Program Name: Psychology

Assessment Report prepared by: Prof. Eb de Oliveira, Department of Psychology

Reporting cycle of Fall 2019 – Spring 2020

Mission Statement:

The mission of the Department of Psychology is to promote the development of students who understand a broad range of areas within psychology and make connections among Christian faith, learning and living.

Program Goals:

1. Develop students' knowledge across a broad range of areas within psychology.
2. Teach Students to use ethical guidelines and procedures involved in psychological research.
3. Challenge students to contemplate the connections among Christian faith, learning, and living.
4. Prepare students to serve in their future educational, career, and personal endeavors.

MALONE UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT ANNUAL REPORT CARD

Department: *Psychology*
Program: *Psychology*
Assessment report prepared by: *Prof. Eb de Oliveira*
Time Period Covered: *2019-2020*
Submission Date: 10-30-2020

Note: This report updates data for PILOs # 2 and 4. Beginning with the 2020-21 cycle, the Psychology Department decided to develop its own measure for PILO#1 in lieu of the expensive MFT which had been adopted in the past.

Program Intended Learning Outcomes (PILO)	Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results
Outcome #1 *Students will evidence a satisfactory level of knowledge of key theories, findings, and methods across a broad range of the primary sub-disciplines in psychology.*	ETS Major Field Test (MFT) in psychology Total score, four subscale scores, and six assessment indicators (11 total). See Appendix 1 for specific results from 2005-2011, and every even year since 2014. We aim to have the trend in our mean scores at or above the comparative mean in all areas of the MFT.	No data are available on this outcome for this assessment cycle.	NA
Outcome #2 *Students will demonstrate familiarity with the ethical guidelines and procedures involved in developing, performing, and reporting psychological research.*	The first tool involves a series of course-embedded assessments in PSYC 273 to assess student mastery of ethics and methods. The assessments are done using a rubric. The second tool involves a course-embedded final exam in PSYC 273. The exam is designed to test a student's ability to apply knowledge about research ethics and methods to a *novel problem*. Thus, the exam involves	The general pattern of results relative to the last cycle is clearly one of growth across rubric elements. Where growth is not observed, there is no concern about any significant drop, and all of the scores across rubric elements in both of the measures are well above the target of 66% meeting or exceeding expectation. It is noted that in the spring 2020 Covid-19 caused students to move off campus after Spring Break; so, some of the measures were taken online, as specified in the Appendix 1.	The instructors are advised to keep on explaining rubric elements to students prior to the administration of the quizzes and final exam. A revision of the wording / standard in rubric elements may be in order if percentages reach 100% in three consecutive cycles, in each measure.

	general knowledge and transfer of training. See Appendix 1 for details. We aim to have 66% of scores at or above the "Meets Expectations" level.		
Outcome #3 *Students will demonstrate a satisfactory ability to comprehend, synthesize, and critique psychological knowledge presented in primary journal articles which are judged by the departmental faculty to be accessible to undergraduate students. Student writing intended to reflect these abilities should evidence quality, clarity, and mechanics consistent with the current Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association.*	In both PSYC 272 (sophomores, formerly PSYC 372) and PSYC 480 (seniors) students write a summary and critical analysis paper in response to reading an empirical study published in a psychology journal (i.e., primary source material). PSYC 272 papers are scored with a rubric, and used formatively and as first stage in pre-post assessment. PSYC 480 instructors calibrate their scoring using a rubric on a random subset of essays (about 1/3), followed by independent scoring of the remaining essays. Rating discrepancies are resolved through discussion; they are used as a follow-up in pre-post assessment. See Appendix 1 for details; for earlier results, please refer to earlier reports and respective tables.	SumCrit Paper #1 (PSYC 272) did not yield scores at the target level across most Rubric Elements (REs), as expected of majors in this formative phase. The exception was for RE #3, "Connection with other reading or theoretical/theological/practical issue," with 75% of majors at or above the target level of 3. SumCrit Paper #2 (PSYC 480) showed some REs with scores at or above 3. Notably, RE #1 "Summary of key aspects of empirical study" had 100% of majors reaching the 3-4 mark for the first time on record. REs #2 ("Critical analysis of issue/problem") and 3 ("Connection with other reading or theoretical/theological/practical issue") also surpassed the target level of 66%. As in the last cycle, however, RE #4 ("Writing – mechanics & APA style") fell below the target level.	The data suggest that intentional emphasis on RE #3 by faculty teaching both PSYC 272 and 480 is paying off, which is encouraging. The growth curve from SumCrit Papers 1 and 2 is also indicative that instructional efforts linked to REs 1-3 have been effective. The continued challenge of RE #4 underscores the importance of teaching writing skills across the curriculum since freshman year, with an emphasis on the APA style.

