and Conclusions from Empirical Results.

a. Graduate Thesis/Project Ratings (AYs: 2007-Present, e.g.,
   1. Methods. Ongoing ratings of student theses/projects by 1-3 committee members.
   2. Sample. N=27 master’s students with ratings from 1-3 thesis committee members (N=61 ratings).
   3. Instruments. Competence in Analyzing and Interpreting the Results of Data and Drawing Inferences and Conclusions from Empirical Results are part of an instrument that assesses nine dimensions of the program’s missions and goals rated on a 4-point Likert scale where 1=Below Minimal Competence, 4=High Level of Competence (Appendix B).
   4. Analysis and Conclusions. Means ranged from 3.39 (Data or Conceptual Analysis) to 3.43 (Conclusion Drawn from Analysis), showing that students performed well in the later stages of the research process.

b. Research Conference Poster Ratings (AY 2011-12 Annual Assessment project)
   1. Methods. Student authored APA-style research posters accepted to the 2011 Psychology annual research conference rated by faculty.
   2. Sample. N=24 sets of research poster ratings by 8 FT faculty. Advanced undergraduate and graduate students often were co-authors on the same poster, making it impossible to separate undergraduate and graduate work.
   3. Instruments. The Psychology Inquiry and Analysis VALUE rubric was used to rate Topic Selection, Design Process, Analysis and Conclusion on a 4-point Likert scale where 1=Benchmark, 2 & 3=Milestone and 4=Capstone (Appendix C).
   4. Analysis and Conclusions. Means in the 3.3 to 3.4 range corresponded to the high end of the milestone category for all dimensions of the rubric for research posters. Thus, student performance was of outstanding quality. Future assessment will include a procedure for differentiating undergraduate from graduate work when possible.
4) **Competence in Writing Psychological Reports and Giving Professional-level Oral Presentations (AYs: 2007-Present, e.g., [http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/Reports/07-08%20Psychology.pdf](http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/Reports/07-08%20Psychology.pdf).** This is an ongoing annual assessment project. Students will learn to write psychological reports and give professional-level oral presentations at a professional level.

a. **Methods.** Ongoing assessment of I-O graduate students who are observed during their oral defense of their culminating project and their thesis/project is reviewed by their committee members who rate the students on three dimensions (Writing of Thesis/Project, Oral Presentation of Work, and Responses to Questions during the Oral Defense for Thesis/Project).

b. **Sample.** N=27 I-O master’s students with ratings from 1-3 thesis committee members (N=61 ratings).

a. **Instruments.** *Competence in Writing Psychological Reports and Giving Professional-level Oral Presentations* is part of an instrument that assesses nine of the department’s missions and goals that are rated on a 4-point Likert scale where 1=Below Minimal Competence and 4=High Level of Competence (Appendix B).

b. **Analysis and Conclusions.** Means ranged from 3.58 (Writing of Thesis/Project) to 3.54 (Oral Presentation of Work) to 3.33 (Responses to Questions). Results showed that students performed well in the later stages of the research process.

5. Regarding each outcome and method discussed in items 2 and 4 above, please provide examples of how findings from the learning outcomes process have been utilized to address decisions to revise or maintain elements of the curriculum (including decisions to alter the program’s desired outcomes). If such decision-making has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur.

**[Please limit your response to 200 words or less per item]**

a) **Competence in Acquiring, Reviewing, and Evaluating Information from the Psychological Literature.** This assessment effort is ongoing and informs the instruction of core I-O courses. No clear problems have been identified in the I-O Option related to competencies in this area, as means related to this outcome are relatively high (approximately 3.6 out of 4.0). To ensure this competency continues to be met, the I-O faculty meet regularly as well as exchange syllabi to ensure that core I-O courses continue to include current and relevant literature in our courses.

b) **Competence in Generating and Articulating Research Problems and Designing Sound Research Studies.** This assessment effort is ongoing and informs the instruction of I-O students engaged in the thesis process. No clear problems have been identified in the I-O Option related to competencies in this area, as means related to this outcome are relatively high (approximately 3.4 – 3.6 out of 4.0). The I-O faculty aim to continue meeting this competency using the strategy currently in place of holding meetings with thesis students and their
committee members prior to the start of data collection for the thesis. The intent of this meeting is to ensure that the proposed research design is sound and should pose no problems with regard to data collection.

