

Submitted by: <u>Alex Chaparro, Chair</u> (name and title)

Program Review Self-Study, Psychology

Academic unit: Psychology College: Liberal Arts & Sciences Date of last review: Fall 2010 Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) N/A									
Degree: Ph.D.	ed in this report (add Psychology Psychology - Clinica Psychology - Comm Psychology – Huma	al nunity	CIP* code: <u>42.0101</u> CIP code: <u>42.2801</u> CIP code: <u>42.2802</u> CIP code: <u>42.9999</u>						
*To look up, go to: Classification	n of Instructional Programs	Website, http://nces.ed.gov/	ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55						
Faculty of the academic	unit (add lines as n	ecessary)							
Name Signature	[See faculty Signat	tures on next page]							
Paul Ackerman (Assista	nt Professor)								
Charles Burdsal (Profes	sor)								
Alex Chaparro (Professo	or)								
Barbara Chaparro (Asso	ociate Professor)								
Darwin Dorr (Professor)								
Jibo He (Assistant Profe	essor)								
Steven Huprich (Profes	sor)	, · ·							
Joe Keebler (Assistant F	Professor)								
Rhonda Lewis (Professo	or)								
Gregory Meissen (Profe	essor)								
Louis Medvene (Profes	sor)								
Rui Ni (Associate Profe	ssor)								
Evan Palmer (Associate	Professor)								
James Snyder (Distingu	ished Professor)								
Robert Zettle (Professo	or)								

In yellow highlighted areas, data will be provided

_Date <u>10/15/2014</u> _

Psychology Self-Study Report (2014-2015)

Program Review Self-Study Report

Academic unit: Psychology College: Liberal Arts & Sciences Date of last review: Fall 2010

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) N/A

List all degrees described in this report (add lines as necessary)

Degree: B.A. Psychology CIP* code: 42.0101
Degree: Ph.D. Psychology - Clinical CIP code: 42.2801
Degree: Ph.D. Psychology - Community CIP code: 42.2802
Degree: Ph.D. Psychology - Human Factors CIP code: 42.9999

Faculty of the academic unit (add lines as necessary)

Name Signature	\mathcal{O}
Paul Ackerman (Assistant Professor)	That between on
Charles Burdsal (Professor)	M. Rus!
Alex Chaparro (Professor)	alex
Barbara Chaparro (Associate Professor)	Swell
Darwin Dorr (Professor)	Day umi D.
Jibo He (Associate Professor)	1 the Jihrs
Joe Keebler (Assistant Professor)	CK
•	Mlonde Kausi
Rhonda Lewis (Professor)	Ly Meison
Gregory Meissen (Professor)	1. OMed =
Louis Medvene (Professor)	10
Rui Ni (Assistant Professor)	7 31
Evan Palmer (Associate Professor)	Fran Jalyne
James Snyder (Distinguished Professor)	Clark the
Robert Zettle (Professor)	Theyelly

^{*}To look up, go to: Classification of Instructional Programs Website, http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55

- Departmental purpose and relationship to the University mission (refer to instructions in the WSU
 Program Review document for more information on completing this section).
 - a. University Mission:

The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good.

b. Program Mission (if more than one program, list each mission):

Undergraduate: The undergraduate program is designed to prepare students for postgraduate work in psychology but is flexible enough to accommodate the interests of students who do not intend to pursue graduate study in psychology. Such students may be career oriented (e.g., social work, management training) or simply have an interest in learning more about why we behave as we do.

Graduate Doctorate in Clinical Psychology: To provide instruction in advanced principles of psychology and to conduct both applied and basic research in clinical psychology to the end that graduates will be prepared for careers in research, teaching, service and administration.

Graduate Doctorate in Community Psychology: To provide instruction in advanced principles of psychology and to conduct both applied and basic research in community psychology to the end that graduates will be prepared for careers in research, teaching, service and administration.

Graduate Doctorate in Human Factors Psychology: To provide instruction in advanced principles of psychology and to conduct both applied and basic research in human factors psychology to the end that graduates will be prepared for careers in research, teaching, service and administration.

c. The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission: Explain in 1-2 concise paragraphs.

The WSU mission states "essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good." To that end, students in our program, whether graduate or undergraduate, are being strengthened in their understanding of scientific research and analysis with balanced attention to basic psychological processes (learning, cognition, physiology, etc.); social/cultural dimensions (social, developmental, personality, etc.); and applied issues and perspectives (clinical, community, human factors, testing & measurement, etc.) At all levels our faculty strives to enrich students in critical thinking and problem-solving skills by developing competence in the methods of scientific research, psychometric principles, and data analysis. The study of psychology increases understanding of self and others and enables individuals to make informed judgments that strengthen community and public policy.

The research activities of the Psychology Department attest to its WSU "driver" mission relevance. Ongoing research and grant activities touch on mental health issues; social problems such as teen pregnancy and drug abuse, homelessness; efficient functioning of community agencies; safety and quality of life issues with the elderly; computer access for the disabled; and air traffic safety. Faculty members contribute broadly to the educational/training function of the department in working collaboratively with both undergraduate and graduate students on research teams. Specifically, faculty members have developed "labs" that take the form of multi-tiered research teams involving the faculty member, one or more graduate students, and undergraduate research aides and data collectors. The source of the undergraduate research team members is typically the Research Methods course (Psychology 311 which is required for all majors).

Faculty research programs are conducted in the context of the following labs:

- Aging, Perception, & Performance Lab
- Child & Family Research Center
- Community Psychology Research & Practice Collaborative
- Human Automation Interaction Lab
- Laboratory of Applied Visual Attention
- NIAR Human Factors Lab
- Perception & Attention Lab

- Personality Research Lab
- Social Science Research Lab
- Social Relationship Research Work Group
- Software Usability Research Lab
- Training Research and Applied Cognitive Engineering Lab
- Visual Perception & Cognition Lab
- Visual Psychophysics Lab

d.	Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review?	🗌 Yes 🛭 No
----	---	------------

i. If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

No need to change the mission. The current mission is sustainable and well suited to the innovative, applied research mission of WSU as well as psychology's status as one of seven "hub disciplines" along with mathematics, physics, chemistry, earth sciences, medicine, and social science.

e.	Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives
	of the program (s) (programmatic). Have they changed since the last review?
	Yes No

If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

General Graduate Program Description, Goals, and Objectives

The Psychology Department offers courses of study leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Students may complete requirements for study in human factors psychology, community psychology, or clinical psychology. At the graduate level, the three doctoral programs are designed to first further educate students as psychologists with a firm commitment to psychology as a scientific, empirically-based discipline. Secondarily, the curriculum in each program is designed to provide students with the knowledge and expertise to function as applied professionals. To meet the first training objective common to all three doctoral programs, all graduate students are required to successfully complete a set of core courses aimed at providing the fundamentals of a basic education in the science of psychology as well as contribute to the undergraduate teaching mission of the Psychology Department. The courses common to all three programs are:

Common Graduate Core

Teaching Ethics (3 hours)

911 Teaching of Psychology: Principles, Practices & Ethics (3)

Research Methods (8 Hours)

902 Advanced Research Methods 1 (4)

903 Advanced Research Methods II (4)

Research (22 Hours Minimum)

901 Predoctoral Research (10) 908 Dissertation (12)

Program/Goals and Objectives (General Graduate)

Program Goals

To provide instruction in advanced principles of psychology and to conduct both applied and basic research in clinical, community, or human factors psychology to the end that graduates will be prepared for careers in research, teaching, service and administration.

Program Objectives

- To admit and fund (for a period of three years or six regular term semesters) twelve well-qualified students each year.
- To maintain institutional academic standards in decisions regarding termination, continuation, and graduation of accepted students.

Learner Outcomes (General Graduate)

Learner Goals

- Maintain steady progress through program requirements
- Contribute to the research life of the Psychology Department
- Collaborate in the research life of the Psychology Department
- Contribute to the undergraduate teaching mission of the Psychology Department
- Demonstrate ability to perform state-of-the-art research conception
- Demonstrate ability to perform state-of-the-art research design and execution
- Demonstrate ability to perform state-of-the-art research data analysis
- Demonstrate ability to perform state-of-the-art research presentations
- Demonstrate ability to perform professional psychology services in real-world, out-of-department settings
- e. If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

No changes

Psychology Undergraduate program description, programmatic goals and objectives, and learner-centered goals and objectives:

General Description

Undergraduate psychology majors take three required courses (general, statistics, and research methods) plus a minimum of five courses from a seven-course core list including: biological; learning; cognitive; social; personality; developmental; systems & theories; and testing & measurement. Finally, students take 6 hours of elective psychology course work which can include independent study and field work options. The total minimum number of hours for the psychology major is 31.

Program Goals

Psychology majors who graduate with GPAs in the range of 3.5 to 4.0 should be able to, on average, succeed in graduate level work in a PhD or comparable program. Majors who graduate with GPAs in the range of 3.0 to 3.5 should be able to, on average, succeed in graduate level work in an MA or comparable program. Majors

who graduate with GPAs in the range of 2:0 to 3.0 should be able to, on average, succeed in employment in a job or activity that requires a liberal arts college degree or equivalent.

