Since the replication crisis, Psychology has begun to experience a “renaissance” where researchers are working hard to improve their scientific and literary practices. Many problems and potential solutions have been discussed; however, we have not yet looked at how this new culture may have altered reporting practices in the social sciences. Outliers, or observations in data that stand out or stray distinctly away from the rest of the data, can bias our analyses if not properly handled. Researchers have recently been reminded of the importance of finding outliers, and report how these data were handled (whether removed or left in the analysis). Here, we tallied how often authors mentioned outliers both in 2010 (when the replication crisis began), and in 2017 (after people began suggesting ways to improve psychological science). A total of 2235 experiments were found, and we saw an increase in mentions of outliers (from 15.7% in 2012, to 25% in 2017). We looked at differences in reporting of outliers across year based on the psychological field or statistical analysis used. We also looked to see if these outliers were considered people or datapoints, and what reason authors gave for stating an observation was outlying. We find that report rates are getting better, but there is still room for improvement, which can only help strengthen our science.