c) Competence in Analyzing and Interpreting the Results of Data and Drawing Inferences and Conclusions from Empirical Results. This assessment effort is ongoing and informs the instruction of core I-O courses. No clear problems have been identified in the I-O Option related to competencies in this area, as means related to this outcome are relatively high (approximately 3.4 out of 4.0). The I-O faculty continue to use a strategy of regular feedback to thesis students related to thesis data analysis and interpretation as a way of achieving this competency. Each student meets with his or her thesis adviser to obtain feedback multiple times during the period of writing the thesis proposal, collecting data, and writing the final thesis. This strategy ensures that students develop these competencies prior to defending their theses and entering the professional world.

d) Competence in Writing Psychological Reports and Giving Professional-level Oral Presentations. This assessment effort is ongoing and informs the instruction of core I-O courses. No clear problems have been identified in the I-O Option related to competencies in this area, as means related to this outcome are relatively high (approximately 3.3 – 3.5 out of 4.0). The I-O faculty continue to focus on this competency by maintaining the requirement in I-O core courses to provide written psychological reports as well as provide professional-level oral presentations, to ensure that all I-O students practice and develop this competency while in training.

6. Has the program systematically sought data from alumni to measure the longer-term effects of accomplishment of the program’s learning outcomes? If so, please describe the approach to this information-gathering and the ways in which the information will be applied to the program’s curriculum. If such activity has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur. [Please limit your response to 300 words or less]

The I-O program as of yet has not conducted an alumni survey which measures outcomes from I-O alumni specifically. However, the Psychology Department conducted an alumni survey of our graduate students, and I-O students were part of the sample. Though there is no unique identification of their program designation in the survey data, the following information can be taken as at least partially representative of I-O alumni opinions.

Our most recent Psychology alumni survey was completed in AY 2006-07 and was keyed to a subset of missions and goals set forth in the department’s 2006 self-study. As shown in Appendix D, the 23-item survey contained four quantitative parts, one qualitative part and demographic questions. A 5-point rating scale was used with higher ratings indicating higher educational quality. Of the 238 surveys sent out, 48 were returned, resulting in a 24% return
rate which is generally consistent with the mailed survey methodology. Of those 48 surveys, 15 represented students who had received both a B.A. and a M.A. (n=8) or only a M.A. from our department. Survey results pertaining to the Psychology MA program, showed that most ratings averaged a scale value of 4: **Training** M=3.75-4.75; **Activities/Experiences** M=3.0-4.86; **Perceived Faculty Competence/Activity** M=3.3-4.75; and **Guidance/Preparation** M=2.67-4.86.

Substantial changes have been made since this survey that help to maintain areas of strength and address areas needing for improvement. For example, in the **Training** area, our general methods courses give more exposure to different phases of the research process, e.g., conducting literature searches, analyzing data. In the area of **Activities/Experience** we have begun “budgeting” our FTES allotment to protect supervisory course offerings, such as PSYC 295F (fieldwork), PSYC 294 (Cooperative Research) and PSYC 295A (Teaching Assistantships). To support **Perceived Faculty Competence/Activity** we began alternating semesters of 3-class and 4-class teaching loads, thereby increasing faculty assigned time for scholarly activity. To improve **Guidance/Preparation**, we shifted to a mentoring model with more one-on-one mentoring, guidance and supervision from faculty to students, which encourages timely completion of thesis/project. We recently adopted a system where student advisors regularly complete and sign off on a “graduate student progress report” to provide timely, written notification of any problems and the opportunity to discuss them and to provide any guidance to remediate problems.

7. **Does the program pursue learning outcomes identified by an accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization as important? Does the set of outcomes pursued by your program exceed those identified as important by your accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization?** [Please limit your response to 300 words or less]

There is no accrediting organization that establishes strict learning outcomes for certification of I-O programs. Perhaps the closest thing is a set of guidelines published in 1994 ([http://www.siop.org/guidelines.aspx](http://www.siop.org/guidelines.aspx)) by the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP)—Division 14 of the American Psychological Association (APA). The authors were clear that these were only intended to provide guidance, and not strict standards. Further, given the extensiveness of the guidelines relative to the number of hours required for a master’s degree (the guidelines closely follow a set of doctoral I-O guidelines), the authors were clear that variability is expected across master’s programs in their breadth and depth of coverage of each recommended area.