Program Objectives

- To hire and maintain a highly qualified faculty to teach and advise undergraduate students, and otherwise meet the needs of the program.
- To assure that all necessary instructional tools, materials and equipment are available, staffed and serviced.

Learner Goals

- Students will acquire broad based knowledge in scientific psychology and its application.
 - Students will acquire knowledge in the traditional, core areas of psychology such as biological, learning, cognitive, social, personality, developmental; and demonstrate mastery of that material.
 - Students will be adequately educated to pursue advanced professional education in psychology and related fields or to obtain meaningful post-baccalaureate employment.
- Students will acquire the ability to access and utilize existing knowledge, and to engage in scientific methods to address psychological and other applied problems.
 - o Students will be able to use the scientific method in a creative manner to address specific problems.
 - Students will be able to communicate existing information and that derived from their own analysis and experimentation in a clear, informative manner.
- 2. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, graduates, and scholarly/creative activity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Complete the table below and utilize data tables 1-7 provided by the Office of Planning Analysis (covering SCH by FY and fall census day, instructional faculty; instructional FTE employed; program majors; and degree production).

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles		Number Presentations		Number Conference Proceedings		No. Books	No. Book Chaps.	No. Grants Awarded or Submitted	\$ Grant Value	
	Ref	Non- Ref	Ref	Non- Ref	Ref	Non- Ref					
Year I	27		86		1			1	13	682,000	
Year 2	25		46	1	2			1	30	3,351,674	
Year 3	11	2	49	1				1	24	1,753,921	

^{*} Winning by competitive audition. **Professional attainment (e.g., commercial recording). ***Principal role in a performance. ****Commissioned or included in a collection.

 Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the faculty/staff using the data from the table above and tables 1-7 from the Office of Planning Analysis as well as any additional relevant data. Programs should comment on details in regard to productivity of the faculty (i.e., some departments may have a few faculty producing the majority of the scholarship), efforts to recruit/retain faculty, departmental succession plans, course evaluation data, etc.

Provide assessment here:

Planning Office data confirm the excellent productivity of the Psychology Department faculty. With 14 faculty members the department is able to produce directly and indirectly through our graduate students an average 12,223 student credit hours each year semester. This level of SHC productivity has been generally stable over the past several years.

Undergraduate graduation rates for Psychology can be estimated from data in Planning Office Tables 6 and 7. On average, from 2008-2012, the department had 489 majors and graduated an average 89 of them each year. These numbers indicate an undergraduate graduation rate of 73%. This rate of 73% is equivalent to the "after 6 years rate for 4-year institutions that only accept between 25% and 50% of applicants. (National Center for Education Statistics) Therefore we conclude that our faculty is doing an excellent job in its undergraduate education mission.

For graduate doctoral students the department has averaged 74 for the years 2008-2012. During that general time frame the department has graduated 12 doctoral students each year. Since our doctoral program requires 6 years on average, these data estimate a graduation rate of 97%. (Data from Planning Office Tables 6 and 7)

- 3. Academic Program: Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students for each program (if more than one). Attach updated program assessment plan (s) as an appendix (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information).
 - a. For undergraduate programs, compare ACT scores of the majors with the University as a whole.

ACT scores for Psychology majors run slightly below the average for all students (22 versus 22.6 over the years from 2006-2012). The trend is slightly upward for both groups. The average score for the ACT is between 20 and 21, so Psychology is above average and improving in terms of the ACT performance of its majors.

b. For graduate programs, compare graduate GPAs of the majors with University graduate GPAs.

GPAs for admitted graduate students in Psychology runs slightly above that for WSU graduate admissions as a whole (3.7 for Psychology and 3.5 for all WSU graduate students). GPA levels are stable over the recorded data period.

c. Identify the principal learning outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes in the table below. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e. Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome with proposed actions based on the results.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details. Definitions:

<u>Learning Outcomes</u>: Learning outcomes are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors

that students acquire in their matriculation through the program (e.g., graduates will demonstrate advanced writing ability).

<u>Assessment Tool</u>: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

<u>Criterion/Target</u>: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Learning Outcomes	Assessment Tool (e.g.,	Target/Criteria (desired	Results	Analysis
(most programs will	portfolios, rubrics,	program level		
have multiple	exams)	achievement)		
outcomes)				
Raw Education	Institutional Data for	90% of PhD students	Graduate Programs: Institutional data	Programs
Quality: Core	progress through	will progress at an	on date of MA degrees show that 97% of	are
Content; Research	doctoral and	adequate pace though	graduate our students are moving with	successfully
Methodology; and	undergraduate programs	the first 3 years of their	adequate progress through our PhD	moving
Data Analysis		program.	program (24% Excellent, 34% Good, &	students to
proficiency; Creative			17% Adequate).	graduation
Problem Solving and		95% of undergraduate	Undergrad Program:	
conceptual		students who continue	Institutional date on undergraduate,	
integration	-	in the program to junior	junior level psychology majors revealed	
		level will be on track to	that 100% were on track to graduate.	
		graduate	None of the majors sampled had GPAs	
			below 2.1. 33% had GPAs between 3.5 &	
			4.0.	
	!			
	Departmental Surveys -	Student satisfaction of	Undergrad Program:	Survey Data
	Data were examined	program offerings	85% of the psychology majors surveyed	indicate
	from two departmental	should exceed 80%	believed they had been taught skills	good
	surveys, one aimed at all		they could use in the workplace. 65%	performance
	undergraduate		plan to apply to graduate school after	by the
	psychology majors and	· ·	graduation. 94% believed that their	department
	the other at junior &		experience as a psychology major was	
	senior majors		valuable. The composite rating for	
			quality of the psychology major by	
			juniors and seniors was 4.8 out of a	
			possible high rating of 6.	Program
Success After	Unsolicited External	WSU Psychology	Impartial external researchers "	quality is
Graduation: Life	Review and data	Department will have a	identified programs that produced exceptionally better outcomes than	good and
Satisfaction;	analysis (Hidden Gems	good national and	exceptionally better outcomes than expected, given their predoctoral	nationally
Employment; Social	Among Clinical	international	characteristics. The identified top	recognized
and Cultural	Psychology Training	reputation		as such.
sensitivity	Programs, Callahan &		programs were next compared on a range of department level training-	1 43 34Ciii
	Ruggero, Training and		relevant variables to similar programs."	1
	Education in Professional		The WSU Clinical program was identified	
	Psychology, 2013, Vol. 7,		as one of these top programs and	
	No. 4, 278-284)		ranked third among them in matching	
			students to internships.	
			Students to atternamps.	
Graduate Program	Survey and personal	Employment rate of	All PhD graduates who seek	Excellent
post-graduation	faculty contact	graduates should	employment upon graduation are	Outcome
employment	TOURING COTTON	exceed the national	finding discipline relevant jobs.	
Cubiolugue		unemployment rate	,	
Learning Outcomes	Assessment Tool (e.g.,	Target/Criteria (desired	Results	Analysis
(most programs will	portfolios, rubrics,	program level		
have multiple	exams)	achievement)		
outcomes)				

d. Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results (if applicable), employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the outcomes of the program as listed in 3c).

OPA Table 10 reveals a high level of satisfaction among our graduate and undergraduate majors. The most recent data reveals that 89.1% of undergraduate and 95.5% of graduate majors were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with our program. The undergraduate 89.1% satisfaction rate is comparable to that for all of LAS (89%) and a bit higher than the rate for the entire university (82.9%). However, the graduate student 95.5% rate of satisfaction is distinctly higher than that for WSU as whole (82.5%) and also LAS (77.5%).

Evaluate table 10 from the Office of Planning and Analysis regarding student satisfaction data.

Learne	Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years										
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±							
1	12	PhD Qualifying Exam	All 12 students passed								
2	12	PhD Qualifying Exam	All 12 students passed								
3	12	PhD Qualifying Exam	All 12 students passed								

e. Provide aggregate data on how the goals of the WSU General Education Program and KBOR 2020 Foundation Skills are assessed in undergraduate programs (optional for graduate programs).

Outcomes:		Results
o Have acquired knowledge in the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences o Think critically and independently o Write and speak effectively o Employ analytical reasoning and problem solving techniques	Majors	Non-Majors
GRE-Verbal for WSU undergraduate majors applying to our graduate program	56 th Percentile nationally	No data
GRE-Quantitative for WSU undergraduate majors applying to our graduate program	20 th Percentile nationally	No data
GRE-Analytic for WSU undergraduate majors applying to our graduate program	68 th Percentile nationally	No data

Note: Not all programs evaluate every goal/skill. Programs may choose to use assessment rubrics for this purpose. Sample forms available at: http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/

f. For programs/departments with concurrent enrollment courses (per KBOR policy), provide the assessment of such courses over the last three years (disaggregated by each year) that assures grading standards (e.g., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) course management, instructional delivery, and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.

Provide information here:

Two surveys, one aimed at concurrent enrollment high-school students and the other at our regular college undergraduate psychology majors. Data from these surveys indicate (1) that both sets of students are highly satisfied with the quality of our course offerings and (2) that the quality of our concurrent sections is equivalent to that of our regular college sections. A composite quality score for the concurrent enrollment classes was 5.26 on a scale of 1-6 with 6 being the most positive. (WSU no longer offers concurrent enrollment psychology courses.)

g. Indicate whether the program is accredited by a specialty accrediting body including the next review date and concerns from the last review.