	We aim to have 66% of scores at or above "Meets Expectations" level in PSYC 480. PSYC 272 embedded assessment is formative.		
Outcome #4 *Students will articulate an informed position on foundational issues, contributions of theology to a holistic view of persons, contributions of psychology to a holistic view of persons, and their own personal philosophy of integration.*	Paper on Christianity-PSYC relationship; scored with a rubric See Appendix 1 for details. We aim to have 66% of scores at or above "Meets Expectations" level.	The data suggest a pattern of growth in all rubric elements as compared to the last cycle, except #1 (Foundational Principles), which still fell well above the target of 66%.	The instructor reported requiring drafts for each one of the four rubric elements this time around, and he believes that this practice had a positive effect in the results, notwithstanding Covid-19.
Outcome #5 *Students will evidence reflection upon their reasons for studying psychology, their short-and long-term educational and career goals, and their intellectual,*	Seniors in PSYC 480 write a reflection paper (Personal and Vocational Reflection Paper, PVRP) about their journey as psychology majors by looking at papers they wrote in the sophomore year (i.e., at a snapshot of their previous selves).	As in the last three cycles, PVRP data on REs # 1-3 had percentage of majors reaching scores ≥ 3 well above the target of 66%. For the first time in recent years, RE #4 ("Reflection on connections among faith, learning, and living") also surpassed the target.	- PSYC 480 instructors' encouragement of vocational reflection from the very beginning of the academic semester seems to continue helping majors reach the desired mark.

personal, and interpersonal strengths and weaknesses. They will also evidence the ability to reflect back on their undergraduate careers and describe continuity and change in these areas as well as plans for the future. Students' reflections on these areas will exhibit an understanding of relations among faith, learning, and living.	Scored with a rubric by both instructors. Rating discrepancies are resolved through discussion. See Appendix 1 for details. We aim to have 66% of scores at or above "Meets Expectations" level.		- Since the last cycle, instructors started using more explicit guidance for students to link their faith to their vocational reflection, plan for the future, and life endeavors. This seems to have started showing positive results.

Summer Camp Assessment

Program Intended Learning Outcome (PILO)	Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results
Overall expectation of Psych Campers being met	Item from general PR survey ("Did camp meet your expectations?") We aim to have 3/4 (75%) of campers saying "Yes" to this survey item.		

Enrollment in the Psych Camp	Head count of campers in the Psych Camp; % of MU campers who enroll for a program at MU. We aim to reach a minimal head count of 12, which is set by the University Relations Dept. as the cut-off mark to a viable budget. Also, we aim to have an overall MU #campers newly enrolled/ total #campers ratio at or above 10%		
Camp Program	One item in the general PR survey, rated 1 (=worst) to 5 (=best), plus # of responses citing Psych Camp program as "favorite aspect of camp" and ratio of positive by negative comments on Psych Camp program. We aim to have at least 66% of program rates at or above 4 on the 5-point scale; at least 66% of "faves" related to the Psych Camp program; and a +/- ratio comments on the Psych Camp program greater than 2.		

Appendix 1

Annual Assessment Report 2018-19 Cycle (and Some Previous Ones)

Assessment Data

PILO #1: ETS Major Field Test in Psychology (2012 and 2013 were skipped; beginning in 2014, test has been given in even years only)
Overall Scale Score (Range 120-200) and Subscale Scores (Range 20-100)

Note. ETS changed the Major Field Test (MFT) in Psychology in 2005. Therefore, results cannot be compared to previous years. Also, our students began taking the MFT on-line in 2005.
Bold print denotes score below target of nat'l normative mean score or higher.

