



Planning and Evaluation Tracking

College Year: Results: 2010-11

Division of: Behavioral Studies

Person Responsible: Jerry Moller

Department of: Behavioral Sciences

Person Responsible: Jerry Moller

Purpose Statement:

Goal Statements	Objectives/Outcomes (including assessment tools and standards)	Results	Use of Results (including improvements and revisions)
1. Develop an appreciation of the diversity of the human condition.	1. After completing courses in behavioral sciences, students will demonstrate a significant change in attitudes toward diversity. This will be demonstrated by the completion of an anonymous pre and post survey (test).	1. This year, 176 students from General Sociology, Minority Relations and Social Psychology courses at Amarillo College answered 5 questions in a pre and post test format that were related to students' appreciation and comfort level with the American culture, as well as other cultures, religions and ethnic traditions. The sample included 67 men and 258 women from ages 18-50+ years, with 29% Caucasian (non-Hispanic), 52% African Americans, 15% Hispanics, 14% Asians and .6% Middle Easterners. Item 1: This item was related to students' appreciation of American culture. No difference was expected on this item from the pre and post test. The hypothesis was confirmed with the pre test mean being 4.02 and	1. According to the 2008-2009 Action plan, questions were rewritten and collected from a much larger sample of students, across several different courses with different instructors. 2. There will be a continued focus on appreciation of cultural, racial and ethnic diversity for upcoming year. 3. Action Plan for Improvements and Revisions: a. Additional exercises have been added to the General Sociology course and the Social Psychology course to enhance appreciation and understanding of the diversity right here at Amarillo College. This will include two class segments, one at the beginning of the course and one towards the end of the course where students share about their cultural background.

the post test being 4.14, $t = -1.519$, $p = .130$

Item 2: This question examined students comfort level with people of other cultures. Results showed a significant shift to a greater comfort level from the pre mean of 1.91 to the post mean of 1.75, with a difference of .165, $t = 2.435$, $p = .015$ (a lower mean suggests greater comfort).

Item 3: Examined students comfort with someone of a different religion (or no religion) from their own. Results showed a significant shift to a greater level of comfort with a pre-mean of 1.82 and post mean of 1.61, $t = 2.98$, $p = .003$.

Item 4: Created a scenario related to the Cambodian culture, and asked students to rate their ability to appreciate other cultural traditions. Students showed a significant shift to less ethnocentric views on the post test, with a pre mean of 2.46 and a post mean of 2.21, $t = 3.006$, $p = .003$.

Item 4: Examined a second scenario related to Middle Eastern customs. Again, students were asked to rate their appreciation for these

b. A film has been added to our library for these courses that is designed to enhance both student discussion and appreciation for multicultural awareness.

c. Two homework assignments have been added for credit to encourage students to visit a church, synagogue, mosque, AA meeting, or other types of "spiritual" or "religious" meetings different from their own background or to interview someone of a difference race, culture or religion.

d. The item on the diversity questionnaire that did not meet significance was related to Middle Eastern culture. A special segment has been added to some courses that deal with stereotypes and realities of Middle Easterners, also reflecting on the fact that Jesus of Nazareth was of MIDDLE EASTERN descent. This segment of the courses will include a research topic AND/OR an in class discussion.

cultural traditions. Results showed a trend towards less ethnocentric views, but this did not reach significance with a pre mean of 2.83 and a post mean of 2.61, $t = 1.65$, $p = .101$.

2. Develop effective methodologies to help students understand, exhibit knowledge and appreciate basic scientific research and how it is conducted in the behavioral sciences, including comprehension of research methodologies and designs typically used in psychology and sociology.

2.a. During the Fall of 2009 and Spring 2010 semesters, 74 psychology and sociology students taking general psychology, general sociology courses and social psychology, were instructed using one of two teaching methodologies on scientific research. In once instance, students received a lecture only, and in the second instance, students received the lecture and an in class lab where students met in groups to design a simple psychological experiment. Prior to the teaching methodology selected and introduction of the topic, all students took a pre test with 4 questions covering an example of a psychological experiment (1) what is the hypothesis being made? 2) label the independent variable(s); 3) label the dependent variable, 4) is there a confound and, if so, what is

2. While over 100 students took the pre-test, the questionnaire given to the first class that took the pre-test had an error in it. This data was not used. The questionnaire was fixed. We ended up with 69 pre-test scores and 61 post-test scores.

Data was collected in Fall of 2009 in two general psychology classes (one of these classes was the unusable data) and one social psychology class, and one general sociology class.

Results showed that, regarding the first prediction,

1) was SUPPORTED. For both groups, including the students who received the LECTURE AND LAB method, and the student who received the LECTURE ONLY, students did better, as predicted on the post test than the pre test. They did not do significantly better on

2. Based on the data collected, several points are clear:

a) Results showed mixed improvements in scientific methodology knowledge and application as a result of the two teaching methods used. While results show that all groups made significant improvements, overall, from the pre to the post test following the administration of both of the teaching methods, the fact that one group shows significantly higher results prior to the administration of the teaching methods is problematic. To some degree, these results are questionable due to the inequality of the groups prior to administration of the independent variable. Reworking the way in which these methodologies are administered to create a more BALANCED and RANDOM ASSIGNMENT of

it, and how could you fix it and design a better experiment?). Assessments were scored by a panel of four judges as:
0=completely incorrect
1=mostly incorrect 2=mostly correct 3=completely correct. Following either the lecture or the lecture and lab, all students took a post test with the same questions.