Provide information here:

The clinical Ph.D. program initially received accreditation by the APA Commission on Accreditation (CoA) in 2005 for a five year period. The program was re-accredited in 2010 and at that time the CoA set the next accreditation Site Visit for 2015. Hence, during the 2013-2014 academic year, the program conducted their next Self Study that was due September 1, 2014 in anticipation of the actual Site Visit in 2015. The Self Study was submitted by the deadline and has been reviewed by CoA staff. The results of this review will be returned to the program for review and revisions which will be returned to the CoA. Assuming CoA is satisfied with any revisions the Site Visit will be scheduled for 2015.

h. Provide the process the department uses to assure assignment of credit hours (per WSU policy 2.18) to all courses has been reviewed over the last three years.

Provide information here:

In line with the new federal mandate, credit hour expectations are delineated in all course syllabi.

i. Provide a brief assessment of the overall quality of the academic program using the data from 3a – 3e and other information you may collect, including outstanding student work (e.g., outstanding scholarship, inductions into honor organizations, publications, special awards, academic scholarships, student recruitment and retention).

Provide assessment here:

The WSU Psychology Department is perceived nationally by fellow psychology departments, and locally by administrators, faculty, and students as being excellent. The data support this reputation in terms of grants, publications, professional presentations, student perception of teaching effectiveness, post-graduation employment, and alumni satisfaction. One of the most important indicators is the degree to which graduate and undergraduate students are brought into the research life of the department as fellow authors and presenters. For example, eight of our undergraduate majors won *Honors College Undergraduate Research Awards* in 2014. Regarding our graduate students, over calendar years 2011-2013 the department produced 71 research-publications and 183 presentations. For publications, in 32 of the 71 present or former graduate students served as senior author (45%) and for an additional 14 publications graduate students served as co-authors (20%). The total number of graduate student author involvements in department publications was 89. The total number of professional presentations was 183. For 97 of these current or former graduate students served as senior presenter (53%) and for an additional 35 presentations graduate students served as co-presenters (19%). In a small but unknown number of cases, undergraduates served as co-presenters. The total number of graduate student presenter involvements in department publications was 281.

- 4. Analyze the student need and employer demand for the program. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).
 - a. Evaluate tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning Analysis for number of applicants, admits, and enrollments and percent URM students by student level and degrees conferred.
 - b. Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program.

Salary ment % ii		Employment % in the field		o % outside the	No. pursuing	Projected growth from BLS** Current year on
	% In state		the field	field	graduate or	
					profes-	
					sional educa-	
			200000		tion	
					75	

^{*} May not be collected every year

Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis and from the table above. Include the most common types of positions, in terms of employment graduates can expect to find.

Provide assessment here:

For our undergraduate program the percent of URM students is equivalent to that of WSU as a whole, about 16%. Psychology's URM enrollment percentage is below that of LAS which about 22%. At the graduate doctoral level Psychology's URM percentage is double that of WSU as a whole, 12.9% for Psychology and 6.2% for the whole university. Our graduate URM percentage is equivalent to that of LAS as a whole, 13%. We believe the explanation for the difference between the undergraduate and graduate data is that at the undergraduate level majors selfselect their choice of major, whereas at the graduate level the department selects majors from a large pool of applicants. As a discipline Psychology seeks to have a healthy balance of diverse students.

^{**} Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: http://www.bls.gov/oco/ and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

Analyze the service the Program provides to the discipline, other programs at the University, and beyond.
 Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Evaluate table 16 from the Office of Planning Analysis for SCH by student department affiliation on fall census day.

a. Provide a brief assessment of the service the Program provides. Comment on percentage of SCH taken by majors and non-majors, nature of Program in terms of the service it provides to other University programs, faculty service to the institution, and beyond.

Provide assessment here:

Psychology is a popular non-major service course provider for General Education and other departments. SCH has been fairly stable at about 5,500 in the time frame from 2006 to 2012. About 60% of Psychology's SCH is from non-majors. Psychology is a recognized "Hub Science" with strategic links to all other disciplines and so the high rate of service related SCH production is certain to continue.

6. Report on the Program's goal (s) from the last review. List the goal (s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

(For Last 3 FYs)	Goal (s)	Assessment Data Analyzed	Outcome
	Graduate Programs: To provide instruction in advanced principles of psychology and to conduct both applied and basic research in clinical, community, or human factors psychology to the end that graduates will be prepared for careers in research, teaching, service and administration.	Graduation Rate Post-Graduate Employment	1. Of the 87 students most recently admitted to the program but not currently active: 2 Dismissed; 9 left the program with an MA; 9 left the program before completing the MA; and 67 completed the program with a PhD. 2. All students who completed the doctoral program have found psychology related employment.
	Undergraduate Program: Psychology majors who graduate with GPAs in the range of 3.5 to 4.0 should be able to, on average, succeed in graduate level work in a PhD or comparable program. Majors who graduate with GPAs in the range of 3.0 to 3.5 should be able to, on average, succeed in graduate level work in an MA or comparable program. Majors who graduate with GPAs in the range of 2:0 to 3.0 should be able to, on average, succeed in employment in a job or activity that requires a liberal arts college degree or equivalent.	Success in Graduate School Post-Graduation Satisfaction	1. Of 21 WSU undergraduates who most recently entered our doctoral program but are not currently active: 1 Dismissed; 3 withdrew pre-MA; 1 left with the MA; 16 completed the PhD. 2. Institutional data reports that in the most recent year of data collection (2013), 89.1% of graduated psychology majors reported being satisfied or very satisfied their major program. Comparable figures for WSU and LAS were: 82.9% and 89%.

7. Summary and Recommendations

a. Set forth a summary of the report including an overview evaluating the strengths and concerns. List recommendations for improvement of each Program (for departments with multiple programs) that have resulted from this report (relate recommendations back to information provided in any of the categories and to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e). Identify three year goal (s) for the Program to be accomplished in time for the next review.

Provide assessment here:

The assessment report documents that students enrolled in our undergraduate and three graduate programs are very satisfied with the education they received at WSU. The graduation rates of undergraduate and graduate students also demonstrate our effectiveness in helping students successfully navigate the degree programs to graduation. An area of concern shared by the undergraduate and the graduate programs is the relatively low percentage of Under Represented Minority (URM) students. Increasing the representation of URM students in our undergraduate and graduate programs is a goal the department seeks to address over the next three year period.

WSU Pro	gram Rev	/iew	College: LA	S Social	De	nartment: F	Psychology	Program	n: Psycholo	ogy
Appendix			Sciences			•		9		
Tables 1 throi	ugh 7 provide	data for Sec	tion 2 of the P udent Credit	rogram Revie: Hour (SCH) P	w Self Study 1 Production	emplate				
Fiscal Year (s					Rol	ling 5 FY aver			0000 0040	2000 2043
Course	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013
level: Total	12,618	11,908	11,330	12.085	12,430	12,699	12,573	12,074	12,090	12,223
100-299	4,146:	3,330	3,336	3,834	4,248	4,404	3,816	3,779 6.084	3,830 6,237	3,928 6,346
300-499 500-699	5,796 1.377	6,417 927	5,626 1.093	6,367 615	6,215 655	6,562 531	6,961 658	933	764	710
700-059	3	0	51	0	0	0	0	11	10	10
800-899	0	0	0	0	0 1,312	0 1,202	0 1,138	0 1,267	0 1,248	0 1,229
900-999 note: SCH of	1,296 all enrolled de	1,234 enartment of	1,224 ferings summa	1,269 sted by FY for	1,312 each census 0	1,202 lav: in some c	ases departme	ent level SCH ind		
offerings.							·			
Table 2: Stud	lent Credit H	lour (SCH) P	roduction at	Fall Census [Day Dal	ling 5 year av	erane			
Year of Fall C Course	ensus Day 2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
level:							E 004	E E27	E 500	5,536
Total	5,770 1,908	5,501 1,515	5,326 1,572	5,503 1.803	5,585 1.872	5,587 1.869	5,681 1.866	5,537 1,734	5,500 1, 726	1,796
100-299 300-499	1,908 2,637	3,134	2,778	2,849	2,820	3,022	3,035	2,844	2,921	2,901
500-699	608	269	391	249	291	144	245	362 6	269 6	264 6
700-799 800-899	0	0	30 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
900-999	617	583	555	602	602	552	535	592	579	569
note: SCH of	all enrolled d	epartment of	ferings at Fall	census day.	4.14	! 	- Marambar	Employee Can	sue Day (enti	re term
Table 3: Stud SCH)	dent Credit H	lour (SCH) F	roduction an	ong Departm	ient Instructio	onal Faculty (on Moveline	Employee Cens	ous Day (Cita	
Year of Nove	mber Census	Day			Ro	lling 5 year av			0007 0044	0000 004
Employee	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-201
type: Program	n/a	n/a	5,505	5,737	5,471	5,125	5,486	n/a	n/a	5,465
total	100		•	-						1,550
Tenure	n/a	il/a	1,548	2,010	1,591	1,168	1,434	n/a	n/a	I CONT
eligible faculty	Topic of the Control		The state of the s						SCOTON CONTROL OF THE SCOTON O	
Non-tenure	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	333	0	n/a	n/a	67
eligible faculty										
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	342	390	0	15	512	ri/a.	n/a	252 3,568
GTA	n/a	n/a	3,594 21	3,309 28	3,852 28	3,574 35	3,511 29	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	28
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a			District Control of the Same of the Control of the		GAT TO WATER A ANDREW TO STATE OF THE STATE		Construction of the constr	Control Control Value of Control Contr
Classified	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0
staff GSA, GRA,	or a commence of the commence	na managaran da kanan da kana Maran da kanan da ka			ila.	7/2	n√a	n/a	n/a	
	n/a	Apple breder and a way and a part of the p			The sylvenia special variety places of a section of the section of	Constitution of the second of	Process of the control of the contro	A company of the comp	Philosophic manner of the control of	
note: faculty/s	staff with activ	/e class assi	gnments and e	employment at	November fre	eze.; employe	ee type based	on ecls and egr	matrix.	
Table 4: Inst Year of Nove			on Novembe	r 1st Census	∪ay Ro	lling 5 year av	/erage			
real of Novel Employee	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-201
type:			47.0	47.0	E0.0	51 O	50.0	n/a	n/a	49
Program total	n/a	n/a	47.0	47.0	50.0	51.0	ວູບ.ບ	1116	F IF CA	
Tenure	n/a	n/a	150	15.0	10	13.5	140	n/a	nla	14
eligible						And the second s			Andrew Committee	
aculty Non-tenure	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0
eligible		1 11 54	3.0	~· ~		***				
faculty	42			2.0	0.0	1.0	4.0	n/a	n/ä	2
	n/a	n/a n/a	3.0 28.0	2.0 29.0	34.0	34.0	31.0	n/a	n/a	31
Lecturers	n/a						1.0	n/a	rίλα	
Lecturers GTA Unclassified	n/a n/a	na Na	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		The state of the s	article of the second s	
Lecturers GTA Unclassified professional		n/a			The second property of			The state of the s		O
Lecturers GTA Unclassified professional Classified staff		The second secon	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 n/a	n/a n/a	n/a N/a	0 Ø