		Overall Scale Score		Learning & Cognition	Percept/Comp/ Eth/Sens/Physio	Abnormal & Personality	Developmental & Social
2018 N=9	M	**143**		**45**	**45**	**47**	**48**
	SD	16		12	13	21	16
2016 N=17	M	**153**		**54**	59	**53**	**50**
	SD	11		13	12	11	11
2014 N=14	M	**158**		**56**	62	60	57
	SD	11		16	12	12	12
2011 N=12	M	160		59	60	57	64
	SD	15		14	15	15	15
2010 N=13	M	156		60	58	60	**55**
	SD	11		14	14	15	13
2009 N=19	M	**154**		**55**	**53**	56	56
	SD	15		17	16	14	16
2008 N=10	M	**151**		**54**	**50**	**52**	**53**
	SD	11		13	10	14	11

2007 N=19	M	**154**		**48**	**54**	59	57
	SD	13		12	16	12	13
2006 N=8	M	158		58	**56**	60	60
	SD	11		15	16	12	10
2005 N=7	M	156		58	58	**55**	57
	SD	11		17	16	17	9
National Data 9/14 to 6/18	M	156		56.1	55.7	55.9	56.3
	SD	15		15.7	15.2	14.6	14.6
National Data 2/05 to 6/11	M	156		56	56.9	55.9	56.0
	SD	14.9		15	15.4	14.3	14.7

Assessment Indicators: Mean Percent Correct

Note. Assessment indicators are broken down into more specific subfields than are sub-scores

	2005 N=7	2006 N=8	2007 N=19	2008 N=10	2009 N=19	2010 N=13	2011 N=12	2014 N=14	2016 N=17	2018 N=9	National Data [a]2/05 to 12/06, [b]2/05 to 6/10 [c]2011, [d]9/14 to 06/15 [e]9/14 to 6/16 [f]9/14-6/18
Memory & Thinking	**47**	**45**	**41**	**43**	49	55	52	48	**44**	**35**	[a]48 [b]49 [c]44 [d]46.1 [e]45.5 [f]44.9
Sensory & Physio	40	40	**37**	**30**	**36**	**40**	55	61	58	**41**	[a]38 [b]39 [c]49 [d]53.8 [e]53.3 [f]52.7
Developmental	52	52	48	**43**	**45**	47	67	59	**47**	**41**	[a]46 [b]47 [c]52 [d]49.6 [e]48.9 [f]48.3
Clin. & Abnormal	**64**	73	70	**64**	67	71	64	74	**69**	**59**	[a]66 [b]66 [c]59 [d]70.1 [e]69.8 [f]69.3
Social	**59**	65	63	**58**	63	**61**	68	**58**	52	52	[a]61 [b]62 [c]57 [d]63.8 [e]62.8 [f]62.6
Meas. & Method.	**52**	**49**	**48**	**50**	**48**	**48**	52	52	51	35	[a]53 [b]53 [c]54 [d]55.2 [e]54.5 [5]53.8

PILO #2: Specific Research Method Skills

Quizzes (PSYC 273): Psychology majors only

Spring 2018

Psychology Department Outcome #2: Quizzes*

Item	Mean Score (SD)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Inadequate (1)	% Meeting or Exceeding Expectations
Problem Area 2020 (N = 14) 2018 (N=6)	3.71 (.47) 3.34 (.82)	10 3	4 2	0 1	0 0	100 83.33
Ethical Considerations 2020 (N = 14) 2018 (N=6)	3.43 (.65) 3.67 (.52)	7 4	6 2	1 0	0 0	92.86 100
Design and Procedures 2020 (N = 14) 2018 (N=6)	2.93 (.47) 3.17 (.75)	1 2	11 3	2 1	0 0	85.71 83.33

Item	Mean Score (SD)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Inadequate (1)	% Meeting or Exceeding Expectations
Clarity and Coherence 2020 (N = 14) 2018 (N=6)	3.21 (.43) 3.34 (.82)	3 3	11 2	0 1	0 0	100 83.33

* A new rubric was pilot tested in 2017. The first year for its implementation was 2018. In 2020, Quizzes 1,2, and 3, were administered in the traditional fashion: on campus. Quizzes 4 and 5 were administered electronically, and students had one week to complete each, because of the move to online instruction in March and April during the CoVid-19 pandemic.