Items on the pre and post tests will be asking students in a fill in the blank format about a sample experiment, as to the hypothesis, lab design, labeling the variables, and asking them to suggest a better design that would improve the existent experiment. There was a space of 3 weeks between the pre and the post tests.

Three predictions are made:

1) Students, regardless of the teaching methodology will do significantly better on the post test than the pre-test in answering the questions related to the sample experiment and research designs.

2) Students in the two different

the first item that had to do with RESTATING THE HYPOTHESIS in the sample experiment. On labeling independent, dependent and confounding variables, and on fixing the experiment, both groups did as predicted.

2) As to the second prediction, which said that the two groups should NOT do significantly different on the pre test, the prediction was NOT supported. It was found that the NO LAB group, did significantly better than the LAB and LECTURE group on three of the four items on the PRE test. This time, there was not a significant difference between groups on the pre test on the second item (labeling the independent variable or variables). However, on three of the four items, this finding suggests that the LECTURE ONLY group had more knowledge about scientific methodology coming into this section of the class material, and hence did better than the other LECTURE & LAB group BEFORE the methodologies were given.

participants to experimental conditions will be needed. This reformulation will be done in the Fall of 2010 and the outcome assessment will be readministered and the pre test analyzed prior to the administration of the teaching methods, to insure that groups are "equal".

b) The mixed results regarding the prediction that the LECTURE LAB method is superior to the LECTURE ONLY group makes this outcome inconclusive and difficult to interpret in terms of the effectiveness of either method. Because of the confound related to unequal groups discussed in item 2a, a redesign of the outcome assessment itself, as well as the design of the study will be done.

USE OF RESULTS: The reformulated assessment will be administered in the spring of 2011, to four different behavioral science classes. Pre-tests will be analyzed to determine if groups are statistically equal prior to the administration of the independent variable. The

teaching methodology groups will not have a significant difference in pre-test scores.

- 3) Students who complete the lecture with the lab will do significantly better than the students who receive lecture only in answering questions about the sample experiment on the post test.

3) When it came to the third prediction, that students getting the LECTURE WITH LAB method would do better on the POST test than the LECTURE ONLY method, the hypothesis was NOT COMPLETELY SUPPORTED. Results showed no significant differences in the two groups on their POST test scores on items 2 and 3 (identifying independent and dependent variables). One these two items, the LECTURE with LAB group made more improvement from the pre and post tests than the LECTURE only group. However, when it came to items 1 and 3 (restating the hypothesis and finding and fixing the confound), there was no a significant difference between the groups, showing that the LECTURE ONLY group improved more than the LECTURE LAB group. This would be expected since they had begun with more knowledge about scientific methods, according to the between group comparison.

The differences in the two groups prior to the

new data will be analyzed and considered in the early summer of 2011. The redesign of this outcome tool will include several changes

- 1) at least two questions about the students appreciation for science (attitude shift about scientific endeavors and their importance in styding the beahvioral sciences.
- 2) Multiple choice style questions related to a sample experiment to test students ability to identify the variables in the study.
- 3) Questions about other research designs, giving students a sample experiment, and asking them to idenity what type of design is being used (case study, observation, correlation, experiment.

administration of the methodologies must be considered a confound, and this outcome design may be reworked and data collected next year.

3.The goal is to use the forum of the Human Behavior and Personal Adjustment course, which is a "COUNSELING" focused psychology class, to move students from knowledge of terms and counseling models, to an understanding of how the models work, and then to the application of these counseling models in solving real life problems.

3.The objective of this outcome assessment in questionnaire form is to measure the degree of understanding and potential change in the student with regard to their knowledge of and application of some of the primary principles of Rational Emotive Behavioral Therapy. One of the main pillars of REBT is that irrational and dysfunctional ways and patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving are contributing to much, though hardly all, human disturbance and emotional and behavioral self- and social defeatism. REBT generally teaches that when people turn flexible preferences, desires and wishes into grandiose, absolutistic and fatalistic dictates, this tends to contribute to disturbance and upsetness.

3.There is no data at this time. Data will be collected in the FALL of 2010 and/or Spring of 2011.

3.There are no usable results at this time.

It is predicted that, if the format of using a combination of seminar / interactional, and lecturer approach to the topic of REBT works, students would not only have an academic understanding of the material related to the REBT model, but would be able to use that material to solve applied problems in a more effective manner than they could PRIOR to the section of the class on REBT.

The assessment will be given in the Fall of 2010 and/or the Spring of 2011 to students taking the Psych 2315 Personal Adjustment courses. Students will take a PRE test prior to the introduction of REBT, and then will follow up with a POST test after the topic has been covered. Some questions will cover information, terms and knowledge base of the model, while others will cover application of the information to problem examples.

4.	4.	4.	4.
5.	5.	5.	5.
6.	6.	6.	6.
7.	7.	7.	7.