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix.; fte of 1 based on 80 hour bi-week appointment;

employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; KBOR minima for faculty (TTF) 3 for UG, plus 3 for masters, plus 2 for doctoral.

Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) Page 2 of 8 (11/25/2013) Business Intelligence and Predictive

College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Psychology

Program: Psychology

Modeling (BIPM) WSU **Program Review**

Appendix
Table 5a: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for University Instructional Faculty on November 1st

nber Cen	sus Dav			Ro	llina 5 ve	ar averad	ae		
2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-	2007- 2011	2008- 2012
n/a	n/a	225	247	236	231	222	n/a	n/a	232
n/a	n/a	214	240	228	216	194	ri/a	rila	219
n/a	n/a	298	330	301	286	290	n/a	n/a	301
n/a	n/a	280	287	274	269	295	n/a	n/a	281
n/a	n/a	190	201	214	210	204	n/a	n/a	204
n/a	hla	116	121	106	149	121	n/a	n/a	123
n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	14	n/a	n/a	3
n/a	ri/a	n/a	n/a	п/а	n/a		n/a	n/a	A STATE OF THE STATE OF T
	2006 n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a	n/a	2006 2007 2008 n/a n/a 225 h/a n/a 214 n/a n/a 298 n/a n/a 280 n/a n/a 190 n/a n/a 116 n/a n/a 0 h/a h/a h/a n/a	2006 2007 2008 2009 n/a n/a 225 247 n/a n/a 214 240 n/a n/a 298 330 n/a n/a 190 201 n/a n/a 116 121 n/a n/a 0 0 n/a n/a n/a n/a	2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 n/a n/a 225 247 236 n/a n/a 214 240 228 n/a n/a 298 330 301 n/a n/a 190 201 214 n/a n/a 190 201 214 n/a n/a 116 121 106 n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a	2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 n/a n/a 225 247 236 231 n/a n/a 214 240 228 216 n/a n/a 298 330 301 286 n/a n/a 190 201 214 210 n/a n/a 116 121 106 149 n/a n/a 0 0 0 0 n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a	2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 n/a n/a 225 247 236 231 222 n/a n/a 214 240 228 216 194 n/a n/a 298 330 301 286 290 n/a n/a 190 201 214 210 204 n/a n/a 116 121 106 149 121 n/a n/a 0 0 0 0 14 n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a	2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006-2010 n/a n/a 225 247 236 231 222 n/a h/a n/a 214 240 228 216 194 ri/a n/a n/a 298 330 301 286 290 n/a n/a n/a 280 287 274 269 295 n/a n/a n/a 190 201 214 210 204 n/a n/a n/a 116 121 106 149 121 n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a	2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006- 2007- 2010 2011 n/a n/a 225 247 236 231 222 n/a n/a n/a n/a 214 240 228 216 194 ri/a ri/a n/a n/a 298 330 301 286 290 n/a n/a n/a n/a 280 287 274 269 296 n/a n/a n/a n/a 190 201 214 210 204 n/a n/a n/a n/a 116 121 106 149 121 n/a ri/a n/a n/a 0 0 0 0 14 n/a n/a

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on

instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5b: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for College Division Instructional Faculty on November

1st Census E	-	D			Dal	llina 5 vo	or overse	10		
Year of Nover Employee	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	lling 5 yea 2011	2012	2006- 2010	2007- 2011	2008- 2012
type: (College Division level) Total	n/a	n/a	241	255	249	256	238	n/a	n/a	248
Tenure eligible faculty	h/a	n/a	220	245	232	252	189	n/a	n/a	228
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	251	263	251	244	284	n/a	n/a	259
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	327	367	353	313	335	n/a	n/a	339
GTA	n/a	n/a	266	242	265	265	295	n/a	n/a	267
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	149	148	109	99	119	n/a	n/a	125
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	п/а	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	m/a	ri/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	h/a	0

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5c: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for Program Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Celiaus Day		_			_					
Year of Nover	nber Cen	sus Day			Ro	lling 5 ye				
Employee	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-	2007-	2008-
type:								2010	2011	2012
(Program level) Total	п/а	n/a	117	122	109	100	110	n/a	n/a	112
Tenure	h/a	nVa	103	134	106	90	102	n/a	n/a	107
eligible								And Large Superior State Co.	Park Parkers of the San Colors	A STATE OF THE PARTY OF T
faculty			Committee of the commit		The second secon		A company of the second of the	ATTACAMENT AND	The second secon	A Company of the Comp
Non-tenure	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	167	n/a	n/a	n/a	33
eligible										
faculty										Marian Company (September 1997)
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	114	195	n/a	15	128	n/a	n/a	90
GTA	n/a	n/a	128	114	113	105	113	n/a	n/a	115
Unclassified	n/a	n/a	21	28	28	35	29	n/a	n/a	28
professional										
Classified	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
staff										······································
GSA, GRA,	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix;

instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) Page 3 of 8 (11/25/2013) Business Intelligence and Predictive Modeling