PILO #2: Specific Research Method Skills

Final Exam (PSYC 273) Psychology majors only

Spring 2018

Psychology Department Outcome #2: Final Exam*

Item	Mean Score (SD)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Inadequate (1)	% Meeting or Exceeding Expectations
Problem Area 2020 (N = 14) 2018 (N=6)	3.86 (.36) 3.83 (.41)	12 5	2 1	0 0	0 0	100 100

	Mean (SD)	4	3	2	1	%
Ethical Considerations						
2020 (N = 14)	3.29 (.61)	5	8	1	0	92.86
2018 (N=6)	3.50 (.84)	4	1	1	0	83.33
Design and Procedures						
2020 (N = 14)	3.07 (.27)	1	13	0	0	100
2018 (N=6)	3.67 (.52)	4	2	0	0	100
Clarity and Coherence						
2020 (N = 14)	3.64 (.50)	9	5	0	0	100
2018 (N=6)	3.17 (.75)	2	3	1	0	83.33

* A new rubric was pilot tested in 2017. The first year for its implementation was 2018. In 2020, the Final Exam was administered electronically, and students had one week to complete it, because of the move to online instruction in March and April during the CoVid-19 pandemic.

PILO #3

SumCrit Paper #1 (PSYC 272)*

Fall 2018, 2016, 2015; since 2016, these data have been reported in even years only.

Note. Rating frequencies and means for each rubric element are given below (parentheses contain standard deviations). Four-point rubric used for the first time in 2015 in this measure. **Bold print denotes below target of 66%.**
*Students in PSYC272 are at the beginning of their coursework related to writing summaries/critical analysis.

	4 Exceeds Expectations	3 Meets Expectations	2 Needs Improvement	1 Inadequate	Mean (SD)	% $\geq$ 3 Meets Expectations
1. Summary of key aspects of empirical study						
Fall 2018, N = 8	1	3	2	2	2.38 (1.06)	**50**
Fall 2016, N=13	0	0	8	5	1.62 (0.51)	**0**
Fall 2015, N=16	0	0	10	6	1.63 (.50)	**0**
2. Critical analysis of issue/problem						
Fall 2018, N = 8	1	3	4	0	2.63 (0.74)	**50**
Fall 2016, N=13	0	4	6	3	2.08 (0.76)	**30.77**
Fall 2015, N=16	0	5	8	3	2.13 (.72)	**31.25**
3. Connection with other reading or theoretical/theological/practical issue						
Fall 2018, N = 8	1	5	2	0	2.88 (0.64)	75
Fall 2016, N=13	0	3	8	2	2.08 (0.64)	**23.08**
Fall 2015, N=16	0	6	8	2	2.25 (0.68)	**37.50**
4. Writing – mechanics & APA style						
Fall 2018, N = 8	0	5	3	0	2.63 (0.52)	**62.5**
Fall 2016, N=13	0	3	4	7	1.62 (0.77)	**23.08**
Fall 2015, N=16	0	2	7	7	1.69 (.70)	**12.5**

PILO #3

SumCrit Paper #2 (PSYC 480)

Fall 2018, 2016, 2015, 2014; since 2016, these data have been reported in even years only.

Note. Rating frequencies and means for each rubric element are given below (parentheses contain standard deviations). **Bold print denotes below target of 66%.**

	4 Exceeds Expectations	3 Meets Expectations	2 Needs Improvement	1 Inadequate	Mean (SD)	% $\geq$ 3 Meets Expectations
1. Summary of key aspects of empirical study						
Fall 2018, N = 9	2	7	0	0	3.22 (0.44)	100
Fall 2016, *N*=17	1	8	6	2	2.47 (0.80)	**52.9**
Fall 2015, *N*=11	2	5	3	1	2.73 (1.27)	**63.7**
Fall 2014, *N*=14	2	7	4	1	2.71 (0.83)	**64.3**
2. Critical analysis of issue/problem						
Fall 2018, N = 9	1	6	2	0	2.89 (0.60)	77.8
Fall 2016, *N*=17	4	2	7	4	2.35 (1.11)	**35.3**
Fall 2015, *N*=11	2	2	5	2	2.36 (1.03)	**36.4**
Fall 2014, *N*=14	1	9	2	2	2.64 (0.84)	78.6
3. Connection with other reading or theoretical/theological/practical issue						
Fall 2018, N = 9	4	4	1	0	3.33 (0.71)	88.9
Fall 2016, *N*=17	4	7	6	0	2.88 (0.78)	**64.7**
Fall 2015, *N*=11	2	5	4	0	2.82 (0.75)	**63.7**
Fall 2014, *N*=14	5	5	3	1	3.00 (0.96)	71.4
4. Writing – mechanics & APA style						

