

That said, some o! the P/3 . ,74, students had ta%en so&ial ps\$&holo"\$ and some had ta%en personalit\$ ps\$&holo"\$, but li%el\$ not both. Thus, we e:&luded P/3 . ,74, students !rom anal\$ses re"ardin" the &ourse the\$ had not ta%en. Onl\$ ( o! the ,74, students had ta%en personalit\$ ps\$&holo"\$ and we &ompared them to the P/3 . 2424 students on personalit\$ ps\$&holo"\$ %nowled"e (5 @uestions). The P/3 . 2424 students demonstrated more %nowled"e (/ C\*.4;, -0 C 4.7) than the P/3 . ,74, students (/ C 2.;4, -0 C 4.2,), albeit not at a statisti&all\$ si"ni!i&ant level, t(,1) C 84.;7, p C .\*\*, d C 84.\*4. <i!teen o! the P/3 . ,74, students too% so&ial ps\$&holo"\$ and the\$ s&ored about e@uall\$ (/ C 2.51, -0 C 4.5\*) to the P/3 . 2424 students (/ C 2.55, -0 C 4.(4), t(54) C 84.\*,, p C .5\*, d C 84.14.

On a bri"hter note, P/3 . ,74, students s&ored sli"htl\$ hi"her ( / C 2.77, -0 C 4.54) than P/3 . 2424 students ( / C 2.( ,, -0 C 4.( ,) on the methods @uestions alone, albeit not at a statisti&all\$ si"ni!i&ant level, t(55) C 1., (, p C .15, d C 4.\*;.

-ummari.e your assessment results briefly using the follo ing sub-headings

Althou"h advan&ed students (P/3., 74,) outper!ormed lower&division students (P/3. 2424) overall and on methods @uestions, the P/3. 2424 students outper!ormed advan&ed students on spe&i!i& &ontent %nowled"e in so&ial and personalit\$ ps\$&holo"\$.

(changes in course content, course

se1uence, student ad%ising)

The !a&ult\$ will dis&uss potential &han"es at a !utures potentià' (

&ourses should be &ondu&ted to &apture &ontent that is &overed in all iterations o! these &ourses and to ensure a&&urate representation o! material tau"ht in the pro"ram. In addition, instead o!