College: LAS Social **Sciences**

Department: Psychology

Program: Psychology

(BIPM) WSU Program

Review Appendix

m Majors (including double majors) on Fall Census Day

Year of Fall Census Day Student Class 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006- 2010 2007-2011 2008-2012 Total 592 595 552 555 555 590 562 570 569 563 freshmen 99 106 94 97 92 107 78 98 99 94 sophomore 86 91 90 103 106 110 94 95 100 101 junior 147 122 113 115 120 113 138 123 117 120 senior 182 204 176 168 161 182 183 178 178 174 masters 7 1 2 2 1 3 1 3 2 2 post masters 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <	Table 6: Prograi	nimajois (in	cluding ababi	e iliajora <i>j</i> on	t an Ochso						
Student Class 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006-2012 2007-2011 2008-2012 Total 592 595 552 555 555 590 562 570 569 563 freshmen 99 106 94 97 92 107 78 98 99 94 sophomore 86 91 90 103 106 110 94 95 100 101 junior 147 122 113 115 120 113 138 123 117 120 senior 182 204 176 168 161 182 183 178 178 174 masters 7 1 2 2 1 3 1 3 2 2 post masters 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 obtotoral	Year of Fall Cens	sus Dav				Rollin	g 5 year ave			2227 2244	0000 0040
Total 592 595 552 555 555 590 562 570 569 563 freshmen 99 106 94 97 92 107 78 98 99 94 sophomore 86 91 90 103 106 110 94 95 100 101 junior 147 122 113 115 120 113 138 123 117 120 senior 182 204 176 168 161 182 183 178 178 174 masters 7 1 2 2 1 1 3 1 1 3 2 2 post masters 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 doctoral 71 71 71 77 70 75 75 68 73 74 73 other 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		•	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		2007-2011	2008-2012
Total	010001110100								2010		
freshmen 99 106 94 97 92 107 78 98 99 94 sophomore 86 91 90 103 106 110 94 95 100 101 sophomore 147 122 113 115 120 113 138 123 117 120 senior 182 204 176 168 161 182 183 178 178 174 masters 7 1 2 2 2 1 3 1 3 1 3 2 2 2 1 3 1 3 1 3 2 2 2 1 5 5 68 73 74 73 other 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Tatal	500	EOE	552	555	555	590	562	570	569	563
sophomore 86 91 90 103 106 110 94 95 100 101 junior 147 122 113 115 120 113 138 123 117 120 senior 182 204 176 168 161 182 183 178 178 174 masters 7 1 2 2 1 3 1 3 2 2 post masters 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 doctoral 71 71 77 70 75 75 68 73 74 73 other 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Lating and the control of the contro	392		usurususurummenenenenenensususulaksidaa	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O	CONTRACTOR	107	72	QR:	99	94
sophomore 86 91 90 103 106 110<	treshmen	99					440	04	05	100	101
senior 182 204 176 168 161 182 183 178 178 174 masters 7 1 2 2 1 3 1 3 2 2 post masters 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 doctoral 71 71 77 70 75 75 68 73 74 73 other 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		86	91	and the second s	men-in-recommendants (SMS) (SMS) (SMS)			74 • • • • •	CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF	447	120
senior 182 204 176 168 161 182 183 178 178 174 masters 7 1 2 2 1 3 1 3 2 2 post masters 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 doctoral 71 71 77 70 75 75 68 73 74 73 other 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	iunior	147	122	113	115	120	113	THE RESERVE OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NAME	The state of the s	117	474
masters 7 1 2 2 1 3 1 3 2 2 post masters 0	***************************************	182	204	176	168	161	182	183	178	1/8	1/4
post masters 0 <t< td=""><td>CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF</td><td>7</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>9</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>2</td></t<>	CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF	7	4	2	9	1	3	1	3	2	2
clockoral 71 71 77 70 75 75 68 73 74 73 other 0		<u> </u>	^	^	Λ	Λ	0	0	0	0	0
other 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	AUTO AUTO AUTO AUTO AUTO AUTO AUTO AUTO	U	U	V		70	75	69	73	74	73
other 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	doctoral	71	n.	U	70	1.0	(A)	^	^	n.	n
	other	0	0	0	0	O _	. 0			aroo otudonte:	•

note: majors include all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; other includes guest or non degree students;

KBOR minima 25 UG, 20 GR masters and 5 GR doctoral.

Table 7: Degree Production by Fiscal Year

Fiscal Year (sum					Rollin	g 5 FY avera	ige			
Degree level:	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-	2008-2012	2009-2013
20g. 00 10 to								2011		445
Total	108	134	129	121	93	100	116	117	115	112
Doctoral	- 8	7	15	6	10	12	15	9	10	12
Masters	12	13	15	13	6	8	14	12	11	11
Bachelor	88	114	99	102	77	80	87	96	94	00
Associate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	. U	U CD destoral	U

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; KBOR minima 10 UG, 5 GR masters & 2 GR doctoral.

Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) Page 4 of 8 (11/25/2013) Business Intelligence and Predictive Modeling

College: LAS Social Sciences

Department: Psychology

Program: Psychology

Review Application	Intelligence and F		aeung								
Table 8. Mean Application GPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source=Applications)	(BIPM) WSU F	Program									
Table 8. Mean Application GPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source=Applications)	Review App	endix								e a se e se con como su assessa de manda a se a considerabrada de la considerabrada de la considerabrada de la	
Table 8: Mean ACT score of Juniors and Seniors Enrolled on Fall Centus Day (source=Fall Centus Day) Statistic: 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2010 2011 Commonweight Commonweigh	Tables 8 novides	s data for Se	ction 3a of the	e Program Re	view Self Stud	y Template.					
Year of Fall Census Day 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2010 2011 2	Table 8: Mean A	CT score of	Juniors and	Seniors Enr	olled on Fall (Census Day (source=Fall	Census Day	1		
Statistic: 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2008 2007 2008 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2						Rol	ling 5 year ave	erage			0000 0040
Inhibitity value 2.1 2.3 2.2 2.5 2.5 2.7 2.8 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.2 2.2 2.5 2.7 2.8 2.9 2.2 2.5 2.8 2.8 2.2 2.2 2.5 2.8 2.8 2.8 2.2 2.2 2.5 2.8 2.8 2.8 2.2 2.2 2.5 2.8 2.8 2.8 2.2 2.2 2.5 2.8 2		•	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012			2008-2012
University level # 21											22.7
Program 214 219 222 219 218 218 218 229	University level	22.1			Company of the Control of the Contro			 A resident of the control of the contr	and the second programme and all the programme to the		AND THE RESERVE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT
Program 329 326 289 283 281 285 321 302 285	Program	21.4	21.9	22.2	21.9	21.8	22.4	22.A			Commence of the commence of th
Program agror court importance of the program of th		And the second s	A CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF T	Control Contro			A CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF T	224	202	205	204
Percent 57,1% 55,5% 55,5% 56,4% 57,2% 56,6% 57,2% 56,6% 57,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 57,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6% 57,6% 56,6% 57,6		329	326	289	283	281	295	321	302	250	201
Percent 37.1% 55.5% 56.4% 57.2% 56.6% 57.6% 57.6% 56.6% 57.1% 57.1% 55.5% 56.4% 57.2% 56.6% 57.6% 57.6% 56.6% 57.1% 57.1% 57.1% 57.1% 57.1% 55.5% 56.4% 57.2% 56.6% 57.6% 57.6% 57.6% 56.6% 57.1% 57					400	100	470	185	171	167	168
Percent 57.1% 59.5% 59.4% 57.2% 30.0% 37.2% 30.0% 37	Children (Children Children Ch				NEW YORK THE PARTY OF THE PARTY			Contract to the second		CONTRACTOR OF STREET,	COMPLETE CONTRACTOR CO
Table 1: Man Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications) Table 3: Man Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications) Table 3: Man Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications) Table 3: Man Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications) Table 3: Man Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications) Table 3: Man Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications) Table 3: Man Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications) Table 3: Man Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications) Table 3: Man Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications) Table 3: Man Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications) Table 3: Man Applications		57.1%	55.5%	56.4%	37.2%	30.076	31.070	31.070	00.070	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Table 9: Mean Application GPA of Admitted Graduse Student Majors (source Applications)	reporting	ing and CAT	available 9/	T is used cor	werted to ACT	metric: KBO	R cantures A0	CT data for en	rolled juniors	& seniors only	y; KBOR
Table 9: Mean Application OPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (sources Applications) Fiscal Year (summer-fail-spring sequence) 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2007 2014 2012 2013 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018		ang and SAT	avallable, SA	AT IS USEU COL	iverted to AOT	meane, repo	r captaloo, it	. , .			
Table 9: Mean Application GPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source—Applications) Stutistic: 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2007 2008 2009-2013 2011 2012 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013	Table 0 provides	data for Sad	tion 3h of the	Program Rev	new Self Study	Template					
Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence) Statistic 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2007 2008 2009-2013 2011 2012 2013 2007 2008 2009-2013 2009-2	Table 9: Mean A	polication (SPA of Admi	tted Graduate	e Student Mai	ors (source=	: Application:	s)			
Statistic: 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2007 2008 2009-2013 2019-2013 2019-2013 2019					•	Rol	ling 5 FY weig	hted average)		
University level 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5					2010				2007-		2009-2013
University level 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.7 3.7 3.7 3.7 3.7 3.7 majors Percent 96.2% 88.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.8% Percent 96.2% 88.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.8% Percent 96.2% 88.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.8% Percent 96.2% 88.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.8% Percent 96.2% 88.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.8% Percent 96.2% 88.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.8% Percent 128.5 10 provides data for Section 3.0 of the Program Raview Self-Study Template. Table 10: Satisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit Academic Year (fall-spring-summer sequence) Student level: 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2007- 2018- 2012- 2012 University n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 79.5% 82.9% n/a n/a n/a n/a University n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 83.7% 89.0% n/a n/a n/a n/a Undergraduate level Collège n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 71.7% 91.1% n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a statisfied or very satisfied median n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n											2.5
Program 26 19 14 15 26 16 23 20 18 19 majors 26 19 14 15 26 16 23 20 18 19 majors count reporting GR 25 17 13 15 26 16 22 19 17 18 grad majors count reporting GR 25 17 13 15 26 16 22 19 17 18 grad grad grad grad grad grad grad grad	University level	3.5	3.5	3.5							
Program 26 19 14 15 26 16 23 20 16 19 17 18 19 18 19 18 19 17 18 19 18 19 17 18 19 18 19 19 17 18 18 19 19 19 19 19 19		3.760	3.7	3.8	37	3,8	3.7	3.7	3.7		A CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF T
Program 20 19 14 13 20 10 20 20 30 30 30 30 30 3	majors		And the second s	Personal Communication of the		Princey where a princey and the second secon	William Control of the Control of th	80		10	10
Percent 96.2% 89.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.9%		26	19	14	15	26	16	23	20	10	13
gga 96.2% 89.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.9% Percent 96.2% 89.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.9% Percent 96.2% 89.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.9% Percent 96.2% 89.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.9% Percent 96.2% 89.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.9% Percent 96.2% 89.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.9% Percent 70.2% 70			on meneral and a second se			on.		20	10	47	18
Percent 96.2% 89.5% 92.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 95.7% 96.0% 96.7% 97.3% reporting reporting note: graduate student application gpa based on last 60 hours of course work earned. Table 10: Statisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit Table 10: Statisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit Table 10: Statisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit Table 10: Statisfaction with Program among Undergraduate Students at End of Program Exit Rolling 5 AY average 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2007 2008 2011 2012 2011 2012 University n/a	Partition of the Republic Annual Control of the Con	25	175	14	15	20	10	- 44	12		The second of th
reporting note: graduate student application gpa based on last 60 hours of course work earned. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Students at End of Program Exit Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Students at End of Program Care and Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Students at End of Program Care and Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Students at End of Program Care and Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Students at End of Program Care and Template. Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of Section 3d of Program Care and Template. Table 10 program Gardinate Section 3d of Sectio		Control of the Contro	ao ra	00.00/	400.00/	100.0%	100 0%	95.7%	96.0%	96.7%	97.9%
Table 10: Satisfaction unth Program Review Self Study Template. Table 10: Satisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit		96.2%	89.5%	92.976	100.076	100.076	100.070	00.1 70	001070		
Table 10: Provides data for Section 3d of the Program Raview Self Study Template.	reporting	udont applic	ation and has	na tael on he	hours of cours	e work earne	d.				
Table 10: Satisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at Land or Program Exit Academic Year (fall-spring-summer sequence)	Tobie 10 provide	e data for Se	auon gpa bas etion 3d of th	e Program Ri	wiew Self Stu	ly Template.	College Colleg	And the second s			And the state of t
Rolling 5 AY average Student level: 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2007 2008 2009-2013	Table 10: Satisf	action with	Program am	ona Underar	aduate and G	raduate Stud	ents at End	of Program E	xit		
Student level: 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2007 2011 2012 2009-2013 2007 2011 2012 2019-2013 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019 2019						Ro	lling 5 AY ave	rage			
University n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 79.5% 82.9% n/a	•				2010	2011	2012	2013			2009-2013
University n/a										and the second s	-1-
level College n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 83.7% 89.0% n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a Division Undergraduate level Program Undergraduate majors: Percent n/a	University	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	79.5%	82.9%	n/a	n/a	п/а
Collège n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 83.7% 89.0% n/a	Undergraduate										
Division	level			Marian Maria and American Street and American Street and American Street Ameri		a kodensta status este en venira kod (ka 2013)				ala:	a de la companya de l
Undergraduate level Program Undergraduate majors: Percent n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 71.7% 91.1% n/a n/a n/a n/a satisfied or very satisfied mean n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n	College	nla	n/a	n∕a	n/a	n/a	83.7%	89.0%	rva	wa	PI A
Program Undergraduate majors: Percent	San the season with the second										The second secon
Program Undergraduate majors: Percent n/a	hand a specificant (%) and self-and sel										The second secon
Percent						And Education Control of Control					A Committee of the Comm
satisfied or very satisfied mean		-		n lo	nla	n/a	71 7%	91.1%	n/a	n/a	n/a
satisfied mean n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n		nva	rva	II/a	IVa	ING	1 1.7 70	V	7.1.		
Mean M/a	i concerna										
median n/a n/a<		n/a	n/a	n/a	nla	n/a	4.0	4.3	n/a	n/a	n/a
Count		"					Children to the control of the contr	4	n/a	n/a	2002/AUGASOBINIO CONTROPOS
University n/a	NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY O		0480180800400801884444458543CACCACUSOCCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCACCA				60	90	n/a		***************************************
Graduate level Graduate level n/a n/a <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>80.0%</td> <td>82.5%</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td>							80.0%	82.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a
College n/a			-					and a sure or agreement to a finite or the first of the f			
Graduates level	College	n/a	ri/a	n/a	n/a	nia	77.0%	77.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Program Graduate majors: Percent n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a Percent n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a satisfied or very satisfied mean n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a mean n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a median n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a	Division		A Company of the Comp								Control March Control
Percent n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a satisfied or very satisfied n/a n/				A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O	The state of the s			And the second s			Community of Community Com
Percent n/a		•					00.5%	OE 50/	n/o	n/a	n/a
satisfied mean n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a median n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 4 5 n/a n/a n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	88.5%	9 5.5%	IVđ	1110	IVG
mean n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 1.04 n/a 1.04 n/a											
mean n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n				1-		n/e	12	47	n/a	n/a	n/a
median n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n			The state of the s				and the state of t				7.39
										University of the Control of the Con	Contract to the second