Fall 2016, N = 9	2	3	4	0	2.78 (0.83)	**55.6**
Fall 2016, *N*=17	4	7	6	0	2.88 (0.78)	**64.7**
Fall 2015, *N*=11	5	3	2	1	3.09 (1.04)	72.8
Fall 2014, *N*=14	3	7	3	1	2.86 (0.86)	71.4

PILO #4

Integration of Faith and Learning

Spring 2018, 2016, 2015 (2017 was skipped).

Note. Bold print denotes below target of 66%.

	4 Exceeds Expectations	3 Meets Expectations	2 Needs Improvement	1 Inadequate	Mean (SD)	% $\geq$ 3 Meets Expectations
1. Foundational Issues						
Spring 2020, N = 14	7	3	1	3	3.00	71.4
Spring 2018, *N* = 13 *	6	5	0	2	3.15 (1.07)	84.6
Spring 2016, *N*=15	5	8	2	0	3.20 (0.68)	86.7
Spring 2015, *N*=13	5	3	4	1	2.92 (1.04)	**61.5**
2. Contributions of Theology						
Spring 2020, N = 14	5	6	1	2	3.00	78.6
Spring 2018, *N* = 13 *	3	5	3	2	2.69 (1.03)	71.7
Spring 2016, *N*=15	3	8	4	0	0.73 (0.70)	73.3

Spring 2015, *N*=13	5	3	4	1	0.62 (1.04)	**61.5**
3. Contributions of Psychology						
Spring 2020, N = 14	5	6	1	2	3.00	78.6
Spring 2018, *N* = 13 *	4	4	3	2	2.77 (1.09)	66.6
Spring 2016, *N*=15	7	7	1	0	0.93 (0.63)	93.3
Spring 2015, *N*=13	5	4	4	0	0.69 (0.86)	69.2
4. Personal Philosophy of Integration						
Spring 2020, N = 14	4	7	0	3	2.86	78.6
Spring 2018, *N* = 13 *	6	3	2	2	3.00 (1.15)	69.2
Spring 2016, *N*=15	6	7	2	0	3.27 (0.70)	86.7
Spring 2015, *N*=13	5	4	3	1	3.00 (1.00)	69.2

*Note. The data for Spring 2018 are potentially misleading. As always, non-majors were not included in the data (N=2). However, a unique circumstance this year was that three majors failed to complete the course. One of these dropped the course, but two remained enrolled in the course and never completed the final paper on which these data are based. As a result, these data include two students who were scored as "Inadequate" across all domains. If these two students are excluded from the data analysis, we see a very different picture, which demonstrates improved scores that are probably due to a pedagogical change. *Note.* Rating frequencies and means for each rubric element are given below (parentheses contain standard deviations). Four-point rubric used for the first time in this measure.

PILO #5

Personal and Vocational Reflection Paper (PVRP)

Fall 2016, 2015

Note. Rating frequencies and means for each rubric element are given below (parentheses contain standard deviations). Four-point rubric used for the first time in this measure. Bold print denotes below target of 66%.

	4 Exceeds Expectations	3 Meets Expectations	2 Needs Improvement	1 Inadequate	Mean (SD)	% $\geq$ 3 Meets Expectations
1. Reflection on reasons for studying psychology						
Fall 2018, N = 9	6	2	1	0	3.56 (0.73)	88.9
Fall 2016, *N*=17	7	8	2	0	3.29 (0.69)	88.2
Fall 2015, *N*=11	3	8	0	0	3.27 (0.47)	100
2. Reflection on educat'l & career goals						
Fall 2018, N = 9	3	6	0	0	3.33 (0.50)	100
Fall 2016, *N*=17	5	10	2	0	3.18 (0.64)	88.2
Fall 2015, *N*=11	3	7	0	1	3.09 (0.83)	90.9
3. Reflection on personal, interpersonal, and intellectual strengths & weaknesses						
Fall 2018, N = 9	3	4	2	0	3.11 (0.78)	77.8
Fall 2016, *N*=17	3	11	3	0	3.00 (0.61)	82.4
Fall 2015, *N*=11	4	4	3	0	3.09 (0.83)	72.8
4. Reflection on connections among faith, learning, and living						
Fall 2018, N = 9	3	5	0	1	3.11 (0.93)	88.9
Fall 2016, *N*=17	2	6	8	1	2.53 (0.80)	**47.1**
Fall 2015, *N*=11	3	1	3	4	2.27 (1.27)	**36.4**

APPENDIX 2:
CAMP DATA

Summer 2017; bold print denotes below target.

