

failed to reach this threshold on 3/6 categories and therefore our averaged ratings for those categories should be reviewed with caution. To address concerns about interrater agreement in each category, we also summed across the category scores to form the “Total” row. This row had adequate interrater reliability and gives a general sense of the strength of a paper across the specified categories.

In addition, because the papers from our three sections were different from each other, we included scores for each section in Tables 2 (PSYC 491B), 3 (PSYC 491C), and 4 (PSYC 491D) below. The interrater agreement for scores from PSYC 491C was on par or higher than the agreement for the three sections combined. Alternatively, one of the categories for PSYC 491B yielded negative agreement and four of the categories for PSYC 491D yielded zero agreement due to the negative average covariance of the ratings (i.e., the ratings moved in the opposite direction). Scores from categories with low agreement should be taken with caution.

Table 1 (All student papers included; N = 42)

Skill area	<i>M (SD)</i>	% of students who scored 3 or 4	ICC
Statement of purpose, thesis, or controlling ideas	2.99 (0.70)	61.90%	.49
Audience awareness	3.15 (0.67)	66.67%	.29
Organization, cohesion, and clarity	2.76 (0.60)	47.62%	.44
Presentation of supporting ideas			

Table 3 (PSYC 491C; $n = 19$ – APA Style Manuscript Assignment Submitted by an Individual)

Skill area	<i>M (SD)</i>	% of students who scored 3 or 4	ICC
Statement of purpose, thesis, or controlling ideas	3.16 (0.69)	68.42%	.55
Audience awareness	3.55 (0.44)	94.74%	.19
Organization, cohesion, and clarity	2.97 (0.59)	73.68%	.67
Presentation of supporting ideas	2.97 (0.68)	57.89%	.62
Language usage, sentence structure	3.24 (0.45)	89.47%	.33
Mechanics: grammar, punctuation, and spelling	3.29 (0.51)	89.47%	.53
Total	19.18 (2.71)	68.42% scored 18 or over	.67

Table 4 (PSYC 491D; $n = 5$ – APA Style Manuscript Assignment Submitted by a Group)

Skill area	<i>M (SD)</i>	% of students who scored 3 or 4	ICC
Statement of purpose, thesis, or controlling ideas	3.30 (0.57)	80.00%	.50
Audience awareness	3.70 (0.27)	100%	.00
Organization, cohesion, and clarity	3.00 (0.50)	60.00%	.20
Presentation of supporting ideas	2.70 (0.57)	40.00%	.00
Language usage, sentence structure	3.10 (0.42)	80.00%	.00
Mechanics: grammar, punctuation, and spelling	2.80 (0.67)	40.00%	.56
Total	18.60 (2.48)	60.00% scored 18 or over	.27

D. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Summarize your assessment results briefly using the following sub-headings.

Main Findings:

Table 1 revealed that the majority of our students successfully stated the central purpose of the paper, demonstrated audience awareness, and had appropriate language usage and grammar.

491B was the section that had the question and answer format rather than the professional APA style manuscript. The lower scores among students in 491B may have been because the worksheet format prompted more informal responses and thus did not showcase their levels of competence to the raters in the same way as the APA style manuscript from the other sections. Another possibility is that students who submitted the APA style manuscript had received beneficial feedback from their instructor while developing their paper, but students who submitted the worksheet received no such feedback.

Recommendations for Program Improvement:

same page about what types of papers would earn certain scores, they could decide not to have the instructor rate the paper (so all raters are new to the paper), or they could have more raters.

E. Assessment Plans for Next Year

Summarize your assessment plans for the next year, including the PLO(s) you plan to assess, any revisions to the program assessment plan presented in your last five-year plan self-study, and any other relevant information.

During spring semester of 2023, we plan to evaluate PLO 5 (career options within psychology). We will evaluate the degree of psychology career knowledge among our senior students in PSYC 491/493 with open-ended and multiple-choice questions.

Reference

Fleiss, J. L. (1986). *The design and analysis of clinical experiments*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.