count n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 26 22 n/a note: primary majors only; data from the Application For Degree Exit Survey; scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being high (very satisfied).

Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) Page 5 of 8 (11/25/2013) Business Intelligence and Predictive

College: LAS Social Sciences

Department: Psychology

Program: Psychology

Modeling (BIPM) WSU Program Review

Appendix

Table 11: Applications, Admits and Enrollment for Undergraduate and Graduate Applicants Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence) Folling 5 FY average Student 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2007-2011 2008-2012 2009-2013 2009-2014 2009	Appendix										
Table 11: Applications, Admits and Enrollment for Undergraduate and Graduate Applications Science Scie	Tables 11 thro	ough Table 19	provide data	r for Section 4	of the Progra	n Review Self	Study Lempi	ate.			
Student 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2007-2011 2008-2012 2009-2013	Table 11: App	olications, A	dmits and Er	nrollment for	Undergradua	te and Gradu	iate Applican	เร			
Suident 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2010 2011 2012 2011 2012 2011 2012 2011 2012 2011 2012 2011 2012 2011 2012 2011 2012 2011 2012 2013 2013 2014 2014 2015	Fiscal Year (se	ummer-fall-sp	ring sequenc					rage	2007 2011	2009-2012	2000-2013
Undergraduates: Applicants 201 198 174 213 230 254 237 203 214 222 Admitted 190 190 161 197 218 243 225 191 202 209 Admitted 190 190 161 197 218 243 225 191 202 209 Census day 120 117 104 127 145 144 129 123 127 130 Craduates: Applicants 73 68 68 61 79 82 77 70 72 73 Admitted 28 19 14 15 26 16 23 20 18 19 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006-2010 2007-2011 2008-2012 Ievel: University level: Freshmen & 15.3% 14.5% 15.0% 15.7% 17.0% 18.0% 18.5% 15.5% 16.0% 16.8% Sophomores Juniors & 12.3% 12.0% 12.3% 13.0% 14.0% 14.9% 15.4% 12.7% 13.2% 13.9% Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% College division level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 50.0% 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 50.0% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 15.5% 16.0% 10.0% 10.0% 20.0% 20.0% 15.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Sophomores Juniors & 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 16.8% 15.5% 15.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors & 16.8% 15.9% 15.5% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors & 16.8% 15.9% 15.5% 15.5% 15.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors & 16.8% 15.9% 15.5% 15.5% 15.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors & 16.8% 15.9% 15.5% 15.5% 15.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3%	Student	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2000-2012	2003-2010
Applicants 201 198 174 213 230 254 237 203 214 222 Admitted 199 190 161 197 218 243 225 191 202 209 Census day 120 117 104 127 145 144 129 123 127 130 Graduates: Applicants 73 69 68 61 79 82 77 70 72 73 Admitted 26 19 14 15 26 16 23 20 18 19 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 note: unduplicated count as last record of FY; applicants exclude incomplete or cancelled applications. Table 12: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) on Fall Census Day Year of Fall Census Day Student 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006-2010 2007-2011 2008-2012 Ievei: University level: Freshmen & 15.3% 14.5% 15.0% 15.7% 17.0% 18.0% 18.5% 15.5% 16.0% 16.8% Sophomores Juniors & 12.3% 12.0% 12.3% 13.0% 14.0% 14.9% 15.4% 12.7% 13.2% 13.9% Doctoral 5.0% 6.8% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Doctoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.8% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% Speniors Masters 5.8% 20.5% 20.1% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% Sophomores Juniors & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors & 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.4% 16.4% Sophomores Juniors & 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors & 10.8% 15.5% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 15.5% 11.6% 13.3% 13.2% 12.9% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 15.5% 17.8% 15.5% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.5% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.5% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.5% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.5% 17.8% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.5% 17.8% 15.5% 17.6% 13.3% 13.2% 12.9%	level:										
Admited 190 190 161 197 218 243 225 191 202 209 Census day 120 117 104 127 145 144 129 123 127 130 Census day 120 117 104 127 145 144 129 123 127 130 Census day 120 117 104 127 145 144 129 123 127 130 Census day 120 117 104 127 145 144 129 123 127 130 Census day 120 117 104 127 145 144 129 123 127 130 Census day 120 117 104 127 145 144 129 123 127 130 Census day 120 117 104 127 145 144 129 123 127 130 Census day 23 13 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 120 141 15 29 18 14 15 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 18 18 18 19 18 15 17 16 18 18 19 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Undergraduate	es:						007	000	244	222
Armitled 190 190 161 197 218 218 129 123 127 130 Census day 120 117 104 127 145 144 129 123 127 130 Graduates: Applicants 73 69 68 61 79 82 77 70 72 73 Admitted 26 19 14 15 26 16 23 20 18 19 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 note: unduplicated count as last record of FY; applicants exclude incomplete or cancelled applications. Table 12: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) on Fall Census Day Year of Fall Census Day Student 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006-2010 2007-2011 2008-2012 level: University level: Freshmen 8 15.3% 14.5% 15.0% 15.7% 17.0% 18.0% 18.5% 15.5% 16.0% 16.8% Sophomores Juniors 8 12.3% 12.0% 12.3% 13.0% 14.0% 14.9% 15.4% 12.7% 13.2% 13.9% Seniors Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Doctoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.8% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% Sophomores Juniors 8 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.8% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.8% 20.9% 21.9% Sophomores Juniors 8 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.8% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.8% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 13.4% 13.9% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors 8 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors 8 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors 8 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors 8 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors 8 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors 8 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors 8 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors 8 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors 8 16.1% 16.9% 16.9% 16.5% 14.4% 14.	Applicants							The second secon		and the second s	
Craduates: Applicants 73 69 68 61 79 82 77 70 72 73 Applicants 73 69 68 61 79 82 77 70 72 73 Amitted 26 19 14 15 26 16 23 20 18 19 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Consus day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Table 12: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) on Fall Census Day Year of Fall Census Day Student 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006-2010 2007-2011 2008-2012 level: University level: Freshmen 8 15.3% 14.5% 15.0% 15.7% 17.0% 18.0% 18.5% 15.5% 16.0% 16.8% Sophomores Juniors 8 12.3% 12.0% 12.3% 13.0% 14.0% 14.9% 15.4% 12.7% 13.2% 13.9% Seniors Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Doctoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 5.6% 5.6% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 5.0% Sophomores: Juniors 8 20.5% 20.1% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors 8 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.3% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen 8 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors 8 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0	Admitted	190	and the second second second			A CONTRACT OF THE PARTY OF THE		The second second second second		the second second second	Control of the second s
Applicants 73 69 68 61 79 82 77 70 72 73 73 73 73 74 74 75 75 75 75 75 75	Census day	120	117	104	127	145	144	129	123	127	130
Admitted 26 19 14 15 26 16 23 20 18 19 10 17 10 16 17 10 10 17 10 10 17 10 10 17 10 10 17 10 10 17 10 10 17 10 10 17 10 10 17 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Graduates:							77	70	70	73
Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 16 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 Census day 23 13 18 13 18 13 19 18 15 17 College di Census day 23 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	Applicants			68		and the second s				and the control of th	
Census day 23 13 18 18 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	epiteraledulurgudoldisilrioseksitusiksuu vuonaikuttitiitiitiit		and the second s							CONTRACTOR	
Table 12: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) on Fall Census Day Year of Fall Census Day Year of Fall Census Day Student 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006-2010 2007-2011 2008-2012 level: University level: Freshmen & 15.3% 14.5% 15.0% 15.7% 17.0% 18.0% 18.5% 15.5% 16.0% 16.8% Sophomores Juniors & 12.3% 12.0% 12.3% 13.0% 14.0% 14.9% 15.4% 12.7% 13.2% 13.9% Seniors Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Doctoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.6% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% College division level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 10.0% 2.0% 0.0% 13.3% 13.2% Tochool 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 15.8% 16.9% 11.6% 13.3% 13.2% 12.9%	Census day	23	13						17	10	• •
Student 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006-2010 2007-2011 2008-2012	note: unduplic	ated count as	s last record o	of FY; applican	nts exclude inc	complete or ca	incelled applic	auoris.			
Student 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2006-2010 2007-2011 2008-2012 Ievel: University level: Freshmen & 15.3% 14.5% 15.0% 15.7% 17.0% 18.0% 18.5% 15.5% 16.0% 16.8% Sophomores Juniors & 12.3% 12.0% 12.3% 13.0% 14.0% 14.9% 15.4% 12.7% 13.2% 13.9% Seniors Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Doctoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.6% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% College division level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 21.3% 15.9% 17.9%			represented	Minorities (U	RM) on Fall C	ensus ນay	Iller E voos ov	omao			
Student level: Iuniversity level: Freshmen & 15.3% 14.5% 15.0% 15.7% 17.0% 18.0% 18.5% 15.5% 16.0% 16.8% Sophomores Juniors & 12.3% 12.0% 12.3% 13.0% 14.0% 14.9% 15.4% 12.7% 13.2% 13.9% Seniors Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Doctoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.6% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% College division level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0					0000				2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
University level: Freshmen & 15.3% 14.5% 15.0% 15.7% 17.0% 18.0% 18.5% 15.5% 16.0% 16.8% Sophomores Juniors & 12.3% 12.0% 12.3% 13.0% 14.0% 14.9% 15.4% 12.7% 13.2% 13.9% Seniors Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Doctoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.6% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% College division level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Juniors & 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.0% 0.0% 0		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2000 20.0	200. 2011	
Freshmen & 15.3% 14.5% 15.0% 15.7% 17.0% 18.0% 18.5% 15.5% 16.0% 10.6% Sophomores Juniors & 12.3% 12.0% 12.3% 13.0% 14.0% 14.9% 15.4% 12.7% 13.2% 13.9% Seniors Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Dictoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.6% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% College division level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.4% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Sophomores Juniors & 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0		_									
Sophomores			4.4.504	45.00/	45 70/	47.00/	40 00/	18 5%	15.5%	16.0%	16.8%
Juniors & 12.3% 12.0% 12.3% 13.0% 14.0% 14.9% 15.4% 12.7% 13.2% 13.9% Seniors Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Doctoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.6% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% College division level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Juniors & 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0		15.3%	14.5%	15.0%	15.7%	17.070	10.070	10.570	10.070	10.070	
Seniors Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 8.8% Doctoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.6% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% College division level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 19.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0							4.4 00%	TE 40%	12.7%	13.2%	13.9%
Masters 5.8% 6.6% 6.8% 7.8% 8.2% 9.7% 11.3% 7.1% 7.8% 6.3% Doctoral 5.0% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.6% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% College division level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% </td <td></td> <td>12.370</td> <td>12.076</td> <td>34.376</td> <td>13.076</td> <td></td> <td>17.7</td> <td></td> <td>AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND</td> <td>Company of the Company of the Compan</td> <td>Company of the company of the compan</td>		12.370	12.076	34.376	13.076		17.7		AND	Company of the Compan	Company of the compan
Naters 5.8% 6.9% 6.8% 5.6% 6.6% 5.4% 6.7% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% 6.2% College division level: Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% 13.3% 13.0% 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.0% 0.0% 0			C C0/	C OV	7 00/	g 2%	9.7%	11 3%	7.1%	7.8%	8.8%
College division level: Freshmen & 23.7%	The same and the s				CO. CO. CO. CO. ADMINISTRAÇÃO DA COLO DA COLO DE					6.2%	6.2%
Freshmen & 23.7% 20.7% 19.9% 20.9% 20.9% 27.1% 26.0% 21.2% 21.9% 22.9% Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.0% 0.0% 0	\$5000 v 400 v 40 v 40 v 40 v 40 v 40 v 40	CONTRACTOR OF STREET, SALVANON AND PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF		Market Company			Charles Control of State of St		**************************************		
Sophomores Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% (4.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Jüniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.0% 0.0% 0			20.7%	10 0%	20.9%	20.9%	27.1%	26.0%	21.2%	21.9%	22.9%
Juniors & 20.5% 20.1% 19.1% 20.6% 22.5% 22.3% 22.2% 20.6% 20.9% 21.3% Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 13.3% 13.2% 12.9%		23.170	20.1.70	10.070	20.570	20.070					
Seniors Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctored 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Jüniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 13.3% 13.3% 13.2% 12.9%	 Services commenced and commenced and control for the PROPERTY 	20 E07	ZOE NC	40 1%	20.6%	22.5%	22.3%	22.2%	20.6%	20.9%	21.3%
Masters 10.8% 15.7% 15.7% 17.1% 17.4% 18.9% 20.6% 15.3% 16.9% 17.9% Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0% Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Jünidis & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 13.3% 13.2% 12.9%		44,470	4 0.1.0						Provide Control of the Control of th	Control of the contro	private processor processor and the processor of the con- linear processor processor in the control of the con- plete processor of the control of the control of the con- plete processor of the control of the control of the con- trol of the control of the control of the control of the con- trol of the control of the control of the control of the con- trol of the control of the co
Doctoral 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 16.0% 10.7% 11.8% 13.4% 13.3% 13.0%		10.8%	15 7%	15 7%	17.1%	17.4%	18.9%	20.6%	15.3%	The state of the s	CONTRACTOR
Program level: Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 15.4% Sophomores Jünibis & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 13.3% 13.2% 12.9%	Manufacture Company of the Company o	and the state of t	CONTRACTOR		The state of the s	AND THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF	10.7%	11.8%	13.4%	13.3%	13.0%
Freshmen & 22.2% 18.3% 12.5% 16.5% 14.6% 18.4% 15.1% 16.8% 16.1% 13.4% Sophomores Jüniörs & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0		Andrew Control of the					AND THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS A PARTY OF THE PERSON NAMED IN PROPERTY OF THE PERSON NA				
Sophomores Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.3% Seniors 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%			18.3%	12.5%	16.5%	14.6%	18.4%	15.1%	16.8%	16.1%	15.4%
Juniors & 16.1% 16.9% 15.9% 15.5% 17.8% 15.9% 16.2% 16.4% 16.4% 16.4% Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.0% 0.0% 0.0% Descripted 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 15.8% 10.5% 11.6% 13.3% 13.2% 12.9%			. 0.0 / 0		, -	·			And the second s	orenos do altimos presidadantes	
Seniors Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0		16.1%	16.9%	15.9%	15.5%	17.8%	15.9%	16.2%	16.4%	16.4%	16.3%
Masters 10.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0									The state of the s		had an arrange and property of the second se
Declared 14.1% 15.5% 14.3% 11.4% 15.8% 10.5% 11.6% 13.3% 13.2% 12.9%		10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%					and the second of the second o
	Doctoral	14.1%	15.5%		11.4%	15.8%	10.5%				consistent and a second