The I-O program at CSUS provides consistent coverage of Area I (Core Psychological Domains), Area II (Data Collection and Analysis Skills), and Area III (Core I-O Domains) of the SIOP guidelines. The balance of breadth and depth in the core I-O domains varies somewhat based on faculty emphasis and student interests, but this is in keeping with the spirit of the guidelines. Coverage of Area IV (Additional “Desirable” I-O Domains) is usually limited because these areas are not deemed crucial by the guidelines or the current I-O faculty.
The SIOP guidelines blend well with our stated learning outcomes from item 2 in this report: Our coverage of general psychology and I-O specific content (SIOP Areas I & III) gives students the foundation for understanding the relevant psychological literature and identifying relevant research problems; our solid coverage of research methods and statistics (SIOP Area II) provides them with the foundation for designing sound studies, analyzing data, and properly interpreting the results; our coverage of general psychology, I-O content, and research methods (SIOP Areas I, II, & III) gives them the foundation for writing informative research reports and communicating research findings.

8. Finally, what additional information would you like to share with the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities regarding the program’s desired learning outcomes and assessment of their accomplishment? [Please limit your response to 200 words or less]

The I-O program has a long history in our Department. It was formalized as a concentration in 2002, but some of the founding members of our Department were I-O psychologists and put the curriculum in place very early on. For many years prior to its formal designation as a concentration, there was an unofficial “track” of I-O courses in place that was popular among students. For decades our I-O training has fed the local workforce (especially in State jobs but also local consulting firms) with individuals trained in research and statistical methods plus more specific I-O content and methods. We have alumni that have been working locally for 30 years or more, supervising our more recent graduates. Our students and alumni are very active in the Northern California chapter of the Personnel Testing Council. There is a nice professional community built around our long-standing I-O program, and our students and graduates are very employable with the knowledge and skills they gain in our program.

We feel that our desired learning outcomes, which are built around the research process, are in keeping with our research-oriented perspective on the I-O training we provide. That so many of our students and alumni are using their I-O focused research skills in their jobs supports our focus on these learning outcomes.
APPENDIX A

Fall 2011 Enrollment for Psychology MA – I/O Concentration Program

**Current Enrolled Majors By Department/ College - Primary Academic Plans**

Term:  2118 - Fall 2011  
College: SSIS - College of Soc Sci & Inter Std  
Career: PBAC - Postbaccalaureate  
Department(s): PSYC - Psychology  
Selected Plan(s): PSYCIPSYCC - Psych (Indust & Org Psyc) CC, PSYCIPSYMA - Psych (Industrial & Org Psyc)  
Run Date: Feb 2, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Desc</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Academic Plan</th>
<th>Academic Plan Desc</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>PSYCIPSYMA</td>
<td>Psych (Industrial &amp; Org Psyc)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MAJ - Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>PSYCIPSYCC</td>
<td>Psych (Indust &amp; Org Psyc) CC*</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRP - Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychology - Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary - Total for Selected Career(s), College/Department(s), Academic Plan(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Conditionally classified students are admitted to the program but have required course remediation.*
APPENDIX B

Thesis/Project Competencies Assessment Form

Student Name: ____________________________

Thesis/Project Competencies Assessment Form
California State University, Sacramento

Instructions to thesis/project chair and committee members: Please fill out this evaluation at the completion of the oral defense. There is no need to put any identifying information on this form. The data will be aggregated and used to generate summary statistics for the graduate student outcomes assessment. Please return the completed form to the Assessment Coordinator. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Assessment Scale
The following response scale should be used to evaluate the dimensions covered in the Evaluation Chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Label</th>
<th>Behavioral Anchor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Minimal Competence</td>
<td>Student has not demonstrated the minimal level of competence for master's students in psychology on this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Competence</td>
<td>Student has demonstrated the minimal level of competence for master's students in psychology on this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Competence</td>
<td>Student has demonstrated a satisfactory level of competence for master's students in psychology on this dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Level of Competence</td>
<td>Student has demonstrated a higher level of competence than is ordinarily expected of master's students in psychology on this dimension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Chart
Consider all of the Master's level psychology students you have known in your capacity as a professor at CSUS. With respect to that population of students, please place a check mark in the box representing the demonstrated level of each dimension listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Below Minimal Competence</th>
<th>Minimal Competence</th>
<th>Satisfactory Competence</th>
<th>High Level of Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of content for thesis/project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of research problem/purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology addressing problem/purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data or conceptual analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions drawn from analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing of thesis/project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End presentation of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to questions during the oral defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX C