Time of Assessment	PR Survey, "Did camp meet your expectations? #Yes (%)	Enrollment: Head count in Psych Camp	Enrollment: % of MU campers enrolling at MU that year	PR Survey, General Program Content rate (*1=worst, 5=best*)	PR Survey, # of Mentions of Psych Camp program as "favorite aspect of camp" (%)	PR Survey, +/- Ratio of Comments on Psych Camp program (excluding faves)
Summer 2017	16 (100%)	16	about 20%	2 – N=1 3 – N=2 4 – N=4 5 – N=9 % at target = 81.25	N=11/16 (68.75%)	22 positives, 12 negatives, ratio = **1.83**
Summer 2018	*	13	*	*	*	*

(*) Data not available at the time when this report was prepared. We hope to resume reporting these data in the next cycle, if Psych Camp continues.

APPENDIX 3:
RUBRICS

PILO #2

Item	Score	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Inadequate (1)
Problem Area *(a set of statements to propose a research project, given the context of*		*The student demonstrates **superior understanding** of research through description of a research*	*The student demonstrates **basic understanding** of research through description of a research*	*The student demonstrates **rudimentary understanding** of research through description of a research*	*The student **fails to demonstrate understanding** of research through description of a research problem, goal,*

a completely novel problem)		***problem, goal, and at least one hypothesis.***	***problem, along with one goal, or one hypothesis.***	***problem, but fails to accurately identify an associated goal and/or hypothesis.***	*and/or hypothesis.*
Ethical Considerations		*The student demonstrates* ***superior understanding*** *of research ethics by identifying* **two risks** <u>**and**</u> **two safeguards** *in a novel research problem.*	*The student demonstrates* ***basic understanding*** *of research ethics by identifying* **one risk** <u>**and**</u> **one safeguard;** <u>**or**</u> **two risks but no safeguards;** <u>**or**</u> **two safeguards but no risks** *in a novel research problem.*	*The student demmonstrates* ***rudimentary understanding*** *of research ethics by identifying* **either one risk, or one safeguard** *in a novel research problem.*	*The student* ***fails to demonstrate rudimentary understanding*** *of research ethics through description of a risk or safeguard in a novel research problem.*
Design and Procedures		*The student demonstrates* ***superior understanding*** *of research design and methods by* ***naming a study/design type and exploring its application***	*The student demonstrates* ***basic understanding*** *of research design and methods by* ***naming a study/design type and describing its application***	*The student demonstrates* ***rudimentary understanding*** *of research design and methods by* ***describing the application of a design (with at least one procedure or***	*The student* ***fails to demonstrate rudimentary understanding*** *of research design and methods through description of a study type/design.*

		(with sampling and procedures) to a novel research problem.	*(with procedures) to a novel research problem.*	*sampling technique) to a novel research problem. **The name of the study/design type might be missing.***	
Clarity and Coherence		*The student demonstrates **superior clarity and coherence in communication about** a novel research problem. **Ideas flow very well; writing is very clear** and **nearly free** of grammatical errors and misspellings.*	*The student demonstrates **basic clarity and coherence in communication about** a novel research problem. **Ideas flow well; writing is generally clear,** but there may be **up to four** grammatical errors and/or misspellings.*	*The student demonstrates **rudimentary clarity and coherence in communication about** a novel research problem. **Ideas do not necessarily flow well; writing is not necessarily clear, and** there may be **several** grammatical errors and/or misspellings.*	*The student **fails to demonstrate rudimentary clarity and coherence in communication about** a novel research problem. **Ideas do not flow well; writing is not clear** and there are **several/many** grammatical errors and/or misspellings.*

PILO #3: SumCrit PSYC 480 (Over, please)

Item	Score	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Inadequate (1)
Summary		*Coherent* summary of *all* of these: theoretical underpinning, previous research, hypotheses, methods, results, and conclusions.	*Coherent* summary of *four or five* of these: theoretical underpinning, previous research, hypotheses, methods, results, and conclusions.	*Coherent* summary of *three* of these: theoretical underpinning, previous research, hypotheses, methods, results, and conclusions.	*Coherent* summary of *fewer than three* of these: theoretical underpinning, previous research, hypotheses, methods, results, and conclusions.
Critical Analysis		One *central* issue/problem is specified with a *cogent* theoretical, meta-theoretical/theological or methodological justification. **And:** Critique is *not* acknowledged or hinted by the article's author/s.	One *significant* issue/problem is specified with *acceptable* justification on theoretical, metatheoretical/theological or methodological grounds. **And:** Critique is *not* directly acknowledged but may be *hinted* in the article.	One *significant* issue/problem is specified but with *inadequate* justification on theoretical, metatheoretical/ theological or methodological grounds. **And:** Critique is *not* directly acknowledged but may be *hinted* in the article.	Critique is *not* specified or, if it is, it involves a *minor/tangential* issue/ problem with *inadequate* justification on theoretical, metatheoretical/ theological or methodological grounds. **Or**: *Regardless* of the nature of issue/problem and justification, critique is *directly taken* from the article.
Connection		One *coherent* connection is established with another PSYC 480 reading or theoretical/ theological/practical issue that leads to a *new* idea/practical implication.	One connection is established with another PSYC 480 reading or theoretical/theological/ practical issue, but: Connection is *insufficiently coherent* **or** leads to *no new* idea/practical implication.	*One* connection is established with another PSYC 480 reading or theoretical/theological/ practical issue, but: Connection is *incoherent* **and** leads to *no new* idea/practical implication.	*No* connection is established with another PSYC 480 reading or theoretical/theological /practical issue.
Writing		The writing is *very clear* **and** *nearly free* from grammatical error and misspelling. **And:** The text is *well organized* in a good number of sections/paragraphs, **and** *closely follows* the current APA style (title page, headings – if used, citations, references, etc.).	The writing is clear *for the most part* with *just a few* grammatical errors and/or misspellings. **And:** The text is *fairly* organized in a good number of sections/ paragraphs, **and** *for the most part* follows the current APA style (title page, headings – if used, citations, references, etc.)	The writing has *several* unclear sentences and/or grammatical errors and/or misspellings but is still *fairly organized* in a good number of sections/paragraphs **and** follows the current APA style *for the most part*. **Or:** *For the most part, clear* writing, just a few grammatical/spelling/ organizational issues but the text	The writing has *several/ many* unclear sentences and/or grammatical errors and/or misspellings **and** is *disorganized* (e.g., poor distribution of paragraphs). **And:** *for the most part* it does *not* follow the current APA style (title page, headings – if used, citations, references, etc.)

				does *not* follow the current APA style (title page, headings – if used, citations, references, etc.) *for the most part*.	

PILO #4: Integration Paper in PSYC 410

Item	Score	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Inadequate (1)
Foundational Issues		Student demonstrates **sophisticated** awareness of how worldviews shape the way one conceives of epistemology, cosmology, and philosophical anthropology, and *explores* their own metaphysical assumptions *thoroughly*.	Student demonstrates **basic** awareness of how worldviews shape the way one conceives of epistemology, cosmology, and philosophical anthropology, and *identifies several* of his or her own metaphysical assumptions.	Student demonstrates basic awareness that worldviews shape foundational assumptions but fails to identify his or her own metaphysical assumptions.	Student **fails to clearly articulate** how worldviews shape foundational assumptions.
Contributions of Theology to a Holistic View of Persons		Student demonstrates **sophisticated** awareness of what Christian theology (belief and practice) can contribute to a holistic understanding of persons. A sophisticated answer should include discussion of creation, fall, redemption, consummation, and implications (e.g., social justice, value of persons, etc.) NOTE: Students can fulfill this by articulating personally held Christian beliefs or by articulating what Christian faith could contribute to such an understanding even if the student does not personally hold these beliefs.	Student demonstrates **basic** awareness of what Christian theology (belief and practice) can contribute to a holistic understanding of persons. A basic answer will include at least three key theological observations but may only imply rather than clearly articulate the implications of these theological views.	Student demonstrates **rudimentary** awareness that Christian belief or practice can contribute to the understanding or welfare of persons, but lacks specificity of either the theological constructs or the implications.	Student **fails to demonstrate** awareness that Christian belief or practice can contribute to the understanding or welfare of persons, **OR acknowledges the above but without specificity** of both relevant theological constructs and the implications of these constructs for how Christianity might help us understand and value people.
Contributions of Psychology to a Holistic		Student demonstrates **sophisticated** awareness of what psychology can contribute to a holistic understanding of persons. A sophisticated answer should include extensive discussion of two of the following: the biopsychosocial perspective, the usefulness of empiricism, and the usefulness of	Student demonstrates **basic** awareness of what psychology can contribute to a holistic understanding of persons. A basic answer should acknowledge that psychological methods and findings help us to understand what it means to be persons.	Student expresses a **vague or implicit** awareness that psychology can help us to understand what it means to be persons, but lacks specificity and depth of discussion.	Student **fails to demonstrate awareness** that psychology can help us to understand what it means to be persons.

View of Persons		philosophically-based psychological theories.			
Personal Philosophy of Integratio n		Student **clearly and thoroughly** defends a paradigm for relating psychology and Christianity, including personal application.	Student **clearly identifies** a paradigm that they endorse for relating psychology and Christianity, but their defense is **basic or lacks specificity**. They include at least some element of how they intend to apply their paradigm in the future.	Student **identifies** a paradigm for relating psychology and Christianity, with a **vague** expression of why they believe this or what its implications might be. They include at least some element of how their paradigm might impact their future.	Student **fails to identify** a paradigm for relating psychology and Christianity, or identifies a paradigm with very poor explanation of why they selected it or how it might affect their future.

PILO #5: Personal and Vocational Reflection Paper in PSYC 480 (over, please)

Item	Score	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Inadequate (1)
Reflection on Reasons for Studying Psychology		Addresses TWO or more different reasons. **AND** Provides a <u>thorough</u> explanation of continuity and/or change over time, including TWO or more specific influences.	Addresses TWO or more different reasons. **AND** Provides an <u>explanation</u> of continuity and/or change, including at least ONE reference to a specific influence.	Addresses only ONE reason. **OR** Provides only <u>minimal</u> explanation of continuity and/or change WITHOUT reference to a specific influence.	Addresses only ONE reason. **OR** Merely lists reasons without explaining continuity or change over time.
Reflection on Educational and Career Goals		Addresses several specific goals, including at least one clear goal for the future (or provides a compelling rationale for being uncertain at this time). **AND** Provides a <u>thorough</u> explanation of continuity and/or change over time, including TWO or more specific influences.	Addresses several specific goals, including at least one clear goal for the future (or provides a compelling rationale for being uncertain at this time). **AND** Provides an <u>explanation</u> of continuity and/or change, including at least ONE reference to a specific influence.	Addresses only a few goals or several vague goals. **OR** Provides only <u>minimal</u> explanation of continuity and/or change WITHOUT reference to a specific influence.	Addresses only a few goals. **OR** Merely lists goals without explaining continuity or change over time.
Reflection on Personal, Interpersonal, and Intellectual Strengths and Weaknesses		Addresses all 3 types of traits as well as both strengths and weaknesses. **AND** Provides a <u>thorough</u> explanation of continuity and/or change over	Addresses two types as well as both strengths and weaknesses. **AND** Provides an <u>explanation</u> of continuity and/or change, including at least ONE reference to a specific influence.	Addresses only one type. **OR** Provides only <u>minimal</u> explanation of continuity and/or change WITHOUT reference to a specific influence.	Addresses only one type. **OR** Merely lists traits without explaining continuity or change over time.

		time, including TWO or more specific influences.			
Reflection on Connections Between Faith, Learning, and Living		TWO or more especially specific and/or compelling connections to connections between faith and learning/living. **OR** Successfully weaves faith issues into a coherent narrative throughout the essay.	At least TWO coherent connections between faith and learning/living.	ONE coherent connection between faith and learning/living.	No mention of faith or only passing, vague reference to faith without sufficiently connecting faith issues to learning/living.