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

Program: Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) Page 6 of 8 (11/25/2013) Department: College: LAS Social Psychology Business Intelligence and Predictive Modeling (BIPM) WSU Sciences **Psychology Program Review Appendix** Table 13: Race/Ethnicity on Fall Census Day Rolling 5 year average Year of Fall Census Day 2007-2008-2006-Student level: Total Total URM RN. Freshmen & Sophomores Total white non-hispanic black non-hispanic я hispanic Я asian non-hispanic 1 : american indian/alaskan nat foreign n hawaiian multiple race unknown Juniors & Seniors Total white non-hispanic black non-hispanic hispanic asian non-hispanic american Indian/alaskan nativ foreign hawailan multiple race unknown : Master Total white non-hispanic black non-hispanic 0 . hispanic a asian non-hispanic american Indian/alaskan nai Õ n foreign Ó hawaiian Ω multiple race O. O unknown **Doctoral Total** white non-hispanic black non-hispanic hispanic asian non-hispanic american indian/alaskan native foreign hawaiian n Ω multiple race unknown note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) Page 7 of 8 (11/25/2013) Business Intelligence and Predictive Modeling

College: LAS Social

Sciences

Department: Psychology

Program: Psychology

(BIPM) WSU Program

1 200 1100 111	ANNONALV
	Appendix

Review Ap	pendix				_						
Table 14: Perc	ent Under-re	presented N	linorities (UR	(M) of Degree	ed Conferred	Students by	Fiscal Year				
Year of Fall Cer					Ro	lling 5 year av	rerage		0007 0044	2008-2012	
Degree level:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-	2007-2011	2000-2012	
Ü								2010			
University leve	l:							0.00/	E E0/	6.5%	
Doctoral	8.7%	1.5%	7.2%	6.1%	6.3%	6.5%	6.5%	6.0%	5.5%	7.6%	Ĕ
Masters	4.9%	6.0%	6.4%	6.1%	6.4%	8.7%	10.5%	6.0%	6.7%	11.9%	ŝ
Bachelor	10.2%	10.7%	11.3%	11.1%	12.0%	12.7%	12.7%	11.1%	11.5%		Ē
Associate	21.4%	13.8%	11.8%	16.0%	18.8%	18.4%	23.1%	16.4%	15.8%	17.6%	Ē
College division	n level:							4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	40.00/	14.3%	
Doctoral	12.5%	14.3%	13.3%	0.0%	30.0%	8.3%	20.0%	14.1%	13.2%	ALL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	85
Masters	10.9%	10.7%	17:3%	14.9%	13.8%	18.6%	13.1%	13.5%	15.1%	15.5% 18.3%	8
Bachelor	18.1%	17.4%	15.5%	15.5%	18.6%	22.2%	19.9%	17.0%	17.9%	NATIONAL PROPERTY OF THE PROPE	R
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Ě
Program level:	999999			•				4.4.004	40.00/	14.3%	
Doctoral	12.5%	14.3%	13.3%	0.0%	30.0%	8.3%	20.0%	14.0%	13.2%	The second secon	æ
Masters	25.0%	15.4%	13.3%	7.7%	16.7%	12.5%	14.3%	15.6%	13.1%	12.9%	Æ
Bachelor	13.6%	11.4%	16.2%	11.8%	13.0%	23.8%	16.1%	13.2%	15.2%	16.2%	255
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200

Table 15: Race/Ethnicity of Degreed	I Conferred Students by Fiscal Year
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Year of Fall Census Day			Rolling	5 year averag	ge			0000 0040
Degree level: 2006 2007	2008	2009	2010	2011		2010		2008-2012
	129	121				117	115	112 17
	20	13				16		12
	15	6				9 7		9
white non- 7 6		5	6	10	11	Visit Visit Property Control (1997) and the control of the control	Q	The control of the analysis of the control of the c
hispanic	STATE OF THE PARTY	Section of the sectio	and the state of t		Service Control of the Control of th	Property of the control of the contr	4	1
black non- 1 1	2	0.	2	0	7	1	ı	•
hispanic					A	n	п	1
hispanic 0 0	0	0	1	l O	∠ 0	0	0	0
dolaritori	0	0	1	0	U	U	•	•
hispanic				Parava harrapha Pirat rasaling	0	Design Assault and the State of		0
The same of the sa	0	0	0	U				A STREET AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF T
indian/alaskan								Account of the control of the contro
native			0	1	1	0	0	1
	0 N	i N	ELY : WARTER YOU CONTROL OF THE STATE OF THE	n N	n	ů .	Ō.	0
HOWARD P		0	pre 7 (00000000000000000000000000000000000	0	0	0	0	0
Transpio race	0 n	0				ñ	0	0
CHRONIC C	u 15	13	•	8	14	12	11	11
The state of the s	13	Address Committee of the Committee of th					8	Signature and a property of the second
The state of the s	A CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF T	Wanter State Control of the Control	The state of the s		Control of the contro			The state of the s
hispanic black non- 1 2	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0
	U	1	J	·				4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
hispanic 2 0	2	n	1	1	1	1	11	1
hispanic 2 0 asian non- 0 2	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	1
hispanic 2	•	•	=					and the second second
american 0 0	O company	0		d minimum in the	0	B. C. C.	0	0
indian/alaskan	A control of the cont	schooling of comments of the control	The state of the s					
native		HERON CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY					The state of the s	Acceptable Acceptable Control of
foreign 0 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ò	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
multiple race 0 0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Linkriown 1 0	ā —		0	0	0	0	0	0

(Table continued on next page)

Program: Psychology Department: Psychology Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA) College: LAS Social Page 8 of 8 (11/25/2013) Business Sciences Intelligence and Predictive Modeling (BIPM) WSU Program **Review Appendix** Rolling 5 year average (Table 15 continued) Year of Fall Census Day 2008-2012 2007-2011 2012 2006-2011 Degree level: 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2010 96 94 89 80 87 102 77 88 114 99 Bachelor Total 61 66 54 49 60 70 75 white non-67 88 65 hispanic 5 5 6 9 8 7 4 4 6 4 black nonhispanic 6 7 7 9 6 3 6 hispanic 10 4 5 5 5 4 3 5 asian non-4 3 hispanic 1 2 Ĺ 0 2 0 4 2 3 american indian/alaskan native 3 2 3 3 1 0 1 8 4 1 foreign 0 0 hawallan Ó 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 6 multiple race 1 0 0 1 4 5 4 2 3 5 unknown 0 0 0 0 0 Associate 'n n 0 Total 0 O 0 0 0 0 0 white non-0 0 0 hispanic 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 black nonhispanic 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 hispanic 0 0 0 0 0 asian non-0 0 0 hispanic o 0 0 0 0 0 0 american 0 O 0 indian/alaskan native 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 foreign 0 0 0 0 0 hawalian 0 0 0 0 0 O 0 0 0 0 0 multiple race 0 0 0 0 0 unknown note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes. Tables 16 provides data for Section 5 of the Program Review Self Study Template. Table 16: Department Student Credit Hour (SCH) by Student Department Affiliation on Fall Census Day Year of Fall Census Day Rolling 5 year average 2008-2012 2006-2007-2011 2010 2011 2012 2008 2009 2006 2007 Major & 2010 student level: 5.536 5.500 5,587 5,681 5,537 5.503 5.585 5,326 5,770 5.501 Total 1,702 1,689 1,643 1,664 Program UG 1,671 1.892 1.659 1.747 1,539 1,607 maiors 580 569 597 527 583 611 564 606 535 Program GR 620 majors 3.490 3,239 3,232 3,325 3.440 3,445 3.192 3.026 3.056 Non-program 3,479 majors 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% Total 29.7% 30.7% 29.3% 30.7% 27.6% 28.8% Program UG 29.0% 34.4% 31.1% 31.7% major 10.3% 10.8% 10.5% 9.3% 9.6% Program GR 10.2% 10.9% 10.7% 10.6% 11.5% major 58.8% 60.0% 61.4% 58.5% 61.7%

58.0%

57.4%

note: program majors includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

Non-program

majors

60.3%

55.0%

61.6%