### Department of Psychology VALUE Rubrics

#### INQUIRY AND ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Selection</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestone 3</th>
<th>Milestone 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies an innovative, focused, and manageable topic that addresses potentially significant yet previously less-explored aspects of the topic.</td>
<td>Identifies a focused and manageable/doable topic that appropriately addresses relevant aspects of the topic.</td>
<td>Identifies a topic that while manageable/doable, is overly narrowly focused and leaves out relevant aspects of the topic or is overly general.</td>
<td>Identifies a topic that is too narrowly focused or too general to be manageable or doable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views | Synthesizes in-depth information from relevant, valid and reliable sources representing various points of view/approaches. | Presents in-depth information from relevant, valid and reliable sources representing various points of view/approaches. | Presents information from relevant, valid and reliable sources representing only limited points of view/approaches. | Presents information from sources that lack validity or reliability or represents limited points of view/approaches. |

| Design Process | All elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be synthesized from relevant subdisciplines. | Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately understood and developed; however, more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for. | Basic methodology or theoretical framework is understood; however, critical elements are missing, under developed, or unfocused. | Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework. |

| Analysis | Identifies and completes most appropriate analytical procedure for methodology. Organizes and interprets evidence to evaluate hypotheses and reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus. | Identifies and completes appropriate analytical procedure. Organizes evidence to evaluate hypotheses and reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus. | Identifies and completes acceptable analytical procedure. Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities. | Has difficulty identifying and completing acceptable analytical procedure. Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus. |
| **Conclusions** | Synthesizes evidence, relates to body of literature and states a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry findings. | States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings. | States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the inquiry findings. | States an ambiguous, illogical, or unsupportable conclusion from inquiry findings. |
| **Limitations and Implications** | Insightfully discusses in detail relevant and supported limitations and implications. | Discusses relevant and supported limitations and implications. | Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications. | Presents limitations and implications, but they are possibly irrelevant and unsupported. |

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*
APPENDIX D

Student Outcome Assessment Alumni Survey Spring 2007

Part 1: Training
Using the response scale below, please indicate the extent to which the department provided training or experience in the following areas:

- Very Little 1 2 3 4 5 Very Much

___ Conducting literature searches.
___ Acquiring information from research articles.
___ Conducting research studies.
___ Analyzing data using statistical procedures.
___ Organizing information to prepare for oral or written report.
___ Writing research reports.
___ Developing critical thinking skills.
___ Becoming familiar with psychological phenomena.

___ Faculty encouraged me to become knowledgeable.
___ Faculty were competent instructors.

Part 4: Guidance/Preparation
Using the response scale below, please indicate the extent to which you believe the following to be true for you:

- Very Little 1 2 3 4 5 Very Much

___ Even though I am not now in school, I have an interest in learning new things.
___ I was aware of the departmental brochures/handouts that were available.
___ The departmental brochures/handouts were useful to me (N = Not Applicable).
___ I obtained useful guidance/advising when I sought it (N = Not Applicable).
___ Upon graduating from Sac State I was prepared for my chosen career.

Part 5: Demographics
It would be of great help to us if you would provide responses to as many of these questions as you are willing to answer.

Gender: _____ (please specify)

Ethnicity: ________________ (please specify)

Current age: _____ (closest year)

What year did you graduate from Sac State as an undergraduate student?

   Graduated in _____ [Not applicable ☐ ]

What year did you graduate from Sac State as a graduate student?

   Graduated in _____ [Not applicable ☐ ]

If you were a graduate student with us, please indicate (√) your specialty track?

- Behavior Analysis ☐ Counseling
- Doctoral Preparation ☐ I/O
- General ☐ Other ________________ (please specify)

Comments are welcome if you have the time, energy, and interest in making them: